PAUL, JOSEPHUS AND JUDAISM:

THE SHARED JUDAISM

OF PAUL AND JOSEPHUS

by

George Peter Carras

Christ Church

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the

University of Oxford

Michaelmas Term 1989



CONTENTS

Acknowledgments		iii
Abbreviations		iv
Abstract (I)		v
Abstract (II)		vi
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Josephus and Judaism : Contra Apionem 2.190-219	23
III.	Pauline Autobiography	87
IV.	Jewish Elements in Paul's Theology	133
V.	Paul and the Judaizers	205
VI.	Jewish Ethics and Gentile Converts	257
VII.	A Dialogue on the Jewish Religion	285
VIII.	Conclusions: The shared Judaism of Paul & Josephus	307
Bibliography		317

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor E.P. Sanders, for the help and direction he gave in the preparation of this thesis. Since 1985 he patiently read various drafts and gave many decisive remarks about my work. Without his guidance and invaluable comments the thesis would not yet have come to completion.

Initially I came to Oxford to study with the late Dr. G.B. Caird. He agreed to take me on as a research student and he served as my supervisor until his unfortunate death in 1984. Professor Caird read my initial attempts to turn a few ideas into a workable thesis. I would like to express my gratitude to Mrs. Molly Caird for the assistance, help and patience shown to me by her late husband.

My interest in the New Testament and early Judaism began as an undergraduate while attending a class at the University of California, Berkeley, from Professor David Daube. From that time he has, to no small degree, taken an interest in my work. He has read parts of 2 chapters of my thesis. I will always be very grateful to him for his wisdom, sound judgement and pleasant company.

Finally, I would like to express my whole-hearted thanks to my wife, Elizabeth, who has endured many sacrifices for me to complete this thesis.

ABBREVIATIONS

ABR	Australian Biblical Review
Bib	Biblica
Bib. Trans.	Bible Translator
BibLeb	Bibel und Leben
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
Enc. Jud.	Encyclopedia Judaica
ETL	Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses
EvTh	Evangelische Theologie
ExpT	Expository Times
HBT	Horizons in Biblical Theology
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JR	Journal of Religion
JSJ	Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSNT	Journal for the Study of the New Testament
JSP	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
KD	Kerygma und Dogma
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic text
NEB	New English Bible
NovT	Novum Testamentum
NRT	La nouvelle revue théologique
NT	New Testament
NTS	New Testament Studies
OT	Old Testament
PPJ	Paul and Palestinian Judaism (E.P. Sanders)
RB	Revue biblique
RSV	Revised Standard Version
RGG	Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart
RivB	Rivista biblica
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
ST	Studia theologica
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
ThQ	Theologische Quartalschrift
ThZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZTK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

PAUL, JOSEPHUS, AND JUDAISM: THE SHARED JUDAISM OF PAUL AND JOSEPHUS

by George Peter Carras
Christ Church, Oxford
A Thesis submitted for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Michaelmas Term 1989

ABSTRACT I

Students of Second Temple Judaism have drawn two broad conclusions. First, Judaism of the first century is characterized by diversity. Second, the most pervasive influence on Judaism of this period was Hellenism. The present study seeks to contribute to the continuing discussion of Second Temple Judaism, bearing in mind these two factors. Specifically, the aim is to identify the shared ideas of Judaism. The thesis is concerned with the search for common features of the Jewish religion -- what may be termed "common denominators" within Second Temple Judaism. This should help to decide the question of how we are to understand the diversity within first-century Judaism in relation to its common shared features.

In the search for these shared features two main bodies of evidence are explored: Josephus' Contra Apionem, 2. 190-219, and the letters of Paul; for differing reasons both of these documents may be used profitably. The letters of Paul are valuable since this material is all dated before the destruction of the Second Temple; whereas Contra Apionem, 2. 190-219, is one of the earliest and possibly oldest theological summaries compiled by a contemporary of the NT writers. While there are other summaries on the Jewish religion (Philo's Hypothetica, his Spec. Laws and Josephus' Antiquities 4.196-301) Contra Apionem offers a summary of a different kind because its focus is on basic Jewish principles.

The method used is first to consider Ap. 2. 190-219 paragraph by paragraph in conjunction with Philo's Hypothetica and the Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides. Where appropriate appeal is also made to the DSS, the rabbis, and the apocalyptic literature. This follows an assessment of the undisputed letters of Paul. The analysis of this evidence is conducted under the following headings: Jewish autobiography; Jewish elements in Paul's Christian theology; debates with Jewish Christian opponents; Jewish ethics embraced by Gentile converts; a dialogue on the nature of the Jewish religion.

Three main conclusions are reached. The first is that there are discernible common features within first-century Judaism. This is supported by an analysis of the Contra Apionem précis and related Jewish material. Second, there is a body of common opinion that may be deemed to belong to the period before AD 70. This will be argued from the letters of Paul by appeal to various criteria. The third point is that there are Jewish ideas that are both common and pre-70. This will be confirmed by appealing in a comparative way to evidence from both the letters of Paul and Contra Apionem. The criterion can be formulated in the following way: ideas may be considered both common and pre-70 whenever those found in Contra Apionem and attested in a wide variety of Jewish evidence (thus common) are also attested in the letters of Paul (and so pre-70).

PAUL, JOSEPHUS, AND JUDAISM:

THE SHARED JUDAISM OF PAUL AND JOSEPHUS

by George Peter Carras

Christ Church, Oxford

A Thesis submitted for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Michaelmas Term 1989

ABSTRACT II

Students of Second Temple Judaism have drawn two broad conclusions. First, Judaism of the first century is characterized by diversity. Second, the most pervasive influence on Judaism of this period was Hellenism. The present study seeks to contribute to the continuing discussion of Second Temple Judaism, bearing in mind these two factors. Specifically, the aim is to identify the shared ideas of Judaism. The thesis is concerned with the search for common features of the Jewish religion -- what may be termed "common denominators" within Second Temple Judaism. This should help to decide the question of how we are to understand the diversity within first-century Judaism in relation to its common shared features.

In the search for these shared features two main bodies of evidence are explored: Josephus' Contra Apionem, 2. 190-219, and the letters of Paul; for differing reasons both of these documents may be used profitably. The letters of Paul are valuable since this material is all dated before the destruction of the Second Temple; whereas Contra Apionem, 2. 190-219, is one of the earliest and possibly oldest theological summaries compiled by a contemporary of the NT writers. While there are other summaries on the

Jewish religion (Philo's Hypothetica, his Spec. Laws and Josephus' Antiquities 4.196-301) Contra Apionem offers a summary of a different kind because its focus is on basic Jewish principles. Contra Apionem gives few legal details such as are found in Spec. Law and Antiquities 4. Strictly speaking, Contra Apionem is not moral advice or recommendations for a non-Jewish readership to follow as the Hypothetica testifies.

The method used is first to consider Ap. 2. 190-219 paragraph by paragraph in conjunction with Philo's Hypothetica and the Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides. Where appropriate, appeal is also made to the DSS, the rabbis, and the apocalyptic literature. This follows an assessment of the undisputed letters of Paul. The analysis of this evidence is conducted under the following headings: Jewish autobiography; Jewish elements in Paul's Christian theology; debates with Jewish Christian opponents; Jewish ethics embraced by Gentile converts; a dialogue on the nature of the Jewish religion. Two extremes must be avoided if our search for "commom denominators" is to succeed: (1) an overemphasis on diversity in Judaism which excludes the possibility of common elements; (2) the tendency to analyse Judaism document-by-document and to construe each document as a self-contained and complete expression of one of the versions of Judaism. The basic outline of the study is to accept diversity in Judaism as well as adopt a document-by-document approach. Yet this will be done with the intention of looking for common elements.

Three main conclusions are reached. The first is that there are discernible common features within first-century Judaism. This is supported by an analysis of the Contra Apionem précis and related Jewish material. Second, there is a body of common opinion that may be deemed to belong to the period before AD 70. This will be argued from the letters of Paul by appeal to various criteria. The third point is that there are Jewish ideas that are both common and pre-70. This will be confirmed by appealing in a comparative way to evidence from both the letters of Paul and Contra Apionem. The criterion can be

formulated in the following way: ideas may be considered both common and pre-70 whenever those found in Contra Apionem and attested in a wide variety of Jewish evidence (thus common) are also attested in the letters of Paul (and so pre-70).

In the first chapter several preliminaries are discussed such as those given above. In the subsequent chapters the evidence of Josephus and Paul is considered. Chapter 2 analyses Ap. 2. 190-219 and argues that Josephus presents a commonly held form of Judaism. This is neither to say that all the ideas in the section were held by all Jews nor that all were distinctive of Jews: some were shared by Jews and Gentiles. Enough parallels are adduced, however, to indicate that there is both a long list of common features and also that there existed a common understanding of Judaism as an ism. One can itemize some of the obvious points of common Judaism: separateness points to the view that Jews were God's chosen people; they shared monotheism and this cut them off to an appreciable degree from other societies; Jewish standards of behaviour, especially sexual behaviour, distinguished them; most expected some form of a life after death; community membership required obedience; the Torah was to be kept as an expression of covenantal membership.

Chapters 3-7 consider the letters of Paul. Chapter 3 deals with Paul's autobiographical material. In the search for the kind of Judaism which emerges from the letters of Paul, the distinction is made between general information of which we can be completely sure and more particular information, which is less certain. The primary intention is to uncover hard information, even though it will often be of a general sort, and to use this in an attempt to discover what was common to the various forms of Judaism in the first century. In this chapter use is made of contexts which indicate the presence of several categories of Jews: Paul's Jewish Christian opponents; Paul's Jewish contemporaries; Jews of the synagogue; historic Israel; the imaginary Jewish critic. The approach in treating these contexts is first to consider material which is explicitly autobiographical (Phil. 3. 4-6; Gal. 1. 13-14; 2 Cor.

11.22). This is followed by evidence which may be classified as implicitly autobiographical (Rom. 9. 4-5; 2. 17-20; 10. 1-3; 2 Cor. 3. 14ff). From an analysis of this material it is argued that Paul shared the following features with Jews of the time. First, Jews took pride in their nationality and the privileges accorded to them because of it. Second, they were zealous for their God and his Law-which was the norm, final revelation and centre of their religious outlook. Third, Jews held to the belief that correct behaviour was of fundamental importance. Fourth, some Jews held their beliefs with such tenacity that anyone who opposed them could be liable to severe treatment.

Chapter 4 considers Jewish elements in Paul's Christian theology. The concern will be to focus on evidence that may be classified as Jewish ideas contained within Paul's Christian theology whose meaning is presupposed. Paul makes no attempt to argue from the evidence that the ideas are significant or central within the Jewish religion. It may thus be inferred that ideas mentioned without argument in the course of Paul's exposition were regarded by him as matters of such common consent among Jews that a detailed argumentation would be superfluous. The present chapter brings together ideas which satisfy this criterion. This is done by showing on internal grounds that there exists a body of Jewish opinion that is commonly consented to. The inclusion of these supposed common ideas in arguments, dialogue, and ethical teaching in the letters of Paul is based on the assumption that the general meaning and significance of the ideas are understood. It is a reasonable deduction that where unexplained Jewish ideas are discernible in Paul's letters commonly held opinion is represented. In the first place some broad generalizations are formulated, and this is followed by a more precise interpretation of the data, especially focusing on Contra Apionem.

Ideas that satisfy the above criteria include the following. (1) Jews share a monotheistic view of God; their God is just in his dealings towards mankind. (2) Jews have a privileged

status by virtue of their nationality. (3) The election of Israel was a datum in the Jewish tradition. (4) Gentile entry into the people of God is an integral part of Jewish eschatological hope. (5) Holiness is a virtue to be emulated through the fulfilment of the Torah. (6) Belief in a remnant is used as a means of explaining the hiatus between God's promise and reality. (7) God's saving activity arises out of his gracious nature. (8) A consequence of obedience to the will of God is reward, while disobedience is met by punishment. (9) A future afterlife is anticipated.

At the end of this chapter several common features between Contra Apionem and the letters of Paul are noted. First, both share a common view of an afterlife. Second, both authors affirm that sexual activity must be confined to its appropriate context. Third, our authors both maintain that all behaviour has consequences either for good or ill. A fourth point shared by Paul and Josephus is that both affirm the centrality, uniqueness, and justice of the Jewish God. The fifth point of commonality is that entry into the people of God is not limited to those who are Jewish by nationality. There is one further point that is fundamental to our reconstruction of common denominators in the Jewish religion: the assumption that Jews are the elect people of God.

Chapter 5 investigates material relating to what Paul and his opponents shared in common. What was presupposed by Paul and his opponents, and what were the points of common agreement? We shall begin by sketching a suitable approach for determining the nature of the debate(s) and the views of the opponents, as far as this is possible, by establishing several criteria. Discussion focuses on Gal. 3. 6-29 and 4. 21-31, but Phil. 3. 2ff and 2 Cor. 10-13 are also treated, more briefly. From an analysis of this material it emerges that Paul and his opponents share the following points. (1) The significance of Abraham and conditions of entry into his "family" were central tenets held by Paul and his opponents. (2) It was assumed that Gentiles would become members of the new people

of God. (3) The OT was the legitimating authority of appeal. (4) An accountability to the historical plan and purposes of God is assumed. (5) Symbols of Jewish ethnicity that are integral to the debate include circumcision, the covenant, and observance of the Torah. (6) Gentiles are considered to be "sinners". (7) Jews took pride in their race.

Chapter 6 discusses the relationship between Gentile converts and Jewish ethical ideals. Specifically, the issue that requires attention is what occurs when Paul's Jewish presuppositions clash with the behaviour of Gentile converts. While Paul's converts from paganism in one sense are a "new creation", their behaviour did not always reflect this. In order to correct this behaviour Paul instructed his converts to embrace certain Jewish ethical ideals. This investigation concentrates on 1 Cor. 8. 1 -13; 10. 1-11. 1; 1 Thess. 4. 3-8. Gentile converts were to emulate Jewish ideals in two areas: sexual ethics and the rejection of idolatrous practices. First, immorality was to be shunned. In accordance with common Jewish sentiment the practice of incest, homosexuality, and adultery was to be avoided. While in the case of prostitution the Jewish evidence is mixed, there is a strand of opinion that abhorred it, and Paul is in agreement with this view. Second, idolatrous practice, especially that surrounding the pagan temple Cultus, is to be avoided. This was a consequence of the fact that for Jews there was only one God who was to be worshipped and to receive sacrifice. It was also to be avoided because idolatrous practice was a distinct feature of pagan religion which was to be left behind as part of the convert's past experience.

Chapter 7 considers the final body of evidence discussed from the letters of Paul. In this chapter Rom. 2. 1-29 is treated as a dialogue between two Jews from differing perspectives on the nature of the Jewish religion. In spite of the fact that Rom. 2 gives an interpretation of the Jewish religion from two different points of reference, the analysis shows that there were the following common ideas. (1) Jewish ancestry played a central

role in Judaism. (2) Jews possess a historic advantage, yet this does not hinder the availability of God's promises to others. (3) God's acts are just and impartial in nature. (4) Beliefs must be accompanied by a corresponding ethic. (5) Circumcision has a literal and symbolic significance. (6) The observance of the Torah is what binds together correct behaviour, circumcision as rite and symbol, and a Jew's pride of race.

The final chapter brings together Jewish ideas that are common in Ap. 2. 190-219 and the undisputed letters of Paul. The fact that common ground exists suggests the plausibility of a "common denominator Judaism". The shared ideas between these two sources include the following. (1) God is monotheistic in nature; he is able to control the affairs of the universe and direct history. (2) There is hope of a future life after death. (3) The people of God are defined in terms which include non-Jews. (4) The moral structure of the universe consists of reward for obedience and punishment for disobedience. (5) There is an appropriate ethic which shows that a person is a member of the "in-group". This ethic includes sexual behaviour: immorality, adultery, and homosexuality must be avoided. The ethic also applies to worshipping gods other than the one true God: one must shun all idolatrous practices. (6) The observance of the Torah as an ideal is retained by Paul and Josephus. (7) The blessing of God is not something to be earned but freely received. Since God graciously offers his blessing, he expects his people to do his will. (8) Jews possess a strong sense of national pride. (9) Jews are the elect people of God.

The thesis concludes by briefly indicating how the present study relates to previous attempts to describe Second Temple Judaism by appealing to those scholars referred to in the Introduction. Finally, the study offers three implications that the investigation may have for future research. First, the study may enable others to pursue the question of the relationship between diversity and common ideas in Judaism. Second, the present study could assist in redefining the question of the nature of Paul's Judaism. Third, future work

on first-century Judaism may need to give more attention to Ap. 2. 190-219 as an instructive and important portrayal of Judaism to be considered with other witnesses of the period.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The study of a religion, ancient or modern, must concern itself with the context in which it arose as a means of understanding its literature (if such exists), symbols, central figures, and religious outlook. This is equally true of ancient Judiasm, early Christianity, or Islam. In order to understand the religion in a historically accurate way one must consider it on its own terms and from within its own religious and historical frame of reference.

One pitfall that must be avoided in reconstructing ancient Judaism is to assume (as older scholars did) that Judaism was monolithic. The term "normative Judaism" introduced by G.F. Moore exemplifies this tendency.[1] While Moore recognized differences within Judaism he made the correlation between Rabbinic Judaism and normativeness. Although he did not intend the correlation first century Judaism = only Rabbinic Judaism, those who have subsequently read Moore have understood him in this way. Regardless, the origin of Moore's "normative Judaism" needs to be understood in connection with the work of W. Bousset.[2] Like Moore he assumed a monolithic tendency in his portrayal of Judaism. However, the main difference was that for Bousset "The Religion of Judaism" was based on the Apocalyptic and Pseudepigraphic material and especially the Apocalyses. A further example of the above tendency is H.A. Wolfson, who maintains there existed in ancient Judaism a "native religion".[3] According to Wolfson this "native religion" was Rabbinic Judaism and it is in relation to this Judaism that he considered Philo. To these scholars

---

[1]. G.F. Moore, Judaism, (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), Vol. 3, vi.

[2]. W. Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (Berlin, 1903). See further on the relationship between Moore and Bousset n. 12 below.

[3]. H. A. Wolfson, Philo, (Cambridge, Mass., 1947), 2 Vols.

may be added those NT books which include the obligatory chapter on "the Jewish background" and so give the impression that Judaism was a single entity.[4]

Two broad conclusions have been drawn by students of ancient Judaism, or more particularly Second Temple Judaism. First, Judaism of the first century is characterized by diversity. There exists a variety of religious views and tendencies within what may be called Judaism: first-century Judaism is thus thought to consist of several versions of Judaism. [5] Second, the most pervasive influence on Judaism of the first century both in Palestine and in the diaspora was Hellenism.[6]

The present study will seek to contribute to the continuing discussion on the nature of Second Temple Judaism, bearing in mind these two factors. Specifically, we shall discuss a problem that has received little attention. It is well known that Jews of the Second Temple period made use of a variety of symbols, ideals and traditions to express their religious outlook. This was one consequence of the fact that the traditions of old continued to have value for Jews in new situations. The result was that the OT Law was interpreted

---

[4]. e.g. J. W. Drane, "The Religious Background", New Testament Interpretation, I.H. Marshall, (ed.) (Exeter, 1977), 117-125.

[5]. C.J. Roetzel, The World that Shaped the New Testament (London, 1987), 24-45; 51-53; I.M. Zeitlin, Jesus and the Judaism of his Time (Oxford, 1988), 11-37; M. Simon, Jewish Sects in the Time of Jesus (Philadelphia, 1967); S. Sandmel, The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity (New York, 1969), 58ff.; L. T. Johnson, The Writings of the New Testament (Philadelphia, 1986), 41, 43, and the bibliographical note, 64-66; J. Neusner, Judaism: The Evidence of the Mishnah (Philadelphia, 1980), 3-4, 6, 24, 28-29, 43 also "Varieties of Judaism in the Formative Age" in A. Green, (ed.),Jewish Spirtuality: From the Bible Through the Middle Ages (London, 1989), 171-197; M. Smith, "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century", M. Davis (ed.), in Israel: Its Role in Civilzation (New York, 1956), 71ff.; H. Maccoby, Judaism in the First Century (London, 1989), 1-2; W. Meeks, The Moral World of the First Christians (London, 1987), 68ff., esp. 91.

[6]. See W. W. Tarn with G. T. Griffith, Hellenistic Civilization (New York, 1952); M. Hadas, Hellenistic Culture (New York, 1959); V. Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews (New York, 1970); also Johnson, op.cit., 39-40 for a useful bibliographical note; Smith, op.cit. 76-81, 81; D. Daube, "Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric", HUCA 22 (1949), 239-264.

and reinterpreted in ways that were consistent with a person's or a group's own religious point of view. This was done regardless of whether other Jews agreed with the interpretation. Consequently, we find within what is referred to as "Judaism" several different and competing religious ideologies: Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes. Each of these groups within Judaism claimed that it held the legitimate or authoritative view of Judaism. The diversity of literary genres also points to variety within Judaism. There emerged several different vehicles of expressing Jewish ideas: history, apology, wisdom sayings, apocalypses, rabbinic material, and commentaries. If we consider the fact that Jewish literature spanned several centuries, emerged from several different locations and in quite different social and cultural settings, we shall be less surprised by the fact of diversity within Judaism.

Despite this picture of diversity within Second Temple Judaism, the present state of critical opinion indicates that Jews shared some common symbols, ideas, and emphases. Several important studies have contributed to this discussion. First is the now well known and seminal work by E.P. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism.[7] In the present context it is not necessary to sketch the main argument of his study except to point out that Sanders affirms the view that there were common features, or what he calls a "pattern of religion". He refers to these common elements as "covenantal nomism". This central feature Sanders traces through a wide body of Jewish literature and concludes that there is within the Palestinian Jewry a shared and common ideal focused on covenant and obedience to Torah.[8] Sanders also argues that this is a feature of Hellenistic Jewish literature.[9] However,

---

[7]. E.P. Sanders, PPJ (London, 1977), passim. The importance of this study is measured by the number of replies to the study. See e.g. M.D. Hooker, "Paul and 'Covenantal Nominism'", M.D. Hooker and S.G. Wilson, (ed.), Paul and Paulinism: Essays in honour of C.K. Barrett (London, 1982), 47-56.

[8]. Among the various scholars who commend Sanders' thesis see most recently Maccoby, Judaism, 108 and Meeks, World 95, 169 n. 24.

in considering Paul in light of covenantal nomistic categories Sanders concludes that he is essentially outside this basic structure. Paul is seen to depart from the norm in two significant ways. First, he denies the traditional Jewish doctrine of election. Second, he insists that faith in Christ, rather than acceptance of the Law, is the requirement for membership in the people of God. Nonetheless, Sanders affirms that Paul shares certain marks of covenantal nomism in his Christian theology (e.g. while salvation depends on membership of the "in-group", yet deeds still count; the framework of Paul's thought is that of Jewish eschatological speculation).[10] The study of Sanders builds on the earlier work of Moore.[11] He maintains that there existed within Judaism common ideas that can be traced over a variety of Jewish sources from the second century BC onwards. Common themes discussed by Moore include repentance, forgiveness, atonement, Gentile conversion, the centrality of the Torah, Jewish nationality, and univeralism. Thus the situation of Judaism in the first centuries of the Christian era Moore characterized as "normative Judaism".[12] There has been much debate over whether this is an appropriate way to depict

---

[9]. See E.P. Sanders, "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism", in R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs (eds.), Jews, Greeks and Christians: Studies in Honor of W. D. Davies (Leiden, 1976), 11-44. Sanders does however omit one significant author in whom covenant is central, namely Ps.-Philo. See F. J. Murphy, "God in Pseudo-Philo", JSJ 19 (1988), 1-18.

[10]. E. P. Sanders, Paul, the Law and the Jewish People (London, 1983), 111, 207-208; also E.P. Sanders, "Jesus, Paul and Judaism", in W. Haase (ed.) in Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin and New York, 1982), Vol. 25.1, 435-440.

[11]. See n. 1 above.

[12]. This term of Moore's has been much criticized. By the term Moore maintains that he is using what is otherwise referred to as "rabbinic Judaism": "...for the task I have set myself the continuity and progress of the main current of what is called rabbinic Judaism- I should prefer the name 'normative Judaism'..." (Judaism, Vol. 3, vi). The origin of the term is to be understood in connection with W. Bousset's study, Judentums where his reconstruction of Judaism is based on the Apocalyptic and Pseudaepigraphic material, especially the Apocalypses. Moore's criticism of Bousset is that he bases his study on sources to which "so far as we know, Judaism never conceded any authority, while he discredits and largely ignores those which it has always regarded as normative" ("Christian Writers on Judaism", HTR 14 (1921) 244, Moore's review of Bousset's, Judentums). This

the Judaism of the time. Nevertheless, Moore has clearly shown that ancient Jews held common beliefs.[13]

Another study which shows that Jews held similar ideas is that by M. Newton.[14] He considers the concept of purity at Qumran and in Paul, and maintains that Paul shared "much in common" with this central idea at Qumran.[15] Newton does indicate that Paul used the idea selectively in connection with discipline, the nature of the Christian community, the basis of moral behaviour, and the elucidation of the idea of the temple. The one difference between Qumran and Paul is his use of righteousness terminology in relation to entrance into the community.

C. Rowland also affirms the view that Judaism and Christianity shared a common heritage.[16] In fact, he argues that early Christianity must be understood as a sect within first-century Judaism. In this vein, Rowland maintains that adherence to three factors

---

is the "historical circumstance in which Moore's much criticized equation of 'normative Judaism' with rabbinic Judaism arose" (Sanders, PPJ, 34).

[13]. One of the most severe critics of Moore is J. Neusner, Judaism, 5 ff. For an explication of Neusner's approach see "The Formation of Rabbinic Judaism", in W. Haase (ed.), Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin and New York, 1978), Vol. 19.2, 3-42. Neusner's critique is based in part on F. C. Porter Review Moore Judaism JR 8 (1928), 30-62.

[14]. M. Newton, The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul (Cambridge, 1985).

[15]. Ibid., 115.

[16]. C. Rowland, Christian Origins (London, 1985).

indicates that a person belongs to the people of God: they are the Torah, the Temple, and an eschatological hope.[17]

Another contributor to our résumé is J.J. Collins.[18] He argues for a "common ethic" within the Hellenistic-Jewish literature. The focus of this ethic is on monotheism, the avoidance of idolatry, and sexual behaviour (e.g. the prohibition against homosexuality). Among the Jewish-Hellenistic texts Collins appeals to are Josephus' Contra Apionem, Philo's Hypothetica, and the maxims of the Pseudo-Phocylides.

The theme of ethics in ancient Judaism is also discussed by W. Meeks.[19] While it is the concern of this author to show that diverse views on ethics existed in Judaism, he affirms the presence of "recurring themes". The themes that emerged from the literature Meeks surveyed (Sir., DSS, Philo, and the rabbis) are (1) central importance of how one is to behave as "Israel"; (2) God is able to guide the course of history; (3) the constitutive role assigned to Scripture in Jewish ethical discourse as well as in making ethical decisions.

N.J. McEleney advocates a position similar to that of the above authors, but from a different point of reference.[20] He argues that within first century Judaism there was some form of orthodoxy that was definable in terms of belief and accepted by all who called themselves Israelites. McEleney states that in first-century Judaism there was a "minimal

---

[17]. In addition to these points Rowland also maintains that Jews shared the following elements in common: weekly Sabbath, food laws, legal provisions for civil and family life, key festivals, laws of tithing and sacrifice and correct procedure in worship. Comp. also N. Perrin and D. C. Duling, The New Testament: An Introduction (New York, 1982), 22-30, who draw up the following list of common features among Jews: monotheism, God who keeps his covenant, temple and priesthood, feasts, synagogue and prayer, centrality of the Torah, wisdom and apocalyptic eschatology.

[18]. J.J. Collins, Between Athens and Jerusalem (New York, 1983), 137-174.

[19]. Meeks, World, 65-96.

[20]. N.J. McEleney, "Orthodoxy in Judaism of the First Christian Century", JSJ 4 (1973), 19-42.

orthodoxy -- one which was definable -- if not always expressed in doctrinal propositions".[21] This orthodoxy, if expressed in propositions, consists of monotheism, the status of Israel as the chosen people of God, and to some measure an acceptance of the Mosaic Law.[22]

Finally, there is the distinguished study of Martin Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism.[23] Hengel in this work confirms from a different point of reference the general view of the preceding scholars. He argues that within Palestinian Judaism there were also common features, which were characteristic of a diaspora Judaism. Hengel maintains that Jews of Palestine had a common heritage which had been influenced by Hellenism. Therefore, Judaism in Palestine during the Hellenistic-Roman period should be classified as "Hellenistic Judaism" as much as that of the western diaspora.[24]

From this brief résumé it is clear that the scholars mentioned all believe that Jews shared common ideas, but that they define these shared ideas in differing ways. Candidates for inclusion so far consist of: covenant, Torah obedience, purity, monotheism, a common ethic, an eschatological hope, the Temple and Israel as the choosen people of God. The fact that those we have included in our résumé agree from quite different perspectives strengthens the case for shared ideals within Judaism.

---

[21]. Ibid., 21.

[22]. This discussion is set over against those who maintain that it is inaccurate to speak in the 1st cent. of an orthodoxy. Rather, the focus of Jewish existence was an orthopraxy. The discussion continues, as is indicated by the reply of D. E. Aune, "Orthodoxy in First Century Judaism: A Response to N.J. McEleney", JSJ 7 (1976), 1-10 and McEleney's answer in "Orthodoxy in Judaism of the First Christian Century", JSJ 9 (1978), 83-88.

[23]. M. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism (Philadelphia, 1974). For a more recent presentation of his views see M. Hengel, The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century after Christ (London and Philadelphia, 1989).

[24]. Ibid., 311-312.

Our purpose is to contribute to one aspect of the problem of unity and diversity within Judaism.[25] Specifically, our aim will be a consideration of what the shared ideas and ideals of Judaism consisted. We shall be concerned in this study to search for common features of the Jewish religion -- what may be termed "common denominators" within Second Temple Judaism. This would enable us subsequently to ask the question how we are to understand the diversity within first-century Judaism in relation to its common shared agreements. Our study will also set the context to redefine the continuing discussion concerning Paul's Judaism, by asking what is his relationship to a "common denominator" Judaism.

Our study and approach will distinguish itself from previous studies that have considered the theme of Paul and Judaism, in that we shall take neither a genetic nor a pattern of religion approach. The genetic approach seeks to determine whether Paul shows a specific affinity to a given idea and against which background he is best to be understood -- rabbinic, hellenistic Jewish, apocalyptic or otherwise. The classic example of this approach is the distinguished work of W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism.[26] Others who take a similar approach include Sandmel,[27] Schoeps,[28] Goodenough,[29] Chadwick[30] and

---

[25]. This problem has been considered by J.D.G. Dunn within the NT (Unity and Diversity in the New Testament (Philadelphia, 1977). He formulates the issue by asking (1) was there a unifying strand in earliest Christianity which identifies it as Christian (2) was this strand well defined (3) was there a diversity of faith and practice. Dunn argues that there was no single normative form of Christianity in the first century. Nor was there an orthodoxy in concept or practice. Yet there was an identifiable unity alongside a widespread diversity. Though it was outside of Dunn's concern to consider unity and diversity in Judaism he does identify four features that show what the first Jewish Chrisians continued to share with contemporary Judaism (i.e. observance of the Law, attachment to the Temple, affirmation of a Jewish eschatological hope and expectation that Gentiles would flock to Zion in the new age to worship God).

[26]. W.D. Davies, (Philadelphia, 1980).

[27]. S. Sandmel, The Genius of Paul (Philadelphia, 1958), 36-60; Philo of Alexandria (New York and Oxford, 1979), 150ff.

most recently Lührmann.[31] The second approach (i.e. the search for "a pattern of religion") is adopted by Sanders.[32] This approach aims to describe what an adherent to a religion must do to get in and remain in the religion. Therefore this approach seeks to understand "...the way in which a religion is understood to admit and retain members...".[33] With this aim in mind Sanders treats the religious outlook of a given document(s) and author(s) on its own terms and seeks to reconstruct on what basis a person can enter and remain in the religion. Consequently, the concerns may be said to be soteriological in nature.

Our study shall not take a purely genetic or a pattern of religion approach though aspects of both these methods do enter into our analysis. This is indicated by the fact that we aim to treat Paul and Josephus in Contra Apionem on their own terms; thus our treatment adopts a way of analysis similar to Sanders' pattern of religion approach. Equally our investigation requires that we observe when both Paul and Josephus share ideas with other Jews. Thus a genetic dimension also forms part of our analysis. However, our approach is broader and distinctive from both of those described above. Specifically, our aim is to assess the presence of shared ideas between two Greek-speaking Jews by taking large and recurring themes used by each author. To this end our primary concern is not a consideration of minor agreements or individual and peculiar motifs used by Paul or Josephus but whether their ideas reflect "common denominators" within the Jewish religion.

---

[28]. H.J. Schoeps, Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History (London, 1961).

[29]. E.R. Goodenough, "Paul and the Hellenization of Christianity", (completed with A.T. Kraabel), in J. Neusner (ed.), Religions in Antiquity, Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough (Leiden, 1968), 23-68.

[30]. H. Chadwick, "St. Paul and Philo of Alexandria", BJRL 48 (1966), 286-307.

[31]. D. Lührmann, "Paul and the Pharisaic Tradition", JSNT 36 (1989), 75-94.

[32]. PPJ, 12-24.

[33]. Ibid., 17.

Let us attempt to conceptualize the nature and approach to our problem. Henry Chadwick, in a study of Paul and Philo, stated that his aim was to determine the common ground shared by these authors.[34] This exercise was based on the view first that Philo incorporated in his works material that was much earlier than his own. Second, he stood in an established tradition of hellenized Judaism. Third, close Philonic parallels are found throughout the Pauline material. This search for common ground was to determine whether these two Greek-speaking Jews "fished out of the same pool".[35] This rather graphically states part of our concern of the present study. If we may pursue this analogy further our aim will be to describe the big fish. However, in conjunction with the bigger fish we will need to observe smaller objects and smaller fish within the pool.

Sandmel, however, adds another feature that is equally important. He points out that when ideas are compared one must bear in mind the distinction between large, overall agreements and agreements on minor points. As our objective is to determine what is common, minor agreements will not play a major role, since works could have a number of minor agreements yet represent viewpoints that are diametrically opposed.[36] If details are not reliable for making meaningful comparisons, what are we to use? Sanders maintains "a better alternative to individual themes and motifs is obvious: large themes based on generalization". Those must be "carefully choosen, thoroughly researched, and cautiously used".[37] It is this observation that will shape the form of argument in the

---

[34]. Chadwick, "St. Paul", 292. For a further list of parallels between Paul and Philo see W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Churches of Jerusalem (Cambridge, 1925), 129-36; also Sandmel, Philo, 150-154; S. Sandmel, "Philo: The Man, His Writings, His Significance", in H. Temporini and W. Haase (eds.), Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin and New York, 1984), Vol. 21.1, 38-39; P. Borgen, Philo, John and Paul (Atlanta, 1987).

[35]. Chadwick, Ibid., 292.

[36]. S. Sandmel, "Parallelomania", JBL 81 (1962), 4.

[37]. E. P. Sanders, "Parallels and Comparisons: Paul and Diaspora Judaism", Paper in Memory of Samuel Sandmel at the SBL Meeting, Chicago, Dec. 1984, MS 3-4.

following chapters where an attempt will be made to distinguish between firm generalization and less certain detailed inferences. For example, while we can be certain that Paul was a Pharisee, when we attempt to specify what is implied by this our conclusions become less secure. It is this distinction that will become fundamental in our search for "common denominators" within Judaism.

One further clarification of method is now required. In the course of our analysis it is inevitable that we shall appeal to various "minor details". Therefore, the question emerges what is the relationship between minor details, large recurring themes, and a pattern of religion. These elements each in their own way help to determine whether Paul and Josephus may have "fished out of the same pool". Thus minor details, large motifs and the possibility of a pattern of religion each serve a necessary function in any search for shared ideas. In order to affirm whether an idea is common or not one must consider a large theme in connection with several minor details related to the theme (e.g. the context it is found, its function in the argument, presuppositions that may underlie the idea, its meaning and significance etc.). The process can be formulated as follows: The foundation of the analysis is the large theme. The analytical process is carried out by examining various details in connection with the large themes. The goal of this process is to determine whether an idea may be deemed "common". And if an idea is "common" and also documented in a widespread number of literatures and locations the possibility exists that the idea could form part of "a pattern of religion" (broadly understood). The above points of method will be determinative in the analysis and argument of our study.

The work of two further scholars can now be added to our résumé in order to help to focus our problem. First is that of F.B. Watson.[38] It is his concern to assess whether Paul's attitude toward Judaism, the Law, and the Gentile question better reflects that of

---

[38]. F.B. Watson, Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles (Cambridge, 1986).

"reform movement" or that of a "sect". These two terms are defined in the following way: A reform movement is one which seeks to transform the old religion because it is conscious of sharing a common tradition. In addition, a reform movement has a hopeful attitude towards society and a belief in divine help. A sect, on the other hand, considers that salvation is found only within its own group, does not hold a belief in "irresistible" divine power and considers people to be either outsiders or insiders. To these features may be added that a sect is characterized by adopting a hostile and undifferentiated view towards society. Specifically, it sees itself as alienated from society; this alienatation orginates out of protest and a rejection of the establishment view of reality.[39]

It is Watson's thesis that Paul's Gentile Christian communities reflect a sectarian model. This is so because Paul's churches are to be seen as closely knit groups which set up rigid and clearly defined barriers between themselves and the parent community. Therefore, Paul's communities were considered separate from the Jewish community. "The social reality which underlies Paul's discussions of Judaism and the law is his creation of Gentile Christian communities in sharp separation from the Jewish community. His theological reflections legitimate the separation of church from synagogue".[40] On this scenario the controversy in Galatians is over whether the Church should continue as a reform movement within the Jewish community or be viewed as a sect separate from this community. The criterion Watson uses to put forward the view that Paul's Gentile communities are to be regarded as sectarian is that they have a disregard for the offensive aspects of the Law i.e. circumcision, Sabbath observance, and feast days.

There are several places where Watson's thesis is vulnerable. First, if it can be shown that there are more than two approaches to the Gentile question, i.e. the

---

[39]. Ibid., 38-40.

[40]. Ibid., 19.

establishment view of the Jerusalem Judaizers and the sectarian view of Paul, then Watson's case will require some modification.[41] Second, if the view can be sustained that within Galatians we do not have a debate between an establishment and a sectarian view, but what may be termed an intra muros debate on a problem where there is no agreed halakah in the Jewish tradition, then further qualification is required to Watson's theory.[42] A third weakness in Watson's view concerns the conditions required for Gentiles (in the diaspora) to become members of the people of God. His thesis is based on the premise that circumcision is an absolute necessity.[43] Fourth, if it cannot be shown that expulsion from the synagogue occurred for failing to accompany conversion with circumcision Watson's thesis will need further amendment.[44]

There are two further criticisms of Watson's study that will prove determinative for our own analysis. (1) It is not certain from what type of Judaism Paul and the Gentile Christians are excluded apart from the fact that it is represented by the synagogue and is related to circumcision. What is lacking is a very clear definition of Judaism that Watson assumes in his discussion and which Paul is being placed outside. (2) Watson does not

[41]. This point has been investigated by J. Meier and R. Brown, Antioch and Rome (New York, 1983), who argue that there were more than two approaches in early Christianity to the Gentile question.

[42]. The thesis that discussions in Paul's letters of Judaism and Jews are conceived as an intra muros debate and that Galatians is considered a reinterpretation of the tradition of the fathers has been suggested by W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Law: Reflections on Pitfalls in Interpretation", 97 and "Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter", 181 in Jewish and Pauline Studies (Philadelphia, 1984). See also in general Sanders, Law, 18-19.

[43]. It has been argued that there may be more fluidity on the question of Jewish circumcision in the diaspora: N.J. McEleney, "Conversion, Circumcision and the Law", NTS 20 (1973-4), 319-341. For a critique of this thesis see J. Nolland, "Uncircumcised Proselytes?", JSJ 12 (1981), 173-194. Even if the view of McEleney cannot be sustained, it does show that Watson's thesis is less certain than it appears.

[44]. On the theme of expulsion in Judaism see G. Forkman, The Limits of the Religious Community (Gleerup, 1972).

adequately account for the fact that Paul and his opponents shared certain ideas in common.[45]

The second scholar who can help us to focus on our problem is J. Neusner. His work on the Pharisees before 70 will be our main concern.[46] Neusner has considered the traditions assigned to individuals and to the Houses of Hillel and Shammai, and concludes that Pharisees after Hillel were essentially a sect whose concern was for matters of purity. The primary laws that concerned them were those dealing with governance of the sect; of secondary importance to them were agricultural laws and temple rules. The aim of the sect was to live as if its members were Temple priests, enjoying the status accorded to those priests even while outside the Temple. Thus, the table of the Lord in the Jerusalem Temple was seen to be like the table of every Jew in his home. This was a consequence of taking literally the commandment "You shall be a kingdom of priests and a holy people" to mean that "everyone is a priest, everyone stands in the same relationship to God, and must keep the priestly laws".[47]

However, Neusner omits an important group of laws, namely, the anonymous laws including those that deal with civil matters, worship, feasts, and the Temple cult. These laws may allow us to see where Pharisees shared common ground with other Jewish groups. They may also make it possible to assess the relative importance of other concerns which the Pharisees may have had besides purity. In spite of the difficulty of dating the anonymous pericopes concerned with matters other than purity, "one should not convert this difficulty into denial that the Pharisees before 70 were substantially concerned with these

---

[45]. For a recent review of Watson see E.P. Sanders, JJS 39 (1988), 296-300.

[46]. The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70 (Leiden, 1971), 3 Vols.; also From Politics to Piety (New York, 1979); and Judaism, passim.

[47]. Neusner ,Piety, 83.

topics".[48] Furthermore, Josephus informs us that the Pharisees were lay experts in the law.[49] This forms a necessary corrective to Neusner's view of the Pharisees as a sect strictly concerned with purity.[50]

Neusner also denies that Jews shared ideas in common in his critique of Moore,[51] where he proposes that Moore's attempt to reconstruct Judaism is based on too large a body of evidence. But it could conversely be said that Neusner's document-by-document approach in his portrayal of mishnaic religion suffers from being too narrow. He exemplifies his standpoint when he concludes that Jews of the time "would not have understood one another let alone accepted one another as part of the same social group and cultic community. When 'Judaism' is made to refer to the exegetical complications of the rabbis of the fourth and fifth centuries ...and Philo...DSS then the term Judaism stretches so far, covers too diverse a body of evidence--as to lose all definitive form".[52] Similarly he maintains that the Teacher of Righteousness, Akiba, Josephus, and Bar Kokhba "would scarcely have understood one another, let alone have known they all evidenced the same -ism".[53] Neusner seems to have overplayed his hand: it could be true that Moore

---

[48]. E. P. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism (London, 1985), 388 n. 59. Although Neusner does indicate that Pharisees did share common ground with others, this is omitted from his definition of Pharisaism (Traditions, Vol. 3, 287-8).

[49]. Sanders, Ibid., 188. See D.R. Schwartz, "Josephus and Nicolaus on the Pharisees", JSJ 14 (1983), 157-171; A. I. Baumgarten, "The Name of the Pharisees", JBL 102-3, (1983), 411-28; H. Maccoby, "Jacob Neusner's Mishnah", Midstream 30 (1984), 24-32.

[50]. However, see J. Neusner, Piety, 45-66, and remarks in Sanders, Jesus, 388 n. 59.

[51]. Neusner, Judaism, 5ff.

[52]. Ibid., 8.

[53]. Ibid., 22 Comp. also J. Neusner, "The Use of the Later Rabbinic Evidence for the Study of First Century Pharisaism", in W.S. Green (ed.), Approaches to Ancient Judaism (Missoula, MT, 1978), 222; Judaism and Its Social Metaphors (Cambridge, 1989), 216-235 esp. 216, 222, 225; J. Neusner, W.S. Green and E. Fredrichs (eds.), Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era (Cambridge and New York, 1987).

has portrayed not one Judaism but many, but Neusner still has not proved that Jews did not share certain things in common. It also seems to us improbable that no two groups within Judaism would have understood one another. Of course, one must not err in the other direction by claiming that one group dominated all forms of Judaism. This would imply that any common ground that does exist is more a constraint defined by the dominant current in Judaism.[54] A balanced synthesis of the above views would be that Pharisees before 70 (1) were concerned with purity, (2) were exact interpreters of the law, (3) may share common ground with other Jewish groups.

The contributions of both Watson and Neusner are enough to indicate that discussions of the nature of first-century Judaism have not produced conclusive results. Therefore, new approaches and definitions to the problem are necessary.

The intention of the present study will be to determine what Jews shared in common in a context where the Jewish religion is characterized by variety and plurality. What is required for such an endeavour is to assess literature that gives some indication of what Jews of the time thought. Two bodies of evidence that may be used profitably to this end are Josephus' Contra Apionem[55] and the letters of Paul. Paul's letters are a suitable

---

[54]. In this regard G. Alon argues that one halakah governed all of Judaism and that it was Pharisaic. See his The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age (Jerusalem, 1980), Vol. 1, 259, and Jews, Judaism and the Classical World (Jerusalem, 1977), 190ff. Comp. J. Neusner, A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities (Leiden, 1977), Vol. XXII, 262.

[55]. Appeal to Josephus as a good source for reconstructing 1st-cent. Judaism is, in part, related to the fact that scholarly opinion is changing regarding Josephus' so-called pro-Roman and un-Jewish sentiment. For those who advocate a more positive view to Josephus in this regard see M. Stern, Josephus and the Roman Empire (Haifa, 1981), 8; B. D. Cohon, "Josephus: Traitor? Patriot?", in Men at the Crossroads (South Brunswick, NJ, 1970), 151-172; A. Wasserstein (ed.). Flavius Josephus: Selections from His Works (New York, 1974); Smith, "Judaism", 75-76; M. Aberbach, "Josephus: Patriot or Traitor", Jewish Heritage 10 (1967), 13-19; S. G. F. Brandon, "Josephus: Renegade or Patriot", in Religion in Ancient History: Studies in Ideas, Men and Events (New York, 1969), 298-309. See also the valuable study on Josephus' Judaism by A. Schlatter, Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus (Gütersloh, 1932), and the recent work by T. Rajak, Josephus (London, 1983), 11-45. However, the reversal is by no means total. See e.g. P. Vidal-Naquet, "Du bon usage de la trahison", in P. Savinel, translation, Flavius Josèphe, La guerre des juifs (Paris, 1977),

choice since this material is all dated before the destruction of the Second Temple[56] and Contra Apionem 2.190-219 proves an excellent source because these paragraphs may consist of "one of the earliest and possibly oldest theological précis compiled by a contemporary of the NT writers": this is indeed the view of Vermes in his article entitled "A Summary of the Law By Flavius Josephus".[57] Vermes, as well as drawing our attention to this

---

9ff. also A. Momigliano, "What Josephus Did Not See" in On Pagans, Jews, and Christians (Middletown, Ct., 1987), 108-119.

[56]. There are two further reasons that make the letters of Paul a valuable source for our task: with the letters of Paul we are free of the difficulties involved in using the Gospels as a source for 1st-cent. Judaism; there is a greater appreciation of Jewish scholars for Paul's Jewishness. See the survey by W. Wiefel, "Paulus in jüdischer Sicht", Judaica 31 (1975), 109-115, 151-172; H. Ronning, "Some Jewish Views of Paul", Judaica 24 (1968), 82-97; D. Hagner, "Paul in Modern Jewish Thought", in D.A. Hagner and M.J. Harris (eds.) Pauline Studies: Essays presented to F. F. Bruce (London and Grand Rapids, 1980), 143-159; J. Blank, Paulus und Jesus (München, 1968), 106-123, also Schalom Ben-Chorin, Paulus: Der Völkerapostel in jüdischer Sicht (München, 1980).

[57]. NovT. 23 (1982), 301 n. 50. One document that may compete with Ap. as one of the earliest and oldest theological précis contemporary with the NT period is Philo's Hypothetica, preserved for us in Eusebius' Praeparatio evangelica 8. 7-20. The matter of which is older is complicated by the fact that it is difficult to decide whether Josephus and Philo borrow from a common source or whether Josephus is paraphrasing Philo. Here a firm decision is not required since Josephus and Philo both reflect old and early theological ideas. However, whether the Hypothetica is strictly speaking, a summary is a point of debate so E. Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, Revised & edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar & M. Goodman (Edinburgh, 1987), Vol. 3.2. Philo's Spec. Laws and Josephus' Antiquities 4.196-301 are two other summaries of the Jewish religion. In distinction from those works, Contra Apionem offers a summary of a different kind because its focus is on basic principles and gives few legal details.

neglected précis, has presented in a concise and summary manner the content and structure of what constitutes Torah.[58]

In addition to the intrinsic suitability of using Contra Apionem and the letters of Paul,[59] the material in question was written by authors who share the following likenesses: (1) they both wrote in Greek; (2) each received their Jewish training in Palestine;[60] (3) both sought to govern their lives by the rules of the Pharisees (Vita 12; Acts 23.6);[61] (4)

---

[58]. Vermes has not, however, offered any detailed reflection on the importance this section of Ap. may have for understanding the NT material (apart from some passing comments on the ethical and religious character of the teaching of Jesus). In a similar vein, see E. P. Sanders, "Judaism and the Grand Christian Abstractions: Love, Mercy and Grace", Int 39 (1985), 357-372, who suggests that the pattern of religion of Palestinian Judaism is also attested in Ap. 2. However, he offers little assistance on how the Ap. précis may permit a better understanding of the NT situation. What we are told (based on Ap. 2) is that Judaism in the time of Jesus and Paul was a noble religion based on belief in God's mercy and grace, which was intended to inculcate in its members virtuous action and consideration for others. Comp. also I. M. Zeitlin, Jesus and the Judaism of His Time (Oxford, 1988) who uses Ap. to reconstruct 1st. cent. Judaism.

[59]. Our study will also take up a suggestion made in the recent study by P. Bilde, Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome (Sheffield, 1988), 221-229, who acknowledges the importance of Josephus for understanding the NT and the birth of Christianity. He suggests this for points of geography, topography, history, and archaeology. In addition to these subjects, Bilde maintains that Josephus helps to open up the historical scene for John the Baptist, Jesus, and the earliest Christians. In this vein, it is the concern of our study to use Josephus as a source for better understanding the Judaism shared by Josephus and one early Christian in particular, Paul. A similar view is also held by H. Schreckenburg, "The Works of Josephus and the Early Christian Church", in L. Feldman and G. Hata (eds.), Josephus, Judaism and Christianity (Detroit, 1987), 321, who maintains that Josephus (and Philo) should be read "as a commentary on the NT". In this vein see also F. J. Foakes-Jackson, Josephus and the Jews (London, 1930), 259-274, who includes a chapter on Josephus and the NT. However, Paul is referred to only in a passing reference (273 n.).

[60]. This is on the view that Luke is correct in Acts 22. 3 when he states that Paul was trained under Gamaliel. See W. C. van Unnik, Tarsus or Jerusalem (London, 1962); F.F. Bruce, Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit (Exeter, 1977), 50.

[61]. The question does arise of when Josephus learnt about the Pharisees. At 16 he wanted to gain experience with the three sects (Pharisees, Sadduccees, Essenes) in order to select the best one. However, being dissatisfied with the experience he had obtained, he became a disciple of the hermit Bannus until the age of 19. When did Josephus make a "thorough investigation" (Life, 10) of the Pharisees or for that matter the other sects, if he spent three years with Bannus and three years considering the sects, and at 19 became a Pharisee? R. J. H. Shutt, Studies in Josephus (London, 1961), 2 n. 3, resolves this by emending παρ' αὐτῷ ("with him" i.e. Bannus) to παρ' αὐτοῖς ("with them" i.e. the three sects and Bannus). L. H. Feldman, "Flavius Josephus Revisited : The Man, His Writings, and His

Josephus and Paul both had impeccable pedigrees (Ap. 7 ff.; Phil. 3.6); (5) each attempted to make his respective religious outlook comprehensible to the Graeco-Roman world.[62] There is, however, the important difference that Josephus unlike Paul, was not a creative thinker.[63]

Let us now clarify the approach to be used. We shall consider one body of evidence at a time in order to treat the religious outlooks of each on its own terms. We begin with

---

Significance," in H. Temporini and W. Hasse, (eds.) Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin and New York, 1984), Vol. 21.2, 781, however, maintains that this emendation is unnecessary on the grounds that "in all probability" Josephus lived as a Pharisee or Sadduccee before this period and "inasmuch as these two groups knew each other's views well, Josephus only would need a few months to practice their views systematically". Since he spent three years with Bannus, who had a distinct relationship with the Essenes, Josephus would have gained experience with the Essenes. This explanation is also shared by T. Rajak, Josephus (London, 1983), 35. But the suggestion of Feldman and Rajak needs to be questioned for three reasons. First, it is clear from the account in the Life that Josephus spent time between ages 16-19 learning about Pharisaism. (On this point comp. the recent study by S. N. Mason, "Was Josephus a Pharisee? A Re-Examination of Life 10-12", JJS 40 (1989), 31-45.) Second, he was taught young. Before the age of 14 he had made such progress that he was known by the chief priests and leading men of the city for his abilities. Third, the fact that Josephus was taught by his parents who had distinguished priestly ancestors, suggests that he may have learnt at the very least about the Sadducees. The problem we have noted only receives a passing mention by H. W. Attridge, "Josephus and his Works" in M.E. Stone (ed.), Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period (Assen and Philadelphia, 1984), Vol. 2, 186: "one has to wonder how much of an exposure Josephus received to the three 'schools' during a period the bulk of which was devoted to desert asceticism."

[62]. In spite of the above cogent reasons for considering Paul and Josephus together, attempts to date have been rare. However, see J. Jortin, "Josephus and St. Paul", Journal of Sacred Literature 13 (1854), 166ff.; G. Honnicke, "Paulus und Josephus", Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift 29 (1909), 650-654 also A. Edersheim, "Josephus" in W. Smith and H. Wace (eds.), A Dictionary of Christian Biography (London, 1882), Vol. 3, 441-460. Comp. Feldman, "Revisited", Vol. 21.2, 782.

[63]. Regarding Josephus see Sanders, "Grace", 371. An exception to this view is H. W. Attridge, The Interpretation of Biblical History in Antiquitates Judicae of Flavius Josephus (Missoula, MT, 1976), 181, who argues from the Antiquities for a "theologically reflective dimension" in Josephus. See also in this vein, L. H. Feldman, "Hellenization in Josephus' Portrayal of Man's Decline", in J. Neusner (ed.) Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of E.R. Goodenough, (Leiden, 1968), 336-353 and J. L. Bailey, "Josephus' Portrayal of the Matriarchs" in L.H. Feldman and G. Hata (eds.), Josephus, Judaism and Christianity (Detroit, 1987), 154-79.

Contra Apionem, and treat 2. 190-219 paragraph by paragraph. This involves the consideration of other Jewish evidence, especially that of Philo's Hypothetica because it offers a summary of the Jewish religion similar to that in Contra Apionem. We shall also appeal to the Sentences of Pseudo Phocylides since this text consists of maxims, suggesting the possibility that the ideals represent a common view. We shall concentrate on this Jewish evidence on the grounds of time and space, and because the task before us is to determine common/shared features among Jews.

Since the present study is not explicitly an investigation of Judaism as represented by specialist groups, we shall omit in the first instance appeal to the evidence of Qumran, the apocalyptic literature, and the rabbis. However, if an idea which occurs in Contra Apionem and is documented in Philo or the Pseudo- Phocylides is also found in the DSS, the rabbis, or the apocalyptic material, this will serve to confirm that there exists an underlying, common view which forms part of the substructure even of the specialist version of Judaism.

Let us give several reasons for ascribing secondary importance in this investigation to the DSS, the rabbis, and apocalyptic literature. The rabbinic material in its present form is later than the first century, and it is now thought that what can be known from this evidence of conditions of the period before 70 is minimal. The DSS, on the other hand, most certainly dated before 70, reflect an outlook of sectarian Judaism. The apocalyptic writers too will not lead us any closer to common denominators within Judaism. Thus when appeal is made to the DSS, the rabbis, or apocalyptic literature we shall indicate how frequently the idea occurs in this evidence compared with the primary comparative evidence of the Hypothetica and Pseudo-Phocylides.

The second body of evidence we consider is the letters of Paul. Since the Jewish ideas in this material are bound up with debates, pastoral replies, exposition of Scripture,

and paraenesis, a different method of analysis is required. We, thus, consider this material by classifying it according to topics that emerge from the various types of data. These categories are (1) Jewish autobiography; (2) Jewish elements in Christian theology; (3) debates with Jewish Christian opponents; (4) Jewish ethics embraced by Gentile converts; (5) a dialogue on the nature of the Jewish religion. On a possible sixth topic, Jewish assumptions within post-Pauline thought, we shall restrict ourselves to several remarks in the conclusion. This approach is different from that adopted by scholars who have attempted to reconstruct the Jewish religion by classifying it under so-called Christian categories. Our categories were suggested by the basic agenda of determining what were common ideals within Judaism. After suggesting criteria to judge our results by, we shall reconstruct common Jewish ideas from the evidence. We conclude with a demonstration of our thesis and several remarks on the implication our study could have for future discussions.

There are two further preliminaries to be now stated. First, the present study will devote greater space to Paul than to Josephus. This is not because Josephus is of less importance than Paul for our task. On the contrary, both Josephus and Paul have an integral part to play. Since Paul did not specifically set out to write a definition of the Jewish religion it will require more detailed analysis to extract from his Christian theology what his Jewish presuppositions were. Since Josephus' purpose was to give a summary outline of Judaism less space is required when treating this more direct form of evidence.

Secondly, there are two extremes that must be avoided if our analysis is to succeed. Two movements within the study of Judaism, if pushed to their logical conclusion, would preclude this study; our study aims, in part, to show that they should not be pressed to the limit. One is the emphasis on diversity. Partially because of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, partly in reaction to the overemphasis on Rabbinic literature, scholars now correctly

emphasize Jewish diversity, and we have accepted it. Diversity should not, however, be taken to exclude common elements.[64] More recently Neusner, (as we noted above) pursuing the analysis of Rabbinic literature document-by-document, tends to construe each document as a self-contained and complete expression of one of the numerous Judaisms which populated the ancient world. This sort of individual, "systemic" analysis can be and often is very useful, but the hard conclusion -- each document reflects a different -ism -- seems to go too far.[65] The basic outline of our study is document-by-document, yet the intention is to look for common elements.

The following chapters will argue a threefold thesis. The first is that there are discernible common features (denominators) within first-century Judaism. This point will be supported from an analysis of the Contra Apionem précis and related Jewish material. Second, there is a body of common opinion that may be deemed to belong to the period before 70. This assertion will be argued from the letters of Paul by appeal to various criteria. The third point is that there are Jewish ideas which are both common and pre-70. This assertion will be confirmed by appealing in a comparative way to evidence from both the letters of Paul and Contra Apionem. This contention can be formulated in the following way: ideas may be considered both common and pre-70 whenever those found in Contra Apionem and attested in a wide variety of Jewish evidence (thus common) are also attested in the letters of Paul (and so pre-70).

---

[64]. However, Meeks, World, 91, does come close to this: "We must be careful, however, not to think that such a list of recurring themes constitutes the profile of any Jewish community in antiquity."

[65]. The general caution of treating individual representatives of Judaism as a self-contained, air-tight reflection of the Jewish religion is voiced by Rowland, Origins, 10; Johnson, Writings, 41, 61; P. Henry, New Directions in the New Testament (Philadelphia, 1979), 82ff.; S. Sandmel, Christian Century, 23-24.

CHAPTER 2

JOSEPHUS AND JUDAISM : Contra Apionem 2.190-219

Josephus' last work, Contra Apionem, was written during the reign of Domitian in the last decade of the first century (93-4). It was the intention of Josephus in the latter part of his career to write a treatise entitled "On Customs and Causes" (Ant. 4. 198). This work was to contain opinions of Jews on God, his essence and the laws (Ant. 4. 268).[1] This treatise, however, did not come to fruition. Instead, Josephus produced what has come to be called Contra Apionem. Several reasons may exist for the change in plans,[2] one of which was certainly the persecutions that occurred under Domitian.[3] In the nineties he was carrying out repressive measures against those Gentiles who had chosen to practise certain "Jewish customs". Before this (around AD 88) Domitian had begun to enforce more severely the taxes against the Jews as a way of discouraging others who might be tempted to practise precepts of the Jewish religion. A consequence of this manoeuvre was to highlight the great number of pagans who were practising the Jewish way of life. This factor may thus at least have contributed to the persecution of 95. Into this period one might well fit Contra Apionem, which is in fact an apologia of the Jewish religion against a movement of hostile opinions whose purpose was to discredit the views of Josephus on the antiquity of the Jews (Ant. 1. 2). In view of the repressive measures undertaken by Domitian in 95,

---

[1]. D. Altshuler, "The Treatise by Flavius Josephus", JQR 69 (1979), 226-232.

[2]. L. Troianai, Commento storico al "Contro Apione" di Giuseppe (Pisa, 1975), 27-8; E. Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Black (Edinburgh, 1973), Vol. 1, 528.

[3]. E. M. Smallwood, "Domitian's Attitude toward the Jews and Judaism", Classical Philology 51 (1956), 1-13.

and the situation of general malevolence toward the Jews, there was good reason for Josephus to change plans and offer an apologia of the Jewish religion. This is especially so if those for whom Contra Apionem was written included Gentiles.[4] Part of the importance of Contra Apionem lies in the fact that it is one of the major examples from antiquity of the literary genre of Jewish apologia.[5] Other examples include the extracts of Philo's Hypothetica in Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, the Wisdom of Solomon and Demetrius.[6] In what precise sense is Contra Apionem an apology? It would be inaccurate to think of our work as a defence of the whole of Judaism. Even a cursory reading will reveal the omission of several elements common to Pharisaic religiosity: fighting against sin, fear of God, Messianism, clear reference to resurrection, the covenant, the kingdom of God as Jewish motives for life and hope.[7] And if we were to consider other currents of Judaism

---

[4]. The view once held that Ap. was written primarily to present Judaism in a good light to non-Jews has been modified since the study of V. A. Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered", Symbolae R. Taubenschlag dedicatae III, (Warsaw, 1957), 169-193. While there are parts of Ap. that would play no part in the persuasion of Gentiles of the validity of the Jewish religion, the Gentile dimension need not be entirely discounted.

[5]. Th. Reinach, Flavius Josèphe: Contre Apion (Paris, 1930), xvi. On the apologetic dimension of Ap. see E.Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, rev. ed. , G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Goodman, eds., Vol. 3.1, 594ff.

[6]. On the aims of Jewish apologetics see Schürer, Jewish People, Vol. 3.1, 609-616; Tcherikover, "Apologetic", 169ff.; E.J. Bickermann, "The Jewish Historian Demetrios", in J. Neusner, (ed.), Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Part 3 (Leiden, 1975), 72-84.

[7]. A. Momigliano, "Intorno al 'Contro Apione'", in Quinto contributo alla Storia degli Studi classi e del mondo antico (Roma, 1975), Vol. 2, 767; also his "Un' apologia del Giudaismo: Il "Contro Apione' di Flavio Giuseppe", in Terzo contributo alla Storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico (Roma, 1966), Vol. 1, 519.

other omissions would become apparent. However, what Josephus does is to offer a response to the arguments of those who doubt the antiquity of Jews and who slander Jewish religious beliefs.[8] In so doing he intends to affirm the antiquity of the Jews so that their venerability may be proof against attack.[9] Josephus' response is twofold: first, he takes points put forward by his critics regarding the antiquity of the Jews and shows the fallacy of their arguments; second, he offers his positive case by describing the essence of the Law, i.e. the Mosaic legislation, demonstrating the intrinsic foundation of the Jewish religion.[10] In analysing Contra Apionem the "occasional character" of the work's genesis must be borne in mind.

Let us now consider the purpose and structure of our document. Regarding the first we are in little doubt; it is designed to provide direct evidence in order to silence the critics who have spoken against Josephus's Antiquities (Ap. 1. 1-3). By this work's very existence it is evident that Josephus had not been successful in convincing everyone of the long and esteemed history of the Jews in the Antiquities.[11] Josephus' purpose is also to correct the ignorance displayed by some and to teach the antiquity of the Jews to all who want to know the truth about Jewish origins. In Book 2 Josephus writes specifically against Apion, who had persuaded common people to attach more importance to the fables than to truth.[12]

---

[8]. Reinach, Contre Apion, xv; D. L. Balch "Two Apologetic Encomia: Dionysius on Rome and Josephus on the Jews", JSJ 13 (1982), 120; B. Motzo Il Κατὰ Ἰουδαίων di Apione. Atti della R. Accademia delle Scienze di Torino 48 (1912-13), 466.

[9]. E. Kamlah, "Frömmigkeit und Tugend: Die Gesetzesapologie des Josephus in C. Ap. 2, 145-295", in 0. Betz, K. Haacker and M. Hengel, (eds.), Josephus-Studien, Festschrift für 0. Michel (Göttingen, 1974), 221.

[10]. Momigliano, "Intorno", 768.

[11]. T. Rajak, "Josephus and the 'Archaeology' of the Jews", JJS 33 (1982), 477.

[12]. Motzo, "Apione", 460.

Such intentions are scattered throughout Book I (eg. 1. 50, 70, 106, 128, 213) and reappear at the beginning of Book 2 (1-8). To prove his basic thesis two main groups of arguments are presented: first, those refuting charges that Jews are not an ancient people (1. 6-320); second, those arguments that refute various other criticisms of the Jews and the Law (2. 1-286). The structure may be divided as follows: (1) a refutation of specific accusations (1. 6 - 2. 144); (2) a positive description of the Jews and their law (2. 145-286).[13] His arguments may be classified as (1) arguments against bad historiography; (2) arguments adduced from historical events that show the greatness of the Jews; (3) arguments based on the content of the Mosaic Law.[14]

To argue a case against bad historiography of his opponents Josephus utilizes the views of writers of distinction (2. 238) and those witnesses whom the Greeks viewed as the most trustworthy (1. 4). He appeals to four main types of criteria to judge the reliability of his critics' historiography. First is eyewitness evidence. This forms the basis of the retelling of the Jewish War with Rome. For example, "I, on the contrary, have written a veracious account, at once comprehensive and detailed, of the war, having been present in person at all the events". (1. 47). Similarly, "My qualification as historian of the war was that I had been a participant in many, and an eyewitness of most, of the events" (1. 55). This principle of autopsy is also extended to support his view that the Chaldeans are more likely to be right on the question of who founded Babylon than are the Greeks.

The second criterion Josephus adduces is the strong tradition of accurate historical record-keeping among the Near Eastern peoples (e.g. Egyptians, Chaldeans, Phoenicians,

---

[13]. D. M. Hay, "What is Proof?--Rhetorical Verification in Philo, Josephus and Quintilian", in G. MacRae (ed.), Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers, (Missoula, MT, 1979), Vol. 2, 89.

[14]. Ibid., 93.

and Jews). For example, it is the people of Tyre who have public records that were "very carefully preserved" by the state (1. 1, 6-7). However, Jewish record-keeping excels all other peoples (even the Egyptians, Babylonians, Chaldeans and Phoenicians) in their endeavour to be accurate. The reason given for this is that in assigning people to the task of record-keeping great precautions were taken to ensure that they were of the highest character. For example, it was ensured that the priest's lineage had to be pure and unadulterated (Lev. 21. 7ff.). Similarly, veracity of prophets was assured since they obtained their knowledge under the inspiration of God (1. 28-39).

A third criterion of good historiography is common agreement of witnesses. Josephus substantiates his claim that Jewish record-keepers contain no contradictions by the fact that their accounts can be confirmed by the Chaldeans (e.g. 1. 129-30, 145, 160). Furthermore, his record is also supported by Vespasian, Titus, Agrippa, and others as an accurate depiction of the Jewish War. "All those bore testimony to my scrupulous safeguarding of the truth, and they were not men to conceal their sentiments by keeping silent had I, through ignorance or partiality, distorted or omitted any of the facts" (1. 52).

A final criterion is general integrity and the use of good sense in the process of writing history. To this end good historiography will not rely on conjecture (1. 15), gossip (2. 12-14), dubious linguistic data (2. 22-7) and will have concern for factual accuracy (1. 24-5). Neither does good historical method appeal to evidence that similar critics of the Jews disagree, especially about the same events (1. 22-6, 293).

In Book 2 there are two noticeable changes. First, the cross-examination now shifts its focus to Apion: the critics of Book 1 (Manetho, Chaeremon, Lysimachus) disappear. Second, Josephus' method of presenting his case is altered; he now appeals to historical events to demonstrate Jewish greatness. For example, Apion maintains that there is clear proof that Jewish laws are unjust and religious ceremonies erroneous in the fact that Jews

are not masters of an empire but have rather been slaves of one nation after another (2. 125). To refute this allegation Josephus does not question whether political independence is related to religious truth. Instead, his rebuttal is twofold: (1) most nations have been enslaved at one time or another (e.g. Egyptians, Athenians, Spartans); (2) Jews have enjoyed extended periods of independence.[15]

Josephus appeals to other historical events as proof of Jewish greatness. One example is that the Jewish residents of Alexandria were highly esteemed by the rulers of that city from the time of the Ptolemies to the Caesars. He includes a list of these rulers in his record. A further illustration of his point is the incident where Onias planned to have all the Jews of the city crushed by the drunken elephants. The attempt did not work, and instead the king's own friends became the victims. Josephus attributes this to the protection of God, (2. 55). Elsewhere he asserts that Apion's demise will be the deserved penalty for one who has told lies about the Jewish laws and has neglected them (2. 143-4).

The third argument Josephus utilizes in favour of the antiquity of the Jews is based on the contents of the Mosaic Law. In addition to the humanitarian regulations of the Law (especially in the merciful treatment of animals), Josephus stresses that the reward for keeping the Law was "a renewed existence". To demonstrate the Law's excellence Josephus also includes in his summary of its content the exalted concept of God (2. 190-8), its regulations concerning marriage (2. 199-203), family (2. 204-6), community (2. 206-8), and aliens (2. 209-210).

---

[15]. The time referred to in this incident (2. 125-34) is probably the period from the Maccabean insurrection to Pompey's entry into Jerusalem -- about 80 years, not, as Josephus indicates, "about 120 years" so H. St. J. Thackeray, Josephus: Against Apion, (Cambridge, Mass., 1961), Vol. 1, 345.

It is this section, where Josephus offers his explication of the "precepts" and "prohibitions" of the law that is of special concern to us, because the passage (2. 190-219) is one of the earliest theological syntheses of the Jewish religion that we possess from the NT period.[16] We shall set out to determine whether the data of these paragraphs of Contra Apionem accurately reflect what Jews held to be common to their religion. Specifically, is the version of Judaism presented due solely to Josephus' foreign audience or because its literary genre is apologetic, or can it be said that the portrayal offered contains common features (or "denominators") independent of the work's audience and genre? The method adopted to answer this question will be to compare the ideas of Contra Apionem with other bodies of Jewish literature -- Philo's Hypothetica, The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides,[17] and the OT. Other sources will be used where appropriate e.g. the Qumran literature, apocalyptic material as well as other works of Josephus, namely, the War and the Antiquities. Due to their late date the Talmudic and rabbinic material will only be used to corroborate ideas found in other literature. The inclusion of rabbinic material in our discussion will be quite selective. We have therefore provided a summary of relevant rabbinic material in list form at the conclusion of the chapter.[18]

---

[16]. See chp. 1 n. 57

[17]. For the date and destination of these texts I follow P.W. van der Horst, The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides (Leiden, 1975), 81-2, who argues that the content of the document "seems to favour a date between 50 B.C.-100 A.D." This is based on the fact that the Ps. Phoc. were probably written in Alexandria at a time when relations between Jews and Greeks had not yet become too tense. Van der Horst narrows this down to some time during the reign of Augustus (30 B.C. - A.D. 14) or Tiberius (A.D. 14-37). See more recently his "Pseudo-Phocylides" in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (London 1985), Vol. 2, 567-8 and "Pseudo-Phocylides Revisited", JSP 3 (1988), 3-30. For another proponent of Alexandrian provenance for this document see P.M. Fraser, Ptolemic Alexandria (Oxford, 1972), Vol. 2, 539.

[18]. See Summary List 3; also L.H. Feldman, "Josephus' Agreements and Disagreements with the Rabbis", in W. Haase (ed.), Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin and New York), MS. 70ff. (forthcoming).

Since our objective is to determine the principal points of common ground that Contra Apionem shares with other literature of the period, distinctive elements of the treatise will per se not be our primary concern. Nor are we interested in the common ground held between the work and pagan authors,[19] nor in what sources Josephus used in constructing his document.[20] Our principal task is to search for what we have called "common denominators" within Judaism by using the synthesis of Jewish thought presented in 2. 190 - 219. When Josephus claims that a certain precept originated from the Law, we want to determine whether in fact this is the case, or to decide whether this is part of Josephus' own creative activity for the sake of an apologia designed to satisfy his diaspora audience.

Agreements between Contra Apionem and the Bible may or may not be the result of common agreement about a belief or practice.[21] It is possible that a given topic appears in Josephus' summary only because it is in the Bible; his knowledge of it could be purely literary. On the other hand, points common to Josephus and the Bible could be common throughout Judaism; perhaps all Jews agreed on the point precisely because it is in the Bible. This issue cannot be decided in advance, though individual cases will only seldom be contentious. Josephus' summary in Contra Apionem appears to be less clearly the result of "turning the pages" of the Bible than is the more detailed summary of Antiquities 4. 196-301, and our opening assumption is that the summary of Contra Apionem is a summary of

---

[19]. For common ground between pagan writers and Ap. see J. G. Müller, Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion (Basel, 1877), passim.

[20]. On this theme see Kamlah "Gesetzesapologie" 226; Momigliano, "Intorno", 765; Reinach, Contra Apion, 86 n. 5. Comp. Motzo, "Apione", 463.

[21]. Josephus' debt to the Bible is none the less quite extensive. See Summary List 3.

Judaism as Josephus knew it -- idealized, to be sure, but not simply the result of reading the Pentateuch.

There is another feature in Josephus work that can now be stated. Several indications suggest that Josephus is capable of exaggeration. For example, it is not true that all Jews everywhere agree with one another (170-1, 179), nor that no Jews have ever defected (232). Josephus has been cited as an exemplary case of defection.[22] Neither is it true that not a single Jew feared the Law more than a despot (277). There are also some specious claims that a biblical Law exists which supports his views; for example, Josephus wrongly claims that the Law says that the purpose of marriage is procreation (199), that women are in all things inferior to men (201), and that abortion is forbidden (202).[23]

It is in this context that we can consider in more detail Contra Apionem 2. 190-219. The main body of Josephus' Mosaic legislation (190-219) purports to be a sketch of "precepts and prohibitions" of the Law. This legislation does not consist simply of a list of biblical laws; rather, it is a "carefully structured exposition"[24] on God (190-2), and on man's relation to God (193-205) and to his fellow creatures (206-14). After this come two appendices: one on the punishment awaiting transgressors of the law (215-17), the other on the reward of future life awaiting faithful observers of the Torah (218-19).[25]

The form utilized by Josephus to construct the section under consideration may offer some initial assistance in answering our question. Daube maintains that the form of

---

[22]. R.J.H. Shutt, "The Concept of God in the Works of Flavius Josephus", JJS 31 (1980), 171, 185 also Studies, 5; W. Bousset and H. Gressman,Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter (Tübingen, 1926), 39.

[23]. The fact that Josephus maintains that his views reflect biblical law could partially be explained by (1) his appeal to a different text of the Bible than LXX (2) his midrashic presuppostions.

[24]. G. Vermes, "Flavius Josephus", 293.

[25]. The structure followed here is that of Vermes (last note). Cf. Hay, "Proof", 96.

Tannaitic catechism is evident in a striking way at several points in the structure of the material present in Ap. 2. 190-219.[26] The Tannaitic catechism falls into five parts: (1) the test; (2) the commandment; (3) charity; (4) the penalties; (5) the reward and the world to come.[27] The Tannaites and Josephus agree in points 2, 4, and 5. The differences in the remaining two elements can be quite easily explained. First, there is no reference to the test because one would simply not be appropriate in an exposition where Josephus is not concerned with an applicant's admission to Judaism, but wishes to defend the Jewish religion to outsiders. The omission of the part charity is to play within the Jewish community can be similarly explained. Josephus is concerned to refute those anti-Semites who accuse Jews of being haters of mankind, and for this purpose it is not so important to concentrate on the charity which Jews show towards each other. It is rather necessary to show that everyone should be treated with kindness, even enemies and beasts. Josephus therefore adapts for his own purpose the basic structure found in Tannaitic catechism. These observations suggest that at least the form of the material which Josephus adopts is not wholly dictated by his foreign audience. However, the problem in pursuing this line of argument is that the evidence used to reconstruct any picture of the Tannaites is late: noting that Josephus utilizes a structure similar to that of Tannaitic catechism may not be much help. But the parallels are still suggestive enough to encourage further analysis, topic by topic, of each section of the work. We may then be in a position to determine when, to what extent, and how consistently Josephus uses ideas common to the Judaism of his own period. We need to determine whether Ap. 2. 190ff. contains ideas recognized among Jews.

---

[26]. D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London, 1956), 138-140.

[27]. Ibid. 138.

What we need to establish is whether Josephus' theological summary is exaggerated or whether there is some measure of truth to his portrayal.

Therefore what is needed is to apply various criteria to test the general reliability of Ap. 2. 190-219 as a summary of common Judaism; four types suggest themselves. The first is direct evidence. We may test an idea presented in our theological summary by reference to actual history, to determine whether the contents of Contra Apionem reflect how Jews acted in real-life situations. For example, are there cases where a Jew was willing to die for the sake of obedience to the law? A second criterion that could be used is that of archaeological evidence. What do we know from archaeological data regarding a Jew's level of obedience to the Law? The excavations of Jerusalem and Masada[28] may suggest that there was fairly widespread obedience.[29] Third, one can try to determine whether the way the material is presented (e.g. the structure and form of the summary) may assist with our inquiry. The fourth criterion, probably the most important in this context, is multiple attestation.[30] Are the ideals found in Contra Apionem common in Jewish literatures? The aim of such tests is twofold: first, to determine the general religious and historical value of

---

[28]. Y. Yadin, Masada Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand (London, 1966), 166-167; N. Avigad, Discovering Jerusalem (Nashville, 1983), 139, 142.

[29]. This point may equally be supported for a later period by excavations of diaspora synagogues. See A. T. Kraabel, "Unity and Diversity among Diaspora Synagogues", in L.I. Levine, (ed.), The Synagogue in Late Antiquity (Philadelphia, 1987), 49ff. esp. 54; also H. J. Leon, The Jews of Ancient Rome (Philadelphia, 1960), 244-250 in support of the general point regarding Roman Jews.

[30]. There is a fifth criterion that could be used, that of expulsion. Would a Jew be excluded from membership of the people of God if he disobeyed any of the prescriptions listed in summary in Ap. 2. 199ff? The assumption implicit in such a question is that if offending the law leads to expulsion then it would show that the law (or a law) being offended was generally accepted as common. However, in view of the difficulty of confirming sure grounds for expulsion in our period, as well as the generally tolerant attitude of Jews, this criterion will not be applied. On this point see Forkman, Community. Comp. also L. H. Schriffman, Who is a Jew?: Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism (Hoboken, NJ, 1985).

Ap. 2. 190ff. as a portrayal of Judaism. This will be performed by the first two tests above. Second, to ask how common is the portrayal within Judaism? This will be determined by the last two criteria. Because our concern is with the presence of common denominators in Contra Apionem we shall primarily devote attention to the last two criteria, and simply offer some general remarks regarding the first two tests. Our analysis of the texts will be carried out with reference to the views of Reinach,[31] Kamlah,[32] Momigliano,[33] and Balch,[34] who maintain that the précis in Contra Apionem (1) is apologetic and "occasional" in character; (2) reflects enlightened Hellenistic piety; (3) portrays a Judaism that does not conform rigorously to historic Judaism and does not describe distinctive characteristics of

---

[31]. Contre Apion, xx.

[32]. "Gesetzesapologie", 220-32.

[33]. "Intorno", 765-84; "Apolgia", 513-22.

[34]. "Encomia" ; "Josephus, Against Apion II, 145-296, A Preliminary Report," in G. MacRae, (ed.), Society of Biblical Literature 1975 Seminar Papers (Missoula, MT, 1975), Vol. 1, 187-192. Comp. Attridge, "Works", Vol. 2, 229; Zeitlin, Jesus, 10. Our analysis will also take into account the studies by Vermes, "Law", 289ff.; Sanders, "Grace", 357ff.

the Jewish religion (e.g. the Sabbath, circumcision and, keeping the food law are not dealt with).[35]

The four criteria listed above can be clarified by concrete examples. Concerning the first, that of testing theology by historical example we read in Ap. 2. 219: "I should have hesitated to write thus, had not the facts made all men aware that many of our countryman have on many occasions ere now preferred to brave all manner of suffering rather than utter a single word against the Law." A historical incident that will enable us to test the general veracity of this statement occurs in War, 2. 169-74. This example illustrates that large numbers of Jews preferred death to transgressing the Law. Pilate introduced Roman standards into Jerusalem including the circulation of medallions or images of Caesar. The Jews interpreted these as "graven images", which were in violation of their ancestral laws. The result was that a delegation of Jews followed Pilate to Caesarea and implored him to abolish the practice. When he refused they prostrated themselves around his house for five days and nights. After being threatened with death by Pilate the Jews "extended their necks, and exclaimed that they were ready to die rather than transgress the law". A similar example is found in Ant. 18. 262, where Jews were again prepared to die rather than allow

---

[35]. M. Stern, Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism (Jerusalem, 1980), Vol. 2, passim has collected material which indicates that in the face of criticism and ridicule from pagans Jews tenaciously were devoted to the Law. They performed circumcision, kept the Sabbath, and refrained from certain foods. While Josephus affirms in his summary that Jews must be devoted to the Law he omits reference to these items that brought ridicule from pagans. Although Josephus did know of the significance of these distinctive elements their absence from Ap. 2. 190ff is remarkable. The problem of fighting on the Sabbath occurs in several contexts e.g. Ant. 14. Study on the Sabbath is mentioned in Ap. 2. 175, just before the summary, and the appeal of the Sabbath is emphasized after the summary (2. 282). Circumcision is referred to and defended against pagan criticism several times in Ap. 2. 137-142. Jewish food laws are also referred in the same paragraphs. These omissions from Ap. 2. 190-219 show that we do not have a complete summary of Jewish practice and belief, and it will have to be supplemented in various ways as we proceed. It nevertheless provides a good basis for an investigation of common Judaism.

transgression of the law (they were being forced to have the statue of Caligula erected in the Temple). Both of these examples from the historical record reflect a sentiment similar to that present within the theological summary of Contra Apionem and illustrate the level of obedience and self-sacrifice which some Jews demonstrated. The way Jews behaved as depicted in Josephus' theological synthesis has a counterpart in what purports to be historical record.

Archaeological data can also help us to assess the level of obedience to the Law among Jews. Excavations in Jerusalem have uncovered miqvaoth in the upper city of Jerusalem. These ritual pools, used for purification in accordance with Jewish Law, were located in virtually every home of the Jewish quarter of the upper city. Some baths met the specified minimum requirements (a pool must hold 40 seah of water), while others were much more spacious; in certain instances there were several pools within a home. The cleanliness actually exceeding that of the ritual purity required by Jewish Law. These miqvaoth are not an isolated phenomenon; others have been found at Masada. The fact that the pools had to be filled directly with rain-water in view of the location of Masada testifies to the devoutness of these Jews. These excavations indicate what is otherwise known from literary sources: Jews were concerned to keep Laws of purity. Turning to the literature, in the Acts of the Apostles Paul is presented by Luke as one who observed the laws of purification before entering the Temple (21. 26). This concern is reflected in Ap. 2. 198, where purification in connection with sacrifice is mentioned, and at 2. 199-205, where impurity is defined as it relates to marriage, childbirth, the rearing of children, funeral ceremonies and washing is specified as the means of purification. The fact that archaeology confirms the literary evidence highlights the worth of the summary given by Josephus.

The third test is to examine the structure and form of Josephus' summary. The section we are concerned with is thought to be a synthesis in which principles of the Jewish religion are given.[36] These principles are not argued for; their importance, significance, and pervasiveness are taken for granted by Josephus as he presents a mosaic-like picture of the Jewish religion. There are several factors which support the general view that the Judaism portrayed in Ap. 2 190ff. was indeed common. First, Josephus begins his précis with the claim that the "precepts and prohibitions of the law" are simple and familiar (γνώριμοι) : and indeed, by applying our last test -- multiple attestation -- we would see that a number of the ideas in Contra Apionem were attested in other Jewish literature. Second, the form of the précis is that of a carefully structured exposition (as we indicated above). It is notable that the material is largely presented in list-like form. The précis omits arguments that support the importance or signifiance of a given idea. In addition, explanations or relationships between two ideas are not often given. In the thirty paragraphs of the Loeb translation four clear uses of γάρ occur in an explanatory sense (three further examples are disputed), ἵνα is used once to express purpose and ἐπεί occurs once used causally.[37] Thus, whatever may be the objective value of Ap. 2. 190ff., the structure and form of the material suggest that Josephus considered the précis to be a summary of basic principles, not in need of argument: he presupposed these common ideals of Jews.

The final criterion which we shall use to test the veracity of common ideas in Contra Apionem is multiple attestation. A study of other works of Josephus, archaeology, and pagan authors would suggest that certain aspects of the Judaism reflected in Contra

---

[36]. Sanders, "Grace", 365, similarly Zeitlin, Jesus, 5ff.

[37]. The clear uses of γάρ are at 192, 196, 197, 207. The disputed uses are at 201 on (textual grounds) and at 203, 212 where the precise meaning in ambiguous. The use of ἵνα occurs at 204 and ἐπεί at 206.

Apionem are attested elsewhere. Yet how widespread within Judaism are the details of the portrayal? To answer this question it is necessary to take each paragraph in turn.

Josephus commences his exposition of the Torah with the doctrine of God.[38] It is appropriate that he should do so since his apologia of the Jewish religion is motivated by the pride in his race which is chiefly based on his knowledge of God.[39] In paragraphs 190-2 several points are brought out concerning God: (1) he stands as head of the universe; (2) he is plainly seen by his works in creation; (3) he is worthy of worship, and the appropriate manner of worshipping God is by practising virtue (ἀρετήν); (4) no other gods are in competition with the God described here. Josephus' view of God contains points in common with other Jewish material. First, it is standard Jewish opinion that God is in absolute control of history: whatever happens in the world is governed by him.[40] Josephus' depiction of God as "the beginning, the middle and the end of all things" (190) supports this view. In addition to several examples in rabbinic material[41] where this tripartite description of God occurs, the basic point is present in Isaiah (e.g. "I am the first and the last; besides me there is no other God", 45. 5 comp. 41. 4 also Rev. 1. 8, 21. 6, Ant. 8. 280).

There is a second way Josephus' view of God is shared with other Jewish testimony. He prohibits any artistic representation of God. The prohibition is to be observed first of

---

[38]. For a survey of the evidence on Josephus' view of God see Shutt, "God", 171-89.

[39]. Kamlah, "Gesetzesapologie", 221.

[40]. Moore, Judaism, Vol. 1, 374ff.; E. P. Sanders, "Jewish and Non-Jewish Elements in Paul's Theology" was given at the Third Solon Symposium, "Paul the Jew", Nov. 1988, MS 6, 8.

[41]. In addition to several examples given in our summary list 1, see also W.C. van Unnik "Het godspredikaat "Het Begin en het Einde' bij Flavius Josephus en in de openbaring van Johannes", Mededelingen der Kon. Ned. van Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Lett., NS 39/1 (Amsterdam, Oxford and New York, 1976).

all because no material exists that is precious enough, nor does anyone possess sufficient skill to recreate the deity (190). This echoes the second commandment (Ex. 20. 4), prohibiting the making of graven images or the likeness of anything in heaven or on earth.[42] The injunction against idolatry is also found in Wisdom (13. 1-15. 17) as well as in the letters of Paul (Rom. 1. 23). The second reason for the prohibition is that God is the sole creator of all things--his creative activity has not required any assistants or collaborators to help in the process. This view of God has elements in common with the Genesis story. The most obvious is that God was the solitary agent in creation.[43] It is also mentioned that the first creation of God was light (φῶς) (Gen. 1. 3 = Ap. 2. 192). Finally, both accounts mention that God described his own creation as being good, Gen. (LXX) καλόν = Ap. καλῶς While God did not make things with his own hands, it is clear they were things of excellence.[44] Josephus adds that God was made plainly visible, which is similar to an idea to Wisdom (13. 1, 5) and Paul (Rom. 1. 19-20). It may be said that while Josephus was not a literalist in his use of common biblical themes relating to God his sentiments are clearly biblically inspired.

Josephus next turns to discuss the Cult. He begins by stressing the point that it is founded on the principle of unity. Since there is one God and one community, so too there must be one temple (193).[45] From this basic premiss Josephus sketches (1) the duties of priests (193-4); (2) the practices to be observed at Jewish sacrifices (195); (3) guide-lines

---

[42]. However, J.A. Montgomery, "The Religion of Flavius Josephus", JQR 2, (1920-1), 255, maintains that this prohibition is a commentary on the first commandment.

[43]. P. Kruger, Philo und Josephus als Apologeten des Judentums (Leipzig, 1906), 33.

[44]. A. Poznanski, über die religionsphilosophischen Anschauungen des Flavius Josephus (Halle, 1887), 33.

[45]. Schlatter, Josefus, 72.

given for prayer at sacrifices; (196-7) (4) the occasions on which regulations of purity should be deserved (198).

It is striking in a work written at the end of the first century that the sanctuary and sacrifices are represented as present realities. There are several possible explanations for this.[46] He may have expected a quick restoration of the Jerusalem Temple. Or one may prefer to see the portrayal in this paragraph as a depiction of a utopian world in which the destruction of the Temple never occurred. Such considerations do not ease all difficulties here, but for present purposes it is still significant that Josephus shares common features in his portrayal of the Cult with several representatives of pre-70 Judaism: it is intriguing that a post-70 document should in this way reflect the reality of the situation before that date. Specifically, the description is greatly indebted to injunctions contained in biblical law. This is evident in the purification laws that are to be observed after a funeral (in accordance with Numb. 19.11) and following the union of husband and wife (as Lev. 15. 18 prescribes). Josephus' states that sacrifices are not to be occasions for drunken self-indulgence (195), which is reminiscent of Lev. 10. 9, where Aaron and his sons are warned by the Lord not to drink wine or strong drink when they enter the tent of meeting (i.e. the place where the Lord's presence resided). If they did, the consequence was death. This similarity with Josephus is perhaps even more striking when it is remembered that up to this point in the narrative of Leviticus Moses has been giving precepts to his people to enable them to distinguish things holy from common and those clean from unclean, so that they would be able to offer an acceptable sacrifice. A third indication that Josephus shares common ground with biblical law is his depiction of the priests not only as ritual figures in

---

[46]. Vermes, "Law", 296; J. Neusner, A History of the Mishnaic Law of Holy Things, Vol. 6 (Leiden, 1980), 273-5.

charge of sacrifices but also as guardians of the Torah and arbiters of legal controversies.[47] This role of the priest as judge or arbiter is reflected in the Pentateuch at Deut. 17. 9ff, 21. 5, and is assumed in the exhortation to priests at Mic. 3. 11.

Josephus further indicates that sacrifices are to be occasions for prayer, especially for the community: "At these sacrifices prayers for the welfare of the community must take precedence over those for ourselves" (196). This precise formulation is not apparently present in OT or other Jewish material.[48] However, both private and public prayer (i. e. those for the community) permeate the Psalter. An excellent example of private prayer is Ps. 51.[49] Ps. 80, on the other hand, illustrates well prayer for the community. These are the features that Ap. 193-8 held in common with the Pentateuch as well as parts of the OT.

The background to Josephus' formulation can be corroborated from Jewish evidence written nearer to his own time. Josephus propounds a doctrine of "priestly hegemony".[50] According to him the priests, in addition to being God's worshippers par excellence, were to safeguard, administer, and enforce the laws. In the Qumran material we find evidence

---

[47]. S. Riskin, "The Halakah in Josephus as Reflected in Against Apionem and the Life" (MA diss., Yeshiva Univ., New York, 1970), 7; also noted by H. Guttmann, Die Darstellung der jüdischen Religion bei Flavius Josephus (Breslau, 1928), 30; B. Frankel, "Schutzschrift des Josephus Flavius gegen Apion", Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, (1852), Vol. 1, 131.

[48]. However, Montgomery, "Flavius Josephus", 295 maintains the expressions Josephus uses concerning prayer in the Cult are "beyond reproach" when it comes to their Jewishness. Alternatively, see S. Hahn "Josephus on Prayer in c.Ap. II. 197", Études orientales à la mémoire de P. Hirschler (Budapest, 1950), 111-115, for possible suggestions to the background of Josephus' formulation.

[49]. For other examples of prayers of the individual see C. Westermann, Praise and Lament in the Psalms (Edinburgh, 1981) 64ff., 181ff.

[50]. Vermes, "Law", 295; also Schlatter, Josefus, 91.

similar to that in Josephus regarding the high position and authority allocated to priests.[51] In IQS 5. 2-3 we are told that under the authority of the priests decisions were made regarding matters of doctrine, justice and property. Newcomers were to "unite with respect to the Law and possessions, under the authority of the sons of Zadok", (Comp. 1QSa 2. 3). In addition, priests were to be learned in the Book of Meditation (i.e. the Bible)[52] and in "judgements of the law". They also possessed authority to "rule over" the assembly of the camps (CD 13-14). Furthermore, priests were to fulfil such duties as offering blessings at meal-times, presiding over assemblies, and performing required legal functions. One noteworthy fact is that neither the Scrolls nor Contra Apionem have teaching duties assigned to priests. This responsibility is given at Qumran to the Mebakker, whose chief duty lay in the area of instruction: CD 13. 6 declares that "he shall instruct the Congregation in the works of God".[53] Still, priests were given the duty of offering guidance (e.g. 4 QpIs (a) 8-10, 23 to Messiah). Similarly, the Temple Scroll portrays the king as obliged to follow the advice of the twelve priests, twelve Levites, and twelve Israelites who will sit with him to decide disputes and to proclaim the Torah. Thus, it cannot be said that the king will act without priestly counsel (11 Q Temp. 57. 13-15). Similarly to the Qumran documents, Contra Apionem reflects the view that ultimate authority was a privilege of priests: its leaders in general were said to be priests. Whether we can claim that this was

---

[51]. Kamlah, "Gesetzesapologie", 226-227, maintains that Josephus depends directly on Hecataeus for this part of his account. However, Vermes has reservations about this, Ibid, 295 n. 14.

[52]. See G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective (Philadelphia, 1977), 113.

[53]. On the relationship between the Priest and the mebakker see G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (Middlesex, 1968), 19-25.

a common Jewish view is contentious, but nevertheless a view of priests fundamental to DSS is also found in the Contra Apionem summary.

Drawing together some conclusions from Josephus' portrayal of the Cult we can see in some essentials he shares common ground with three bodies of Jewish material: his sentiments on sacrifice and purification practices are in accord with the Pentateuch; his attitude towards prayer may be likened to that reflected in the Psalter; his outlook on the priesthood may be found in both the Pentateuch and the Scrolls.

Josephus concluded his section on the Cult by giving several prescriptions on purification (198). He now continues this theme into other areas: the marriage relationship (199-203), the birth of children (204), and practices at funeral ceremonies (205). This takes the form of a list of regulations that relate, narrowly speaking, to what the law prescribes as appropriate in marriage. In the process, however, other subjects relating to marriage are included.

Josephus begins his portrayal of what he defines as the "marriage laws" by indicating that the principal purpose of the union between man and woman is for the procreation of children (199). Apart from the admonition of Gen. 1. 28, "Be fruitful and multiply", there is not present in the Pentateuch any command to the effect that marriage was for the purpose of procreation.[54] However, this outlook, as Josephus himself indicates, is to be found in one order of the Essene community. In War, 2. 160-1, we are given a description of married Essenes and told that the reason they married was not for pleasure but because of the necessity of having sons.[55] This view is also found in Philo (Life of Moses 1. 28)[56]

---

[54]. M. Olitzki, Flavius Josephus und die Halacha (Berlin, 1885), 32.

[55]. So Riskin, "Halakah", 9.

[56]. L. H. Feldman, Josephus and Modern Scholarship (Berlin and New York, 1984), 520, maintains that Josephus was influenced by Philo's Life of Moses 1. 28, where sexual relations are said to be for the purpose of begetting children. Whether Josephus and Philo agree due to the former's dependence on the latter we can only speculate. If this was not

as well as in Mishnaic and Talmudic law.[57] Therefore, it is clear that Josephus shares a view of marriage with which other Jews agreed and that he follows a tradition that goes beyond the Bible.

In addition, Josephus (Ap. 2. 199) offers several indicators of what is to be forbidden in marital relationships. First, according to Josephus sodomy was forbidden within marriage and was punishable by death. The Pentateuch prescribes death for homosexual sodomy (Lev. 20. 13; 18. 22),[58] but it does not specify that sodomy is prohibited within the context of the marital relationship: the prohibition rather relates to rape, adultery, and homosexuality. Adultery was also forbidden and, as with sodomy, the death penalty was incurred (Lev. 20. 10, 18. 22; Dt. 22. 22-7); this is in accord with biblical law. The man was forbidden to have relations with a married woman or a betrothed virgin (201); there was no restriction on relations with his own wife.[59] Intercourse is also forbidden when the woman is "with child". If the man has relations with his wife during this time he is considered impure (202). Thackeray's rendering, which takes the phrase to mean "pregnant" is not found in biblical or Talmudic thought. However, Riskin maintains that ἐπὶ λεχοῦς may refer not to a pregnant woman but to a woman who has just given birth.[60] Understood in this way the impurity incurred by the man is consonant with biblical law (Lev. 12. 1, 5). This alternative interpretation is supported by two occurrences in Ap. 2. 198, 202. The first reference makes it reasonably clear that ἀπὸ λεχοῦς means childbirth, and the

---

the case, and the agreement is coincidental, it strengthens the supposition that Josephus is giving a common Jewish view. See also L. M. Epstein, Sex Laws and Customs in Judaism (New York, 1948), 141-142.

[57]. See Summary List 3.

[58]. Comp. Epstein, Laws, 194-215.

[59]. Comp. Ibid., 64-5; 134-8.

[60]. Riskin, "Halakah", 11 also Reinach, Contre Apion, 94 n. 3.

occurrence at 202 is similar. Reinach in his translation uses the word "accouchée," while Rengstorf renders the Greek word by the German word "Wöchnerin" -- "woman in childbirth".[61] A purely lexical judgement would rely on too few examples, but on contextual grounds the translations of Riskin, Reinach, and Rengstorf make the best sense, especially since the prohibition is placed within the confines of biblical law, which Josephus declares to be his purpose for section 190-219.

To these above prescriptions on marriage Josephus offers a regulation for purification (202). This is to be practised within the context of legitimate sexual relations between husband and wife. The guide-line for this is laid down in the Law (eg. Lev. 15. 18). Ablutions are prescribed for both man and woman following sexual relations. In spite of the fact that Reinach[62] maintains that Josephus has wrongly interpreted Lev. 15. 18, the Leviticus text does indicate that both the man and woman are affected by the emission of semen and require bathing.[63]

From Josephus' reflections on purity regarding sexual relations he proceeds to define some role differences that exist between man and woman.[64] "The woman, says the Law, is in all things inferior to the man. Let her accordingly be submissive, not for her humiliation, but that she may be directed; for the authority has been given by God to the man" (201). Josephus[65] shares the general view held by Gen. 3. 16 (LXX) and the Essenes

---

[61]. Reinach, Ibid., 94; K. H. Rengstorf, A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus (Leiden, 1979), Vol. 3, 37.

[62]. Reinach, Ibid., 94 n. 4.

[63]. So Müller, Gegen den Apion, 321; Thackeray, Against Apion, 374.

[64]. See Schlatter, Josefus, 148.

[65]. Ant. 4.219 reflects a view similar to that of Ap. 2. 201 : " From women let no evidence be accepted, because of the levity and temerity of their sex". Although the opening clause does not occur in the Bible, there is a rabbinic ruling recorded in Rosh Hashanah 22a that makes it clear that the testimony of a woman was accepted only in a limited

(War, 2. 121; Ant., 18. 21) and also holds common ground with Philo, Hyp. 7. 3 "wives must be in servitude to their husbands, a servitude not imposed by violent ill-treatment but promoting obedience in all things" (also Spec. Law. 2. 124). Similarly, in Philo it is the husband who is to transmit knowledge of the Law to his wife (Hyp. 7. 14).[66] He is also to exercise sexual purity and must have relations only with his with his wife.

In his next paragraph (202) Josephus refers to women in connection with abortion. A woman who deliberately causes a miscarriage or the destruction of a foetus is regarded as one who commits infanticide because she destroys a soul and diminishes the race. While there is no law in the Pentateuch that forbids abortion,[67] the LXX translation of Ex. 21. 22f. seems to have been the starting-point for these reflections.[68] This can be seen by comparing the MT and LXX texts. This first has: "When men strive together, and hurt a woman with child, so that there is a miscarriage, and yet no harm follows, the one who hurt her shall be fined, according as the woman's husband shall lay upon him; and he shall pay as the judges determine. If any harm follows, then you shall give life for life." The Septuagint version "If two men wrestle with one another and hit a pregnant woman, and the child comes forth and is not formed yet, then the penalty shall be money...But if it was

---

number of situations. Comp. Bailey, "Matriarchs", 156, 177 n. 14.

66. See A.-M. Durbarle, "Paul et l' antiféminisme" Revue des Sciences Philos. et Theol. 60 (1976), 263-268 for a survey of attitudes towards women in antiquity and the suggestion that the view of Josephus is typical. In this regard, one may consult Bailey, Ibid., 154-179 esp. 156-7 and J.E. Crouch, The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel (Göttingen, 1972), 107-109.

67. Müller, Gegen den Apion, 320; Van der Horst, Sentences, 233.

68. Van der Horst, Sentences, 234; D. M. Feldman, Birth Control in Jewish Law (New York and London, 1973), 257-258. One possible motivation (according to Riskin, "Halakah", 54), for Josephus'formulation, especially his equation of abortion with infanticide, is that he did not want to give the impression that Jewish law was less severe than the Noahide law (applicable to non-Jews); according to b. San. 57b the Noahide injunction forbids killing a foetus in the womb of its mother.

formed then thou shall give life for life." Although Josephus does not make the distinction in Ex. 21 (LXX) between a formed and unformed foetus, it is clear from the LXX text that a formed foetus was a human being. Therefore, whoever kills such a one has committed murder and will be punished by death. Philo, Hyp. 7. 7, held a view consonant with Josephus, "No one shall cause the offspring of a woman to be abortive by means of a miscarriage or by any other contrivance." (Comp. Spec. Law. 3. 108-9).[69] Philo includes the prohibition against abortion in a group of injunctions which he classifies as greater in importance and more serious in nature than the minor offences listed in 7. 9; but he still maintains that these minor deeds are punishable by destruction from God. If these minor misdemeanours are punished in this way, can abortion be treated with any less severity? It seems reasonable to surmise that Philo in the Hypothetica, like Josephus, viewed abortion, as a capital offence.

There is a further text on the theme of abortion that runs parallel to Josephus and Philo. This is found in Ps. Phoc. 184-5: " a woman should not destroy the unborn babe in her belly, nor after its birth throw it before dogs and vultures as a prey."[70] That is, there

---

[69]. So Troianai, Commento, 189; S. Belkin, "The Alexandrian Source for Contra Apionem II", JQR 27 (1936-7), 9. For a survey of several relevant texts from Philo on abortion see S. Belkin, Philo and Oral Law (Cambridge, Mass., 1940), 129-133, 136 n. 135 and his Alexandrian Halakah in the Apologetic Literature (Philadelphia, 1936) 66, 13-15; on the halakhic literature see D.J. Bleich, "Abortion in Halakhic Literature", Contemporary Halakhic Problems (New York, 1977), 325-371; D. M. Feldman, Marital Relations, Birth Control and Abortion in Jewish Law (New York, 1974), Pt. 5; R. Baile, Women and the Jewish Law (New York, 1984), 219-281.

[70]. So Crouch, Haustafel, 84-85; van der Horst, Sentences, 233-234. This point was already observed by P. Wendland "Die Therapeuten und die philonische Schrift vom beschaulichen Leben", Jahrbücher für class. Philol., Suppl. 22 (1896), 710.

is a prohibition against abortion and exposure.[71] The view that we observe in Josephus, Philo, and the Pseudo- Phocylides is echoed in the rabbinic writings as well. For example, the Mekilta Ex. 21. 13 clearly attests "the killing of a viable foetus is forbidden". We therefore have multiple attestations to the statement of Josephus on abortion.[72]

Finally, on the theme of woman, we may consider what Josephus says regarding entrance into the marriage relationship. According to him the Law commands that when one takes a wife it should be done in the following manner. First, she is not to be seduced or seized by violence (rape).[73] Second, she is to be wooed from him who has the right to testify to the young woman's virginity (i.e. the father or possibly her brothers). Both of these injunctions are based on biblical law (Dt. 22. 28-9; 22. 13ff. respectively). The further injunction that the man is not to be influenced by the dowry that he will receive from the woman is more difficult to parallel. There are neither biblical nor Talmudic prohibitions regarding this point.[74] Thackeray assumes that Josephus' statement is referring to a commandment of Jewish law. However, if the verb κελεύω means "prescribe", "recommend", "advise", as Feldman maintains (rather than "decree"), then what Josephus is offering is good advice instead of a command of God.[75] The Talmudic evidence (in spite of its late date) contains an example that is relevant to gifts promised before marriage, and is offered not as a command but as a warning. Rabbah b. R. Adda said that anyone who marries a woman for the sake of money will have children who are unworthy (b. Kiddushin 70a). However, there is evidence from Pseudo-Phocylides that comes very close to

---

[71]. See on the theme of exposure A. Cameron, "The Exposure of Children and Greek Ethics", Classical Review 46 (1932), 105-14.

[72]. See also Summary List: 3.

[73]. See Epstein, Laws, 179-91.

[74]. Feldman, Scholarship, 520.

[75]. Ibid.

Josephus' sentiment, much more cogent than the Talmudic reference: "You will be a slave to your wife because of a baneful dowry" (200).

This concludes our survey of how Josephus answered the question "What are our marriage laws?"(199). We have seen Josephus' concordance with a wide range of Jewish material: OT, Philo's Hypothetica, Apocalyptic writings, rabbis, wisdom maxims, external evidence reported in the War. and Antiquities. There are several points, however, where Josephus' view does not derive directly from the Bible: that the purpose of marriage was for procreation; the prohibition against abortion; that a person is not to be influenced by dowry in the choice of a marriage partner; the injunction against sodomy in connection with marital laws.

There is a further reflection in the final paragraph of Josephus' section on marriage laws that requires comment. It concerns the departure of the soul to another place (203). Josephus attributes this view to OT law, although there is no evidence to justify this.[76] In context this statement appears to refer to purification regulations: the sentences that precede and follow the statement about the journey of the soul are about purification. Yet the statement itself refers to something that experiences suffering. We would infer from this that Josephus is referring to the foetus, which he mentions at 202 and understood as a human being possessing a soul.

Commentators of Contra Apionem are in agreement[77] that the idea here is akin to that of Essene anthropology, as depicted in War 2, 154-5 :

(11) For it is a fixed belief of theirs that the body is corruptible and its constituent matter impermanent, but that the soul is immortal and imperishable. Emanating from the finest

---

[76]. Olitzki, Josephus, 31.

[77]. Müller, Gegen den Apion, 322; Thackeray, Against Apion, 375; Reinach, Contre Apion, 94 n. 5; Troianai, Commento, 189; also Vermes, "Law", 297.

ether, these souls become entangled, as it were, in the prison-house of the body, to which they are dragged down by a sort of natural spell; but when once they are released from the bonds of the flesh, then, as though liberated from a long servitude, they rejoice and are borne aloft.

Schreckenberg[78] maintains that Josephus' notion is influenced by Greek ideas such as those found in the above passage. He also understands the notion of separation of the soul from the body in conjunction with the previous injunction which Josephus offers regarding sexual intercourse. As the seed of a man creates the soul of a future child by a process of exchange, similarly the soul of the dead person separates from his body and is transferred to another place. While such an interpretation does have the merit of placing the notion of the partition of the soul in context, the explanation seems to be rather forced. It is better simply to note that Josephus shares common ideas with the Essenes. Thus, the idea does not reflect common Judaism.

From marriage Josephus proceeds to discuss the proper behaviour to be observed at festivities associated with the birth of children. He states that sobriety should be maintained; excessive drinking was discouraged. This is different from the account in the Fourth Gospel, where instances occur of dancing and drinking as part of festivities relating to circumcisions, weddings, and betrothals (eg. Jn. 2. 1-12).[79] The picture we find in Josephus seems to be unprecedented in Palestinian literature of this time.[80] Philo, however,

---

[78]. H. Schreckenberg, Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus (Leiden, 1977), 167-168; also Müller, Ibid. Comp. Schlatter, Josefus, 19.

[79]. J. Mann, "Rabbinic Studies of the Synoptic Gospels", HUCA 1 (1924), 324-325; R. Schnackenburg, The Gospel according to St John (New York, 1982), Vol. 1, 327 and n. 10.

[80]. Belkin, "Contra Apionem II", 19ff.

condemns excess at festivals-perhaps because of its evident presence at Greek festivals. Although we have no description from Philo of the way Alexandrian Jews celebrated festivals we do possess a passage from him where he contrasts Greek and Jewish festivals: And it has been shown that it is suitable to his character to keep festivals; Sabbath and festivals therefore belong to the great Cause of all things alone, and absolutely to no man whatever. For come, if you please, and contemplate with me the much celebrated festive assemblies of men. As for those which among the barbarians and Greek nations have been established in compliance with fabulous fictions, all tending to no other object than to excite vain pride in various nations, they may be all passed over, for the entire life of a man would not be enough to make an accurate and thorough investigation of all the absurdities which exist in each of those festivals. In every festival and assembly among men, the following are the most remarkable and celebrated points: amusements, music at the door, banquets throughout the night, unseemly pleasures, wedding feasts during the day...wakefulness during the night for the indulgence of immoderate appetites, sleep by day when it is the proper time to be awake, turning upside down the laws of nature. At such a time virtue is ridiculed as a mischievous thing, and vice is caught at as something advantageous. (Cherubim, 90-2)

Even if the recommendations of Philo were an ideal that most of Alexandrian society did not subscribe to, these do constitute an incentive to sobriety and caution among Alexandrian Jews. Philo presents a contrast in the behaviour of Greeks and Jews at festivals: the one of indulgence and frivolity, the other of contemplation and the study of the Torah. All this may suggest that Josephus' sentiments reflect Alexandrian customs,[81] not that he is portraying common ideals of Jews.

---

[81]. Ibid., 22.

According to Contra Apionem festivals are not the only place that sobriety is to be observed. Josephus affirms that the rule also applies in the bringing up of children (comp. Ap. 1. 60; Ant. 4. 211). They are to be taught the Torah and the deeds of their forefathers so that Jewish children may not be ignorant of the Torah or transgress its laws. This injunction to teach the Torah to one's children is firmly grounded in Jewish tradition. This link between the education of children and Torah observance shows the central place which study of the Torah held as a religious ideal for Jews of Josephus' day as well as before.[82] The locus classicus in the OT for teaching children Torah is Dt. 6. 4-9. Following the giving of the appeal of the Shema "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord", the Israelites were exhorted diligently to teach the commandments of Moses at all times to their children (comp. Dt. 11. 19; 32. 6). Equally, parents are to be ready to teach to their children about their nation's heritage and past (Dt. 6. 20-1; 32.7). A noteworthy example of this is found in the story of the crossing of the Jordan. The narrative indicates that twelve stones were removed from the Jordon when the people crossed over it. This was done so that, if the children asked their fathers what these stones all placed together meant, there would be a lesson for them to learn from this: "You shall let your children know that Israel passed over this Jordan on dry ground" (Josh. 4. 21-2).

Not only are parents to teach their children, but children are to learn from or obey the instruction of their forefathers (comp. also Prov. 1. 8; 6. 20).[83] Proceeding to first-century Jewish evidence, Philo's Hypothetica offers material which supports that in the OT. In Hyp. 7. 13 we are told that it is the priests and elders who read and expound the Torah so that those who listen to their teaching will "advance in piety". One result of Torah

---

[82]. B. I. Viviano, Study as Worship: Aboth and the New Testament (Leiden, 1976), 155.

[83]. On the Jewish education of children see R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel (New York and Toronto, 1965), Vol. 1, 45-51; Moore, Judaism, Vol. 1, 316ff.

instruction is to ensure that Israel's children will have a confident knowledge of their laws.[84] Philo elaborates this point at Hyp. 7. 14. He maintains that when a Jew is attacked with enquiries about his ancestral institutions he will be able to answer these objections and not need to resort to the assistance of a learned person (i.e. a professional in moral and legal matters), because Jews know their law.

The third area in which Josephus offers purification restrictions is the funeral ceremony (205). He includes three injunctions: funeral services are not to incur excessive costs; in addition to the presence of the nearest kin all those who pass by while a burial is in process are to join the procession and share in the family's mourning; after the funeral the family of the deceased must be purified.[85] It is taken for granted that the burial of the dead is a religious duty: this is a point on which there was no difference between Jews and Gentiles.[86] But the injunction that the house and its inhabitants should be cleansed is clearly grounded in biblical law[87] (e.g. Num. 19.11ff, "He who touches the dead body of any person shall be unclean seven days; he shall cleanse himself with the water on the third day, and on the seventh day he will become clean"). Similarly, the idea of mourning the dead is a familiar OT notion. There were known rituals prescribed for the deceased person's relatives and those present at the funeral. The first action was to rend their garments (Gen. 37. 24; 2 Sam. 1. 11; 3. 31), and then put a sack-cloth around the loins (Gen. 37. 34; 2 Sam. 3. 31). In addition, mourners were to remove their shoes (2 Sam. 15. 20)and head-dress

---

[84]. B. Brüne, Flavius Josephus und seine Schriften in ihrem Verhältnis zum Judentume, zur griechisch = römischen Welt und zum Christentume (Wiesbaden, 1969), 109.

[85]. The longer reading is thought by Thackeray, Against Apion, 376 to be a gloss. If not, here is a further example of a view in the Ap. not in the Bible. Comp. Olitzki, Josephus, 31.

[86]. On this point see M. Hengel, The Charismatic Leader and His Followers (Edinburgh, 1981), 8-10; also, regarding Josephus Schlatter, Josefus, 162.

[87]. Müller, Gegen den Apion 324; M. Duschak, Josephus Flavius und die Tradition (Wien, 1864), 75.

(Ezek. 24. 17, 23), and men were to veil their faces (2 Sam. 19. 5). The mourner was to put earth on his head (Josh. 7. 6) and roll his entire body in dust (Mic. 1. 10).[88] This OT view fits in well with the admonition of Ecclesiasticus, "Do not fail those who weep, but mourn with those who mourn (7. 34)[89] These sentiments are in full agreement with Josephus regarding participation in the mourning of the family.

But the principal injunction of the paragraph, that excess should be avoided at funeral services, is not found in the Pentateuch, and it is only with the Talmuds that we have parallel documentation of the prohibition.[90] The Talmud states that previously funeral demands were more taxing on relatives than the death itself. The situation was rectified, however, when R. Gamaliel II (d.110) wished to be dressed in linen shrouds and the nation took up this practice (b. Moed Katan 27b).[91] Since R. Gamaliel is an older contemporary of Josephus it may be that by the time Contra Apionem was written the custom elucidated in the Talmud had become fairly established practice.[92] As for criticism of conspicuous monuments, the Jerusalem Talmud declares that no monuments are erected for the righteous since their works are their memorials (y.Shekalim 11a). One may reasonably conclude, regarding the injunctions against excess at funeral services, that Josephus followed Jewish pronouncements which developed into law at a later time.

---

[88]. See de Vaux, Israel, 59, on OT evidence.

[89]. In the Old Latin version following the line that reads "do not fail those who weep" there are the words "in conrogatione" (in reference to the funeral feast): G. H. Box and W. 0. E. Osterley, "The Book of Sirach" in R.H. Charles (ed.), The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (Oxford, 1913), Vol. 1, 342.

[90]. Müller, Gegen den Apion, 323; Reinach, Contre Apion, 95 n. 2.

[91]. So Olitzki, Josephus, 25; Frankel, Josephus, 132 n. 7.

[92]. Riskin, "Halakah", 44.

We have now considered Josephus' exposition on God and man's relationship to God. The final section of Contra Apionem concentrates on precepts and prohibitions of law relating to human relationships. Three categories of relationships are considered: (1) duties toward parents (206); (2) attitudes toward friends; (207-8), (3) behaviour towards Gentiles (209-14).

Josephus presents three prescriptions for children to follow: they are to honour their parents; they are to be grateful for the benefits given by them; children are to show respect towards their elders.

The precept to honour one's parents is deeply rooted in the Decalogue (Ex. 20. 12; Dt. 5. 16), in biblical law (Lev. 19. 3), the wisdom tradition (Prov. 1. 8; 19. 26; 23. 22-5; 28. 24; Sir. 3. 1-6), the apocalyptic tradition (Jub. 7.20) and in the rabbinic tradition (Mekilta on Ex. 20. 12) comp. Philo, Spec. Laws 2. 235; Decal. 51). In the present section Josephus places alongside honour to parents honour to God (which does however, rank above honour to parents). While in the Decalogue honour to parents is preceded by an account of several different ways in which one is to show honour to God (e. g. not to make a graven image, not to take the Lord's name in vain, to keep the Sabbath), the precise combination of Ap. 206 is found infrequently in Jewish material.[93] (But see the close resemblances at Prov. 1. 7-8; Sir. 7. 27-31; also Arist. 228.) One example that echoes Josephus occurs at Ps. Phoc. 8: "Honour God first and foremost and thereafter your parents". Similar is the Sib Or. 3. 593f.,: "they honour Him alone who reigns for ever, the Eternal, and after him their

---

[93]. Van der Horst, Sentences, 116; K. Berger, Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1972), 285; however, Duschak, Tradition, 65, maintains that Josephus learnt this from tradition. On the rabbinic references see I. Heinemann, Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung (Breslau, 1932), 252-4; Moore, Judaism, Vol. 2. 131-2.

parents...". But it should be borne in mind that honour to parents was also a recurring theme in Greek and Roman literature.[94]

The second prohibition relating to children refers to the biblical concept of the "stubborn and rebellious son" who is stoned because he will not "obey the voice of his father and mother" (Dt. 21. 18-21). The view Josephus gives is also present in Philo's Hyp. 7.2, where those who commit impiety against their father or mother receive the penalty of death by stoning. It is evident that the tradition which Josephus and Philo follow, derives from the OT Law. Pseudo-Phocylides makes the same general point regarding discipline of children,[95] but does not include the penalty of death for disobedience:[96] "And if a child sins against you, let the mother cut her son down to size, or else the elders of the family or the chiefs of the people." The Mishnaic tradition, however, greatly restricted the circumstances under which the rebellious son was to be condemned to death. For example, m. San. 8. 1-6 indicates several criteria: the parents must both wish for the execution to take place; the child may not have any physical defects; the child must have been previously chastised by his parents and the elders of the community; the youth must not be under 13 years and one day old and must have stolen from his parents; finally, he must be guilty of having consumed large quantities of food and drink. With these sort of criteria required to convict a rebellious youth the success of any actual case became a virtual impossibility.[97] Josephus did not have such a restrictive outlook. For him the slightest failure by a son to obey his parents merits stoning.

---

[94]. J. W. Hewitt, "Gratitude to Parents in Greek and Romans Literature", American Journal of Philology 52 (1931), 30-48; van der Horst, Sentences, 116.

[95]. J. Bernays, "Über das phokylideische Gedicht. Ein Beitrag zum hellenistischen Literatur", Gesammelte Abhandlungen (Berlin, 1885), Vol. 1, 244.

[96]. Van der Horst, Sentences, 248.

[97]. Riskin, "Halakah", 16.

Finally, youths were required to respect their elders, as is testified in the wisdom tradition (Sir. 8. 6), OT law (Lev. 19. 32); the sentiment is universal in the ancient world.[98] The outlook of Josephus is equally expressed in Ps. Phoc. 220-2: "Revere those with grey hair on the temples and yield your seat and all privileges to old persons. To an old man of equal descent and of the same age as your father give the same honour" (comp. Philo, Spec. Law 2. 237-8).[99] Josephus does not agree with the Talmudic view (b. Kidd. 32a) that an ignorant elderly man does not necessarily require respect. For Josephus "all the elders" are to be given honour, regardless of their knowledge or the lack of it. Since Josephus contrasts the πρεσβύτατον and the νέους it is evident that age alone, not one's capacity in leadership or acquisition of knowledge, is what Josephus had in mind.[100] Thus, from the three exhortations to children we have seen that Josephus shares common attitudes with OT law, Philo's Hypothetica, the Pseudo-Phocylides and the wisdom, apocalyptic, and rabbinic traditions. It must of course be remembered that the injunction to show respect to elders is not distinctly Jewish, but was common in the ancient world among various people.

Josephus next offers injunctions to those whom he calls "friends" (φίλου). Although he does not tell us explicitly, we may infer that he has in mind here fellow Jews. This view is supported later (208), when Josephus forbids charging interest: the OT prohibition he is in all probability recalling (Dt. 23. 20-1) applies only to Jews and not to foreigners.[101] Firstly Josephus insists that his fellow Jews must not conceal anything from one another, misuse any information that has been divulged in trust if a time of estrangement should

---

98. Heinemann, Philons Bildung, 256.

99. For the view that Ps. Phoc. 220-2 was influenced by Lev. 19. 32 see Bernays, "Literatur", 245.

100. Riskin, "Halakah", 18.

101. So Vermes, "Law", 295.

arise (207). This precise injunction is neither found in the Pentateuch (comp. Lev. 19. 16ff; also Prov. 11. 13) nor in the rabbinic literature (comp. m. San. 3. 7; b. San. 4b). It is generally thought[102] that the statement of Contra Apionem is similar to that of Josephus in the War 2. 141, when, referring to Essenes he says that they "neither hide anything from those of their own sect nor reveal to others any of their sect though urged by death". These secrets referred to in the War are concerned with a prohibition directed at new initiates, so that they will not disclose secrets of the community to others (comp. IQS 8. 11ff.;, 5. 15-16). But the statement from Contra Apionem has nothing at all to do with prohibitions to be observed by an initiate. Rather, what is being referred to is an "ideal of Jewish friendship".[103] This ideal occurs also in Philo, Hyp. 7. 8,[104] although Josephus' statement is more clearly expressed. The words of the Hypothetica are: The secrets of a friend must not be divulged in enmity. The only parallel occurrence of this prohibition relating to friendship thus comes from an Alexandrian source.

Josephus proceeds to a second admonition for his "friends". Judges, he maintains, are not to accept bribes, for the penalty is the death. The admonition against accepting bribes was common in biblical law (e.g. Ex. 23. 8; Dt. 16. 19) as well as in the later comment (e. g. Mekilta on Ex. 23. 8; b. Keth. 105). But these literatures do not record the severe penalty prescribed by Josephus.[105] The only example of Jewish material similar to Josephus is found in 11QTem. 51.17. The penalty may have been included to exalt the Jewish sense

---

[102]. Müller, Gegen den Apion, 325; Troianai, Commento, 191; Kamlah "Gesetzesapologie", 229 n. 32; Thackeray, Against Apion, 376; Reinach, Contre Apion, 95 n. 11.

[103]. The phrase is from Belkin, "Contra Apionem", 22.

[104]. So Belkin, ibid.; Troiani, Commento, 191; Kalmah, "Gesetzesapologie", 229.

[105]. Müller, Gegen den Apion, 325; Olitzki, Josephus, 22;, P. Revel, "Some Anti-Traditional Laws of Josephus", JQR 14 (1923-4), 295-296.

of justice before a Roman audience.[106] The only parallel statement in the Torah that has some resemblance is Dt. 27. 25 "cursed be he who accepts a bribe to strike a soul of innocent blood, and the entire nation answered Amen". If the statement of Josephus means a judge who takes a bribe so that innocent blood is shed must pay life for life by receiving the penalty of death, then one can see some similarity between the OT law and Contra Apionem.[107] But it is probably best to conclude that Josephus is here following a common OT and Jewish sentiment, to which there is little specific Jewish authority.

Josephus next enjoins those who are able to help the needy to do so: "He who refuses a suppliant the aid which he has power to give is accountable to justice" (207). This statement has supporting evidence from a variety of Jewish evidence, but as a moral precept[108] rather than as part of biblical law. From the OT we have: "If there is among you a poor man...you shall open your hand to him and lend him sufficient for his need whatever it may be"(Dt. 15. 7f.); from Wisdom literature "She opens her hand to the poor, and reaches out her hands to the needy" (Prov. 31. 20 comp. 19. 17; 22. 12; 31. 9; Ps. 41. 9); or again "Do not reject an afflicted suppliant, nor turn your face from the poor. Do not avert your eye from the needy..." (Sir. 4. 4-5 comp. Tob. 4. 7); Ps. Phoc. "Of that which God has given you, give of it to the needy" (29; also 10; 19b; 23b; 28); Philo, Hyp.: "If the poor or the cripple beg food of him he must give it as an offering of religion to God" (7.6 comp. Virt. 82-7).[109]

[106]. Olitzki, Ibid.

[107]. Riskin, "Halakah", 19; Revel, "Anti-Traditional Laws", 296.

[108]. Reinach, Contre Apion, 95 n. 13; Thackeray, Against Apion, 377.

[109]. See Berger, Gesetzesauslegung, 369-81 for a commentary on several of these texts. Also A. Nissen, Gott und der Nächste im antiken Judentum (Tübingen, 1974), 166 n. 299; van der Horst, Sentences, 134.

From these texts the strong Jewish concern for the poor is evident. The responsibility that is to be taken by those who are not classified as "poor" or "needy" is equally clear. One can note at least in several of the above texts the explicit religious motive behind helping those in need (e.g. Ps. Phoc.; Hyp.; Dt. 15. 14b). Although the religious emphasis which is stated explicitly in Contra Apionem is not present in this form in the parallel passages, Josephus has nevertheless followed the spirit of Jewish tradition. This is consonant with general Jewish precepts on proper behaviour to be observed in one's relations with fellow human beings.

Josephus adds three further injunctions in the section on relations with "friends". First, one must not appropriate what does not belong to one as if it was one's own. Josephus shares this view both with the OT (e. g. Lev. 6. 2-3; Dt. 22. 1-3) and Philo's Hypothetica. "What he has not laid down he must not take up...". (7.6). Second is the prohibition against stealing, which is clearly rooted in the Decalogue (Ex. 20. 15; Dt. 5. 19; comp. Lev. 19. 11; Ex. 22. 11ff.). Finally, Josephus includes the prohibition against charging interest to fellow Jews. This point, like the two previous injunctions, has strong OT warrant (Ex. 22. 25; Lev. 26. 36; Dt. 23. 19; Ezek. 18. 8, 13, 17; 22. 12; Ps. 15. 5). Josephus does not record that taking interest from non-Jews is legitimate (Dt. 23. 19).

In summarizing what Josephus shares with his contemporaries on the theme of appropriate behaviour within relationships between children and parents, children and "elders" and Jews towards each other we can say that the behavioural prescriptions he sets for children in relation to their parents and "elders" share ideas common to those of the OT law, Pseudo-Phocylides, Philo's Hypothetica, Sib. Or. and that the recommendations for relationships among Jews can similarly be documented in Philo's Hypothetica, OT and Pseudo Phocylides, as well as the wisdom and apocalyptic traditions.

He now extends his discussion to another category of person to whom honour is to be shown. Towards these people Josephus maintains that generosity (ἐπείκεια) is the supreme virtue. In addition to safeguarding his national customs from distortion the Jew was to make them available to non-Jews.[110] The Jewish religion was not to be kept a private possession of Jews and remain inaccessible to others.[111] "To all who desire to come and live under the same laws with us, he gives a gracious welcome..." (210). The only restriction is that casual visitors should not be permitted to know the intimate details of daily religious practice.[112] According to Troianai, Josephus is here referring to dealings with "God-fearers";[113] the context, which focuses on a Jew's "friends" helps to support this. Since God-fearers were technically non-Jews, this interpretation seems plausible.[114]

The content of the section in general overall (209-10) strongly suggests that the underlying theme is the attraction of proselytes.[115] The central point is that individuals who are not ethnically bound to Israel may become part of the people of God. The Book of Ruth serves as a good example of the phenomenon Josephus has in view. In addition, the conversion of non-Jews to Judaism is found in the NT period in the record of Acts, where evidence of the presence of proselytes occurs at 2. 10 and 13. 43. Many scholars[116]

---

[110]. Duschak, Tradition, 73.

[111]. Kruger, Philo und Josephus, 52.

[112]. Schlatter, Josefus, 94.

[113]. Troianai, Commento, 192; similarly Frankel, Flavius, 133; Balch, "Encomia", 119.

[114]. Comp. Bilde, Josephus, 121-122.

[115]. Vermes, "Law", 298; Riskin, "Halakah", 26ff. On proselytism see biblio note chp. 5 n.17

[116]. A recent exception is A. T. Kraabel, "The Disappearance of the God-fearers", Numen 28 (1981), 113-126. For a critique of Kraabel's view see Schurer, Jewish People, Vol. 3.1, 166ff.; also Collins, Athens and Jerusalem, 165-167; T.M. Finn, "The God-fearers

continue to maintain that Acts testifies to "God-fearers" (10. 1-3; 13. 16, 26), who worship a single God and observe aspects of the Jewish way of life, but who have not taken the further steps of circumcision, sacrifice, and ritual immersion. God-fearers remained on the fringe of synagogue life and were not viewed as part of the Jewish commonwealth. In all probability it is this group to which Josephus denies intimate knowledge of Jewish "daily life".

The rabbis also shared the view that Judaism as a way of life should be made accessible to all. This is evident from the following passage from the Talmud:

Our Rabbis taught: If at the present time a man desires to become a proselyte, he is to be addressed as follows: "What reason have you for desiring to become a proselyte? Do you not know that Israel at the present time is persecuted and oppressed, despised, harassed and overcome by afflictions?" If he replies, "I know and yet am unworthy" he is accepted forthwith, and is given instruction in some of the minor and some of the major commandments. He is informed of the sin of the neglect of the commandments of Gleanings, the Forgotten Sheaf, the Corner, and the Poor Man's Tithe. He is also told of the punishment of the transgression of the Commandments. Furthermore, he is addressed thus : "Be it known to you that before you came to this condition, if you had eaten suet you would not have been punished with karet, if you had profaned the Sabbath, you would not have been punished with stoning; but now were you to eat suet you would be punished with karet; were you to profane the Sabbath you would be punished with stoning." And as he is informed of the punishment, so is he informed of the reward granted for their fulfillment, He is not, however, to be persuaded or dissuaded too much. If he accepted, he is circumcised forthwith...As soon as he is healed arrangements are made for his immediate ablution, when two learned men must stand by his side and acquaint him with some of the

---

Reconsidered", CBQ 47 (1985), 75-84.

minor commandments and with some of the major ones. When he comes up after his ablutions he is considered an Israelite in all respects (b. Yebamoth 47a-b).

It is clear that though the practice of making proselytes described here comes from a period later than Josephus, nevertheless his injunction to proselytize is an ideal common to Judaism in different periods of her history.

We have now considered all the injunctions on honourable behaviour which Josephus offers to children, judges, fellow Jews, and proselytes (aliens). In his final paragraphs on this theme he collects a series of prohibitions concerned with Gentiles, enemies, and animals. This section is introduced by the statement that Jews have the duty of sharing with others because this was established in the Law given by Moses (211). Josephus emphasizes the point that Moses was merciful in his law-giving. The various prohibitions included in this section serve to confirm this.

The admonitions concerning Gentiles relate to the provision of sharing of general necessities of life with all people. Even though the intimacies of Jewish practice are reserved for proselytes, all Jews have the universal responsibility of helping those in need, including enemies, with such basic necessities as fire, water, and food (211). This injunction is absent from the Law and from Palestinian literature generally (Ex. 23. 4 states the stray ox or ass of an enemy is to be brought back). Prov. 25. 21 comes closest to Josephus' injunction: If your enemy is hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he is thirsty, give him water to drink. Our sole documentation for the idea in the first century occurs in Philo, Hyp. 7. 6 "He must not grudge to give fire to one who needs it or close off running water". Philo and Josephus share similar concerns here, but two witnesses are not sufficient to permit the conclusion that such concerns were common in Judaism generally.

Josephus next maintains that Jews must help Gentiles by "pointing out the road". This may refer to a lost traveller, or to the blind, as is testified in one of the commandments

Moses gave to Israel: "Cursed be he who misleads a blind man on the road" (Dt. 27. 18).[117] The sentiment is echoed as well in Ps. Phoc. 26: "Extend your hand to him who falls, and save the helpless ones."

The third injunction relating to Gentiles concerns the burying of the dead. The context here suggests that Josephus is referring to the need for Jews to bury Gentiles. For this view the Talmud Gittin 61a may be cited: an Israelite has the duty to bury the dead, including Gentiles.[118] But it is difficult to find such a view in material contemporary to Josephus, or in the OT. In the OT (e. g. Dt. 21. 22-3), where we are given guide-lines for the burial of a criminal the context implies that the criminal referred to was one who had been stoned on the orders of the "elders of the city". The prescription would thus apply to the covenant people of God, not to Gentiles. Similarly, in three separate places Tobit mentions the responsibility of burying the dead. At 1. 17 and 2. 7 the reference is to the Jewish people, while 4.3 mentions his own father. Sirach, on the other hand, keeps the recipient of the rite of burial more general (38. 16). This is also the case in Philo, in his exhortation not to neglect burial of the dead: "He must not debar dead bodies from burial but throw upon them as much earth as piety demands" (Hyp. 7. 7). A further Jewish expression of abhorrence from leaving the dead unburied is Ps. Phoc. 99. which like Philo, speaks of burial very literally in terms of the corpse being covered over with earth. There is thus good reason for Josephus to include burial of the dead as a recognized principle among Jews, although his precise formulation cannot be found until Talmudic times. (For a NT

---

[117]. So Vermes, "Law", 299; Troianai, Commento, 192; Thackeray, Against Apion, 378; Müller, Gegen den Apion, 327; Reinach, Contre Apion, 96 n. 3. However, Reinach (followed by Thackeray) further suggests that Josephus is echoing Juv. Sat. 14. 103, whose intention is to show that Jews assist their own co-religionists. This may be ill-founded, as Vermes and van der Horst, Sentences, 131, insist.

[118]. Belkin, "Contra Apionem", 29.

view see Mt. 8. 21-22 and Lk. 9. 59-60). It is nevertheless obvious that burial of the dead was a distinctive concern of Jews in the ancient world, although as we noted earlier, this concern was shared by non-Jews as well.[119] Josephus, by placing emphasis on this matter would show to an audience which included Gentiles that Jews shared principles of common decency and humanity.

Josephus now enumerates several prohibitions to be observed by Jews concerning their enemies. First, Jews are not permitted to destroy orchards where warfare has taken place, since trees are innocent bystanders in any human conflict. If they could speak they would decline all responsibility for the warfare that goes on around them.[120] The general provision of Josephus is already present in Dt.20. 19.[121]

A second injunction relating to the Jew's treatment of enemies has a biblical precedent. It is the admonition that measures must be taken to prevent "outrage" against a prisoner of war, especially a woman. Guide-lines for this are laid down at Dt. 21. 10ff. If a beautiful woman is taken captive and she is found desirable by her captor, so that he intends to make her his wife, clear prescriptions are given. She shall go to the man's house, where she is to shave her head, pare her nails, and put off her captive's garb. And she shall remain with the man's family for one month before becoming the man's wife. It is this biblical law that Josephus refers to.[122]

---

[119]. Comp. Cameron, "Ethics", 105-14.

[120]. Vermes, "Law", 299.

[121]. Feldman, Scholarship, 526; Riskin, "Halakah", 42.

[122]. There are two injunctions Josephus includes in 212 relating to enemies that are not found in other literatures. The first is that one is not permitted to burn up the enemies' country: in fact Josh. 6. 24 would seem to contradict Josephus. Second, while the admonition regarding the despoiling of fallen combatants is consonant with the spirit of Jewish law, no specific prohibition in fact exists.

Josephus then deals with the treatment of animals (213-14). His inclusion of these injunctions is to show that the Law extends its mercy to animals as well as to humans.[123] Not all the prohibitions Josephus cites are clearly observable in the Torah. Yet the general humane treatment that animals are to receive from humans indicates this acquaintance with the Pentateuch (Dt. 14. 3ff; 22. 1-4; 25. 4; Lev. 11. 2-23). It is also evident that Josephus and Philo share similar sentiments toward animals: Philo says that there must be no maltreatment of animals contrary to what is appointed by God or even by a lawgiver (Hyp. 7. 7).

More specific injunctions against improper use of animals also occur in Josephus' discussion of animals used for labour. Here he shares a view similar to that of Decalogue (Dt. 5. 14), where animals, (like humans), are to do no work on the Sabbath. Josephus further tells his fellow Jews, echoing Dt. 22. 6, that parent birds are not to be separated from their young. In this regard he voices a characteristic Jewish sentiment, as exemplified at Ps. Phoc. 84-5: one should not take all the birds from a nest at the same time but leave the mother-bird behind in order to get the young from her again (84-5).[124]

Philo and Josephus include an injunction, not found in the OT or the Pseudo-Phocylides, that animals which take refuge in homes should be treated as suppliants (Hyp. 7. 7 = Ap. 2. 213).[125] A creature that has taken refuge in someone's home may not be killed by the occupants. The reference may imply a creature in general and thus be reflecting the biblical prohibition against killing a run away slave (Dt. 23. 16). However, given that the surrounding context clearly refers to animals, probably what is intended is

---

[123]. Belkin, "Contra Apionem", 5.

[124]. So van der Horst, Sentences, 172f. Heinemann, Philon Bildung, 234-235

[125]. Van der Horst, Ibid.

an animal seeking refuge.[126] In that case the prescription of Josephus can be found neither in biblical nor in rabbinic law.[127] There is once again a similar idea in Philo: "Do not make the appeals of animals of no effect when they seem to fly to you for help as they sometimes do" (Hyp. 7. 9 comp. Virt. 125).[128] Since this injunction is limited to Philo and Josephus we must be cautious and not derive too much from this example. Regardless, in the section as a whole Josephus has presented a convincing case that a fundamental principle in Judaism was kindness towards Gentiles, enemies and animals.

We have now surveyed the content of what Josephus calls "the precepts and prohibitions of Law". He adds two sections summarizing the consequences for those who violate (215-17) and obey the Torah (218-19). It was God's intention for people to obey his commands and to practise piety. If a Jew does so he is promised a future hope; if he does not he shall fall under God's divine judgement.[129] Josephus considers that the correct penalty for violating most of the offenses of the law is death. He lists several examples: adultery, male homosexuality, wrong done to ones parent's and rape. These reiterate cases which have previously occurred in the treatise (comp. 201, 199, 206 respectively).

The two prohibitions of adultery and male homosexuality occur together in a single saying in Ps Phoc. 3a: commit not adultery nor arouse homosexual passion. Unlike Contra Apionem and the Pentateuch, the penalty for disobedience is omitted in the Pseudo-

---

[126]. Riskin, "Halakah", 32.

[127]. Frankel, Flavius, 134. The only similar reference in the OT is at Dt. 22. 4, where it is not the animal which is to receive help but its owner.

[128]. An injunction relating to humanity towards animals which Josephus includes but is omitted both in biblical and mishnaic law is the prohibition against killing animals used in labour (213). For a possible explanation of Josephus' inclusion see Riskin, "Halakah", 31; Feldman, Scholarhip, 526.

[129]. Shutt, "God", 181.

Phocylides. Nonetheless, the severity of both of these prohibitions is evident from the additional warnings concerning adultery in Ps. Phoc. (170-83) as well as concerning homosexuality (190). The latter passage states: "transgress not for unlawful sex the natural limits of sexuality". This saying, while somewhat vague, is probably a reference to homosexuality activity, as van der Horst[130] maintains, basing his argument on a comparison with several similar Jewish texts (eg. Philo, Abr. 135; Spec. Law. 2. 50; 3. 37-50; T. Naph. 3.4). To these examples may be added abhorrence of homosexuality shown in Sib. Or. 2. 13; 3. 185, 596, 764; 4. 34; 5. 387, 530. We can see that Josephus shares common material with several representatives of Judaism concerning homosexuality and adultery.

The case of behaviour towards parents we find here similar in outlook to 206. However, it is questionable whether "the mere intention of doing wrong" is the best translation of ἀδικία. It would be difficult to determine when a child's intentions were such that the death penalty was warranted. If ἀδικία reflects the simple statement of fact of wrong done by the child against his parents the statements at 206 and 217 would be of the same vein. (For a similar use in Josephus see the Antiquities 4.289).

The example of rape Josephus modifies. His earlier discussion of the case of a married man having union with a virgin betrothed to another has at 215 become a more general reference to the "unmarried woman" (comp. Ps. Phoc. 198).[131] At 215 Josephus has omitted the crucial proviso of Dt. 22. 23-4 -- assumed at 201 -- that violation only applies to a betrothed woman.

To these offences several more are added which if violated are penalized by death. They are outrage against a slave and impiety towards God. In both cases Josephus shares

---

[130]. Van der Horst, Sentences, 238 also his "Pseudo-Phocylides", 581n.

[131]. Comp. Ps. Phoc. 205 where the offense for having intercourse with maidens is not death. What seems to be objected to is not wooing the maiden honourably.

common ground with other Jewish material. Philo's Hypothetica where it is stated that "if you commit an outrage on the person of a slave... the penalty is death" (7. 2). In saying that impiety towards God will be punished by death Josephus has good OT justification, e. g. Lev. 24. 13ff., "whoever curses his God shall bear his sin. He who blasphemes the name of the Lord shall be put to death; all the congregation shall stone him..." Philo agrees with this sentiment, as at Hyp. 7. 2: "If one commits impiety to God not only in behaviour but in thought also the penalty shall be death by stoning".

Josephus' discussion of crime is not confined to cases where the penalty is death. He mentions fraudulent crimes such as dishonesty with weights and measures, injustice and deceit in trade, stealing another's property and other items that were not rightfully his (216). The latter three crimes are covered in the prohibitions of Lev. 19. 11-13 (19) and Dt. 25. 13ff. (although precise punishments are not given). The first of these (though not the others) can be revealed from other Jewish literature. The evidence for unfair play concerning "weights and measures" is as follows: Lev. 19. 35-6; Dt. 25. 13-16; Prov. 11. 1; 16. 11; 20. 10, 23; Sir. 42. 4; Amos 8. 4ff.; Hos. 12. 7-8; Mic. 6. 11; Ezek. 45. 10-12; Philo, Hyp. 7. 8; Ps. Phoc. 14-15.[132] This concludes Josephus' list and consequences for violation of the Torah.

Josephus' second supplementary section deals with the destiny of those who obey the Law (217-19). In this he affirms a belief in life after death. "To those who observe the laws and, if they must need die for them, willingly meet death, God has granted a renewed existence and in the revolution of the ages the gift of a better life". This passage is generally consonant with a great deal of Jewish tradition, beginning with Daniel (12. 2), even if it may be veiled under the mantle of hellenism.[133] The one exception is the

---

[132]. For the rabbinic evidence see Summary List 3.

[133]. Kruger, Philo und Josephus, 35.

Sadducees, who denied any form of continued existence and resurrection after death (War 2. 165; Ant. 18. 16; Acts 23. 6). The fact that at Qumran there was a belief in a future life (IQH 6. 29-39; IQS 4. 7-8; IQM 3. 5-6) supports the view that this was a common Jewish belief, held even in the Qumran community, which had a distinct identity in relation to Jerusalem Jewry.[134] It is noteworthy that Josephus does not make it clear whether he expects a resurrection of the body or some other form of after life. Yet what is not in doubt from Contra Apionem is that he held a belief in the future hope of Israel. (Comp. Is. 26. 19; Ps. Phoc. 103-104; Ps. Philo Ant. 3. 10; Sib Or. 4. 179-191; 1 En. 22. 13). One passage that bears on our theme is 2 Macc. 7. 9-14. The pericope asks why Jews who are righteous and keep God's law should suffer. The answer offered in 2 Maccabees is that the king of the universe shall raise up to everlasting life those who died for their laws. The passage goes on to affirm that those who were unwilling to die for their laws would enjoy no resurrection life (7. 14). In spite of the fact that the phraseology is somewhat different in the two documents, the texts are in general agreement: martyrs for the Law are be assured a future life.[135] Josephus has three other passages where the idea of life after death is present. In War 3. 374 he states that all souls are imperishable but that only the souls of the good pass into another body; this is not attributed to any specific party (Cf. War 7. 344-350). It is notable that in spite of Josephus' knowledge of Sadducees he attributes an afterlife to all Jews. However, in the Ant. 18. 14 he shows that a future life is a party view. The righteous (the reference is to Pharisees) have the capability of coming to new life with rewards given for their virtue (Cf. War 2. 163). Josephus also attributed to the Essenes a belief in an afterlife (War 2. 154-7; Ant. 18.18). Although Contra

---

[134]. See on Qumran's view of the the future life Vermes, Scrolls, 51; M. Delcor, Les Hymnes de Qumrân (Paris, 1962), 58-61.

[135]. See also Philo, Hyp. 6. 9, where the idea of Jews dying for the sake of their Law is present. This is not, however, connected with the doctrine of a future hope.

Apionem has no specific reference to resurrection, it does place emphasis on a future better life and the differences can be viewed primarily as a phraseological one, not one of fundamental outlook.[136] Thus, Contra Apionem, 2 Maccabees, Antiquities, the War (as well as the other sources cited) show that a belief in future life was an indisputable Jewish tenet. What is significant about this is that he includes the element of future hope in a context where he is specifically not portraying what one of the "sects" believed but rather the beliefs of common Jews.

We can now draw some conclusions from the analysis of Contra Apionem 2.190-219. These conclusions will take two forms. First, we shall offer nine conclusions that are given in the subsequent pages of the chapter. In addition, we shall give supplementary conclusions that are presented in list-form according to the degree of certainty that the idea(s) may reflect common Judaism. These supplementary conclusions are to be read in connection with the the nine primary conclusions (the text is marked accordingly). The aim of these supplementary conclusions is to discriminate what are common features of the Jewish religion. These summary lists of Jewish ideas are not meant to be comprehensive but to aid in clarifying what are the motifs of Judaism and whether they are shared widely enough to justify us speaking of Judaism. The intention is to show what features may distinguish the Jews as a people and Judaism as a religion. These common features also may indicate what the boundaries were that demarcated Jews as the people set apart. The materials found in each type of the summary lists are classified in descending order (i. e.

---

[136]. Poznanski, Flavius Josephus, 27; Belkin, "Contra Apionem", 35, on the contrary, affirms that the difference between hope for the future resurrection (in War, Ant.) and that of a better existence (in Ap.) are differences in fundamentals. Feldman, Josephus, Vol. 9, 13, maintains that Ap., War, and Ant. each witness to the Pharisaic belief in resurrection. The question may need raising whether the evidence of Josephus refers even implicitly to resurrection.

the most to least common idea), and the order serves to define more precisely common Judaism.

The primary conclusions of our analysis are as follows. (1) We have seen that in Josephus' portrayal of what constitutes the Torah he shares common ground with a wide range of material. This includes literature within the OT right through to the rabbinic and Talmudic periods. He has used and shaped this material to create his own picture of Judaism. (2) We have also seen in the specific injunctions that Josephus often shares common ground with both Palestinian and diaspora materials. In certain instances, though, the only common evidence comes from the OT, or from material outside Palestine. But in general our analysis supports the view of Hengel regarding the interplay between hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism. (3) We have seen the extensive debt that Josephus has to biblical law in many of his injunctions. Although he does attribute certain injunctions to the Law which are not found there,[137] it would be mistaken to depict Josephus' précis simply as enlightened hellenistic piety (as Kamlah maintains). (4) It is surprising, especially as Contra Apionem is written for an audience which includes Greeks, the lack of dependence on distinctively Greek ideas. Apart from the reference at 2. 203 to the departure of the soul to another place (which is thought also to reflect Essene anthropology) distinctively Greek ideas are absent. (5) We have seen that none of the injunctions which Josephus includes occur only in the rabbinic material. All the injunctions which we have utilized to suggest that he shared common denominators with other Jews are in the first instance taken from the Bible or material broadly speaking from the same historical time period as Josephus.[138] In several instances we have seen that ideas which are common were also "sectarian". That is, an idea can be both "sectarian", in the sense of

---

[137]. See Summary List 7.

[138]. See Summary List 1-3.

definitely attributed to a party, and common. Examples include belief in a future life and the role of women.[139] (6) On several occasions (e.g. his view on prayer, his warnings to judges and the burning of an enemy's country) precise formulations cannot be found outside Josephus.[140] (7) Josephus does present "common Judaism", as he implicitly claims. That is neither to say that all the ideas in the section were held by all Jews,[141] nor that all were distinctive of Jews: some were shared by Jew and Gentile alike.[142] We have found enough parallels, however, that we may speak both of a long list of common features and also of a common understanding of Judaism as an -ism. Jews in general felt that they were, to some extent, a people apart. Josephus states that outsiders, while welcome to a certain degree, were not admitted to the "intimacies" of Jewish life. Jewish literature in general and pagan comments about Jews confirm that the insider/outsider distinction was common, and it is fair to speak about what was inside the boundary as Judaism. We can itemize some of the most obvious points of this common Judaism: separateness points to the view that Jews were God's chosen people; they shared monotheism, and this cut them off to an appreciable degree from other societies; Jewish standards of behaviour, especially sexual behaviour, distinguished them; most held some version of a future hope. From other literature, and from pagan comments, we know that food laws and observance of the sabbath fall within common Judaism.[143] We thus disagree with Reinach's contention that Josephus has smoothed over Judaism's distinctive features in the interest of presenting a Judaism that is metaphysical in value and moral and practical in worth. (8) We maintain

---

[139]. See Summary List 4.

[140]. See Summary List 9.

[141]. See Summary List 8.

[142]. See Summary List 5.

[143]. See Summary List 1.

that several Jewish presuppositions are evident from Josephus' summary of the Jewish religion. These occur as statements mentioned in passing or assumptions implicit in the text: for example, Jews are the people of God, community membership requires obedience.[144] (9) Contra Apionem has no trace of a Judaism concerned with earning salvation or any form of "works-righteousness". Rather, it assumes that the Torah is to be kept as an expression of covenantal membership. This confirms the view of Judaism argued by Sanders in PPJ.[145]

We set as our task to determine whether Josephus has offered a portrayal of Judaism merely to satisfy the expectations of his diaspora audience or is giving a genuine reflection of contemporary Judaism. We have analysed each paragraph of his attempt to present a résumé of the Torah and have shown from a wide range of Jewish literature that Josephus shared a common point of view. The parallels extend beyond the geographical locality of Palestine and beyond Josephus' own day. Even if his version of the Torah as a configuration is unique to him, he has nevertheless created his portrayal of Judaism from a variety of ideas known and shared by other Jews before, during, and after his own day. The mosaic-like eclectic portrayal of Judaism Josephus offers was formed from common denominators that existed within Judaism.

SUMMARY LIST 1

The Shared Judaism of Josephus in Contra Apionem:
(ideas that share common ground with a wide range of Jewish material).

1. God is portrayed as monotheistic in nature. He is in control of the world, the sole creator of the universe and its properties, forbids idolatry, and expects worship by the practice of virtue or the observance of the Torah: Ap. 2.190-3.

2. The Temple is a symbol of Jewish identity: Ap. 2.193.

3. The cultus, its existence and practices are in actual use: Ap. 2.193-8.

4. Prayer has a central place in the life of the cultic community: Ap. 2.196.

5. The purpose of marriage is procreation: Ap. 2.199.

6. There is a prescribed behaviour in marriage for sexual relations. Sodomy, homosexuality, and adultery are forbidden. The consequence for breaking these laws is death: Ap. 2.199, 201, 215-216.

7. Purity laws are to be observed in marriage (following sexual relations and child birth) and after a funeral ceremony: Ap. 2.203, 205.

8. Women are to be subservient to their husbands: Ap. 2.200.

9. Women are not to abort or do away with a foetus: Ap. 2.202.

10. Training in the Torah is prescribed for all Jewish children as the means of learning their tradition and advancing in piety: Ap. 2.204.

11. Honour and obedience to parents are expected for all children: Ap. 2.204.

12. Jews are to behave towards each other in a prescribed manner. They must not steal, charge interest or bear false witness, but offer help to the needy and poor: Ap. 2.207-8.

13. The Jewish religion is to be made accessible to non-Jews: Ap. 2.209-10.

14. Burying the dead is universally obligatory: Ap. 2.205, 211.

15. General humane treatment toward animals is prescribed: Ap. 2.213-14.

16. Hope of a future life is affirmed: Ap. 2.217-19.

17. Unfair play regarding weights and measures will bring a severe punishment: Ap. 2.216.

18. Impiety towards God will result in the penalty of death: Ap. 2.217.

19. Obedience and disobedience to the Law bring their own consequences: Ap. 2.215-18.

SUMMARY LIST 2

Ideas Common in the Bible and Contra Apionem:
(ideas shared by Ap. and the Bible).

1. No graven images are to be made: Ap. 2.191; Ex. 20.4.

2. The laws of purity following a funeral ceremony and union between man and woman are to be observed: Ap. 2.198; Num. 19.11; Lev. 15.18.

3. Sacrifices are not to be occasions to take strong drink, but sobriety: Ap. 2.195; Lev. 10.9.

4. Priests serve both as judge and arbiters in legal controversies: Ap. 2.194; Dt. 17.9ff.; 21.5.

5. Sodomy and adultery are forbidden and punished by death: Ap. 2.199; Lev. 20.13; 18.22; Ap. 2.201; Lev. 20.10; 18.22; Dt. 22.22-7.

6. Homosexuality is prohibited and punished by death: Ap. 2.202; Lev. 12.1, 5.

7. Intercourse is prohibited when a woman is with child: Ap. 2.202; Lev. 12.1, 5.

8. A wife is to be taken not by violence [rape] but wooed by one who can testify to a young woman's virginity: Ap. 2.199-200; Dt. 22.28-9, 22.13ff.

9. Education of children in the Torah is fundamental to the vitality of the Jewish religion: Ap. 2.204; Dt. 6.4-9.

10. Burying and mourning the dead was a practice to be observed: Ap. 2.205; Gen. 47.30; 2 Kgs. 9.28; Gen. 37.24, 34.

11. Children are to obey their parents: Ap. 2.206; Ex. 20.12; Dt. 5.16.

12. The son who is stubborn and rebellious will be put to death: Ap. 2.206; Dt. 21.18-21.

13. Youths are admonished to respect their elders: Ap. 2.206; Lev. 19.32.

14. Stealing is prohibited: Ap. 2.208; Lev. 6.2-3; Dt. 22.1-3.

15. Those who are able to help the needy must do so: Ap. 2.208; Dt. 15.7ff.

16. Charging interest to fellow Jews is punished by the law: Ap. 2.208; Ex. 22.25; Lev. 26.36.

17. The destruction of an orchard where warfare has taken place is prohibited: Ap. 2.212; Dt. 20.19.

18. Outrage [rape] of a prisoner, especially one who is a woman, is prohibited: Ap. 2.212; Dt. 21.10ff.

19. Animals are to be treated in a humane manner: Ap. 2.213; Dt. 14.3ff; 22.1-4; 25.4; 5.14; 22.6.

20. Punishment shall be given to those who practice fraudulent crimes concerning weights and measures: Ap. 2.216; Lev. 19.35-6; Dt. 25.13-16.

SUMMARY LIST 3

Common Ideas in Contra Apionem and the Rabbis:
(ideas found both in Ap. and the rabbis)

2.190 God referred to as the "middle", as part of a tripartite form:
y. San. 1.1
Gen. Rabb. 81.1

192 No collaborators in creation:
Gen. Rabb. 1-8

Priest as judge.
b. Kethuboth 12a

199 Purpose of marriage is procreation:
m. Yebamoth 6.6
m. Gittin 4.5
b. Yebamoth 61 a-b

Comp: b. Yebamoth 126
m. Shabbath 14.3
y. Yebamoth 6.6

200 Testimony of a girl's virginity before marriage:
m. Yebamoth 13.1

202 Abortion:
b. San. 57b
Bereshit Rabba 34.19

Comp. for the view that an unborn foetus is not regarded as a human being:
m. Niddah 5.3
m. Arakhin 1.4
m. Ohalot 7.6
b. Niddah 38b
y. Yebamoth 5 c-d

203 Purification following legitimate relations:
b. Baba Kamma 82b

204 Sobriety at festivals:
b. Berakoth 31a

204 Instruction of children:
b. Kiddushin 30b
Tosf. Kiddushin 1.11
Mekilta on Lev. 20.12
m. Peah 1.1

205 Burials - general:
b. Kethuboth 8b
Tosf. Niddah 9.17
Gen. Rabb. 100.2

205 Funerary Monuments:
y. Shekalim 2.5. (A view contrary to Ap. is found at m.Shekalim 2.5, m.Eruvin 5.1.)

205 Funeral procession (participation by those passing):
b. Kethuboth 17a
b. Berakoth 18a
b. Megillah 29a
b. Moed Katan 27b

206 Honour to parents/God:
m. Peah 1.1
b. Kiddushin 30b
b. Baba Metzia 32a

206 Stoning of youth (attitude of Rabbis contrary to Josephus):
b. San. 71a-72a
Tosf. San. 11.6
Comp. Numb. Rabb. 10.1

206 Respect for elders:
b. Kiddushin 32b
Targum of Onkelos on Lev. 19.32

207 Help for the needy:
b. Baba Bathra 8a-9b
Lev. Rabb. 34.1
b. Kethuboth 67b

212 Forbidden intercourse with a captive woman:
y. Makkot 2.6

213 Treatment of animals:
m. Baba Metsia 8.12
b. Baba Metsia 32a
m. Hullin 12.1

216 Weight and Measures
b. Baba Bathra 88b-89a
b. Baba Metzia 61b

217-19After Life:
m. San. 10.1-3
b. San. 91 a-b
m. Ab. 4.22
m. Sot. 9.15
Shemoneh Esreh (2)

SUMMARY LIST 4

Jewish Ideas both Common and Sectarian:
(ideas that reflect the views of the sects
or are apocalyptic in nature).

1. A belief in the future hope: Ap. 2.218-9; DSS, Apoc., Ps. Philo., elsewhere in Josephus, Philo, OT, NT, Ps. Phoc.

2. Care for the poor and needy: Ap. 2.208; rabbis, Apoc., Wis., OT, Philo, Ps. Phoc., NT.

3. Priestly role of authority: Ap. 2.193-8; DSS, OT, Talmud.

4. A submissive role for women: Ap. 2.201; Essenes (War, Ant.), OT, NT, Philo

SUMMARY LIST 5

Ideas Josephus shares with other Jews but which are also commonly held in antiquity

1. Respect for elders: Ap. 2.206 et. al.
2. Honour to parents: Ap. 2.206 et. al.
3. Burying the dead: Ap. 2.205, 211 et al.

SUMMARY LIST 6

Jewish Presuppositions in Contra Apionem:
(ideas whose significance is not argued for
but mentioned in passing or assumed).

1. Jews are assumed to be the people of God.
2. Jews boast of their race and nationality.
3. The idea of a covenantal relationship is presupposed.
4. A requisite of community membership is an obedient life.
5. Judaism considers itself based on fundamental principles.
6. The revelation of God resides in the Torah. The process of its application is continuing.

SUMMARY LIST 7

Ideas Attributed to the Law by Josephus in Contra Apionem, but not found in the Bible

1. The purpose of marriage was procreation: Ap. 2.199.
2. A woman is forbidden to cause an abortion or do away with the foetus: Ap. 2.203
3. A woman's dowry must not influence a man's choice of a marriage partner: Ap. 2.199.
4. Sodomy of a married person is abhorred and punishable by death Ap 2.199.
5. The destiny of the soul is transference to another place: Ap. 2.203.
6. Nothing is to be concealed from fellow Jews: Ap. 2.207.
7. A judge who accepts a bribe will suffer the death penalty: Ap. 2.207.
8. The general necessities of life are to be shared with all people: Ap. 2.211 (this is partially found in the Psalter).
9. Caring for the corpses of Gentiles is required of Jews: Ap. 2.211.
10. The burning of an enemy's country is prohibited: Ap. 2.212
11. The despoiling of a fallen combatant is prohibited: Ap. 2.212.
12. The killing of a refuge animal is forbidden: Ap. 2.213.
13. Outrage inflicted towards a slave is punishable by death: Ap. 2.215.

SUMMARY LIST 8

Ideas in Contra Apionem not considered Common:
(ideas in Ap. that are found infrequently
in the Jewish material).

1. All people are to be given help with basic necessities: Ap. 2.211 (also Philo, Hyp. 7.6; possibly Ps. Phoc. 26; indirectly Dt. 27.18.

2. Jews are to bury the dead of Gentiles: Ap. 2.211; Talmud Gittin 61a.

3. The destruction of orchard-trees where warfare has taken place is not allowed: Ap. 2.212 also Dt. 20.19.

4. Measures must be taken to ensure that a woman prisoner does not suffer outrage: Ap. 2.213 also Dt. 21.10ff.

5. Use of an animal on the Sabbath is forbidden: Ap. 2.213 also Dt. 5.14.

6. The parent bird must not be separated from its young: Ap. 2.214; Ps. Phoc. 84-5.

7. The killing of a refuged animal is forbidden: Ap. 2.213; Philo, Hyp. 7.9.

8. The penalty for outage inflicted on a slave is death: Ap. 2.215; Philo, Hyp. 7.2.

9. Severe punishments shall be inflicted on anyone who commits injustice, practices deceit in trade, or steals property: Ap. 2.216; Lev. 19.11-13 (19); Dt. 25.13ff.

SUMMARY LIST 9

Ideas and Formulations Peculiar to Contra Apionem

1. At sacrifices precedence is given to prayers for the community: Ap. 2.196.
2. The consequence of accepting bribes is death: Ap. 20B.
3. The burning of the country of an enemy is not allowed: Ap. 2.212.
4. The despoiling of a fallen combatant is prohibited: Ap. 2.212.
5. An animal used in labour is not to be killed: Ap. 2.213.

CHAPTER 3

PAULINE AUTOBIOGRAPHY

We are now ready to consider the evidence of Paul. Indeed, this will be our task for the next six chapters. As has already been indicated in the Introduction, the reason for a more extensive treatment of the evidence of Paul is that, in distinction from Josephus, the aim of Paul's letters was not to offer a summary of the Jewish religion. This more complex evidence thus requires a more intricate analysis.

We begin with autobiographical material, where some clues may exist as to what first century Jews considered important in their religious outlook. At the outset a distinction has to be made that shall prove helpful in the course of this chapter. In our search for the kind of Judaism which emerges from the letters of Paul as being his own, we must distinguish between general information of which we can be completely sure and more particular information which we cannot know securely. We can say with certainty that Paul had been a Pharisee. When we try to say what that implies, our conclusions become less secure. My primary intention is to uncover hard information, even though it will often be of a general sort, and to use this in an attempt to discover what was common to the various forms of Judaism in the first century. I shall sometimes press towards greater specificity, but I recognize that conclusions which emerge from such efforts must be used with caution.

Let us now analyse the evidence with this distinction in mind. There are several pericopes which are explicitly autobiographical (Phil. 3.4-6; Gal. 1.13-14; 2 Cor. 11.22, 24).[1] From this evidence we argue that there exist three principal features which may be

---

[1]. For recent discussions which collect data on Paul's Jewish heritage see E. J. Schnabel, Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul (Tübingen, 1985), 227-32; W. Wiefel, "Paulus und das Judentum", Die Zeichen der Zeit 40 (1986), 60-64; M. Barth, "St. Paul--A Good Jew", HBT 1 (1979), 7-45.

classified as "hard" generalizations, which Jews held in common. They are pride of race, the centrality of the Torah as the guide of the religion, and the importance of correct behaviour.

Each of these features occurs in Phil. 3. 4-6. Before we embark on a more detailed analysis of this passage we must make several general remarks regarding Paul's opponents, against whom he is setting his own pedigree. If it could be maintained that Paul's opponents, were not Jews this pericope would be of little help in determining what Jews shared in common. However, in order for Paul's argument to have any force it must be supposed that his opponents shared a similar pedigree. Scholarly opinion is in general agreement on the Jewish nature of Paul's opposition. What the critics are divided over is the precise identity of latter. There are three principal possibilities:[2] (1) Paul's opponents were Jewish-Christian Judaizers similar to those present in the churches of Galatia. (2) The opponents may be non-Christian Jews. One scholar has suggested that at 3.2 the phrases interpret each other. The word κατατομή on its own is ambiguous. However, if κατατομή is to be understood here as a word-play on περιτομή, and this word is intended to refer to those who called themselves "the Circumcision", i.e. the Jews, the opponents referred to at 3.2 are Jews qua Jews.[3] (3) The opponents may be Judaeo-Christians who had gnosticizing tendencies. One may posit a fourth hypothesis that Paul is being

---

[2]. For recent discussion of this question see J. Gnilka, "Die antipaulinische Mission in Philippi", BZ 9 (1965), 258-276; H. Koester, "The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment (Philippians III)", NTS 8 (1961-2), 317-332; V. P. Furnish, "The Place and Purpose of Philippians III", NTS 10 (1963-4), 80-88; A. F. J. Klijn, "Paul's Opponents in Philippians III", NovT 7 (1964), 278-284; W. Schmithals, "Die Irrlehrer des Philipper-briefes", ZTK 54 (1957), 297-341; J. B. Tyson, "Paul's Opponents in Philippi" Perspectives in Religious Studies 3 (1976), 82-95; E. E. Ellis, "Paul and His Opponents : Trends in Research" in J. Neusner (ed.), Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty (Leiden, 1975), Vol. 1, 264ff. A fuller discussion of the nature of the opponents at Philippi will be included in ch. 5 below.

[3]. G. B. Caird, Paul's Letters from Prison (Oxford, 1976), 135.

confronted from more than one source of opposition. Whichever of the above is most plausible, we can conclude that Paul's opponents were Jews of some sort.

Let us now consider in detail the descriptions which Paul uses to depict his own pride of race. The statements can be separated into two categories: qualities that were bestowed upon him from birth (5abc); and attributes that Paul attained later in life (5d-6). The expressions employed in the first of these categories form a progressive argument and serve to restrict Paul's Jewish past to a particular form. The logic may be as follows: since one who was circumcised on the eighth day could still be of proselyte descent Paul adds that he was by race an Israelite. Similarly, some Israelites might not be able to prove their genealogy (Ant. 11. 20), but Paul indicates that this was not the case with him--he was of the tribe of Benjamin.[4]

The first attribute that Paul includes in his summary of his Jewish past is that he was "circumcised on the eighth day". Like Jesus and John (Lk. 1. 59, 2. 21), Paul was circumcised by his parents in accordance with strict adherence to OT law (Gen. 17. 2; Lev. 12. 3) since the eighth day was the earliest possible time after the mother's seven day period of uncleanness was completed.[5] In addition, the description indicates that Paul was not a convert to the Jewish faith but was a member of Jewish community by virtue of birth.[6]

---

[4]. TDNT Vol. 3, 390. The scholar who suggested this formulation also carried it one step further to include the phrase "Hebrew of Hebrews". He maintains that Hebrew of Hebrews is also to be understood in a restrictive sense: as a Jew of the diaspora Paul would have been expected to be a Hellenist. However, Paul claims he was not, but rather a Hebrew of Hebrews. This view may be questioned on the grounds that Paul's claim that he was a Hebrew of Hebrews does not exclude hellenistic influences from his thought.

[5]. J. R. Porter, Leviticus (Cambridge, 1976), 94.

[6]. R. P. Martin, Philippians (London, 1976), 127; F.W. Beare, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians (London, 1959), 106; G. Barth, Der Brief an die Philipper (Zürich, 1979), 58.

Finally, his identification with circumcision may signify that his initiation into the covenant community started from the time of his circumcision. These remarks cover some of the possible associations regarding Paul's claim of circumcision. The basic point, however, is in little doubt. Paul's family observed strict OT legal regulations and Paul utilizes this fact to illustrate his racial pride.

The second description which Paul gives of his past is that he was an "Israelite by race". This implies that he belonged to the chosen people of Israel -- he was among those who could say "We are God's chosen people".[7] The term Ἰσραήλ is used to denote the descent of the Jewish people. A clear example of this meaning of the term is found at Rom. 11. 1 where the question is raised "Has God rejected his people?" Paul's reply is "By no means, for I am an Israelite". This reply only makes sense if here Ἰσραηλίτης refers to Paul as a member of the people of God.[8] This honourable title of Israelite Paul claimed for himself by virtue of his descent.

But the word does take on several nuances of meaning which may assist in a fuller understanding of the term. For example, it may carry with it the idea of the Jewish people as those who confessed the one true God and worshipped him above others. By virtue of being an Israelite the Jew stood in the right relationship with God, and thus inherited the promise of future salvation (m. Sanh. 10. 1).[9] While these additions are inferred rather

---

[7]. Barth, Ibid., 58; J. Gnilka, Der Philipperbrief (Freiburg, Basel, Vienna, 1968), 18; J.-F. Collange, The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Philippians (London, 1979), 126; Martin, ibid., 127; contra, E. Lohmeyer, Der Brief an die Philipper (Göttingen, 1964), 129; P. Bonnard, Épître de Saint Paul aux Philippiens (Neuchâtel and Paris, 1950), 62 takes the phrase as reference to "racial [biological] privilège".

[8]. TDNT Vol. 3, 386.

[9]. Caird, Letters, 135.

than stated, they may help us to appreciate the shades of meaning surrounding the term "Israelite".

The third attribute which Paul offers to demonstrate (pride of race) is that he was of the "tribe of Benjamin". In the period of late Judaism one motive for genealogical interest was the desire to preserve national purity.[10] This may be the main aspect which is to be borne in mind in the reference made to the Benjaminites in the present context. To have come from the tribe of Benjamin would bestow special prestige, since Benjamin was one of the two tribes of the southern kingdom that had remained true to the Davidic dynasty.[11] Also, in the boundaries of Benjamin dwelled the divine Shekinah (Dt. 33. 12 comp. Sifre Dt. Pisqa 352 on Dt. 33. 12; b. Meg. 26a).[12] A secondary reason, however, for including a reference to the tribe of Benjamin may be that Saul, the first king of Israel, was a Benjaminite and Paul shared this name prior to his call as an apostle of the Christian movement.[13] While we cannot offer proof that any of these nuances were intended in Paul's reference to the tribe of Benjamin the general point is clear enough: membership into this tribe was a boast of some measure.

This leads us to Paul's fourth appellation, "Hebrew of Hebrews": if Paul's opponents could claim Jewish ancestry, he could do so all the more. The fact that ambiguity exists over the precise meaning of this phrase is enough to warrant the approach we have adopted. The ambiguity over "Hebrew of Hebrews" is based on several factors. It is

---

[10]. M. D. Johnson, The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies (Cambridge, 1969), 85-96.

[11]. Caird, Letters, 135; O. Betz, "Paulus als Pharisäer nach dem Gesetz: Phil. 3, 5-6 als Beitrag zur Frage des frühen Pharisäismus", Treue zur Thora, P. von der Osten-Sacken (ed.), Festschrift für G. Harder (Berlin, 1977), 57; Bonnard, Philippiens, 62.

[12]. A Goldberg, Untersuchungen über die Vorstellung von der Schekhinah in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur (Berlin, 1969), 111-118. Lohmeyer Philipper, 129; Betz, "Paulus", 57.

[13]. Martin, Philippians, 128; Beare, Philippians, 106; Gnilka, Philipperbrief, 190.

difficult to establish a fixed sense of the word Ἑβραῖος, and there are few NT examples of it. The debate that has raged over the term is enough to make one cautious about defining the phrase "Hebrew of Hebrews" too closely.[14] This is especially the case since one of the three NT references for Ἑβραῖος occurs in a context where the term is set over against Ἑλληνιστής (Acts 6.1). Hengel has put forward the following points to help clarify the range of meaning included in our phrase. His basic thesis is that the word Ἑβραῖος, which occurs only three times in the NT (Acts 6. 1; 2 Cor 11. 22; Phil. 3. 5), is used with reference to both language and descent. First, the "Hebrews" are those Jews in Palestine who spoke Aramaic or Hebrew as their mother tongue in contradistinction to those Jews in Palestine who spoke Greek. This latter group was known as the "Hellenists" (Acts 6. 1).[15] Second, the "Hebrews" were native Palestinians or at least those who had some special connection to its centre -- Jerusalem. Third, Ἑβραῖος when used in the diaspora, referred to those Jews who emigrated from Palestine and organized themselves into separate synagogues where services were performed in Hebrew, in distinction from those Jews whose synagogue services were performed in Greek.[16] Finally, in spite of the fact that we now know that Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism were not two separate entities, the "Hebrews"

---

[14]. TDNT Vol. 3, 389.

[15]. M. Hengel, "Zwischen Jesus und Paulus. Die 'Hellenisten', die 'Sieben' und Stephanus (Apg. 6, 1-15, 7, 54- 8, 3)", ZTK 72 (1975) 169-171; Cf. Bruce, Paul, 92; H. Windisch, Der zweite Korintherbrief (Göttingen, 1976), 215-216; TDNT 3, 390; Bonnard, Philippiens, 62; C. F. D. Moule, "Once More, Who Were the Hellenists?", ExpT 70 (1958/9), 100-102; Schnabel, Law and Wisdom, 229; E. Larsson, "Die Hellenisten und die Urgemeinde", NTS 33 (1987), 205-209.

[16]. Hengel, "Paulus", 178-179; cf. Windish, Korintherbrief, 350f; H. Lietzmann, An die Korinther I,II, (Tübingen, 1969), 150; F. F. Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians (London, 1978), 240; inscriptional evidence from a synagogue of (the) Hebrews in Rome and one similarly at Corinth (B. Powell, Greek Inscriptions from Corinth (American Journal of Archeology, 2/7; 1903, 60-1 n. 40) suggest that in the diaspora meeting places of Palestinian Jews (as against Greek-speaking Jews) existed. See also Philo, Dreams, 2. 250; Abr. 28.

were those who maintained their Palestinian customs even in a Greek-speaking environment.[17] Hengel's arguments show that it is possible that Paul claims to know Hebrew (or Aramaic), or that his family kept Palestinian customs, but the evidence for the use of "Hebrews" in the diaspora is not very secure. These elements are useful considerations as long as one remains cautious. This concludes our discussion of those privileges that were Paul's by virtue of his ancestry.

The remaining descriptions regarding Paul's past are his by virtue of choice, conviction, and achievement (5b-6) -- the first being his pride in the Pharisaic party and his association with this group. Paul's assertion is that his stance toward the Law was Pharisaic: "regarding the Law a Pharisee". Here the distinction between validated generalities and less certain nuances comes out markedly. For we must ask what can be known with surety about Pharisees before AD 70. Since Paul's attestation of Pharisaism is found in a pre-70 document, whatever the word φαρισαῖος means in this context must be defined in accordance with what is known of pre-70 Pharisaism.

This problem can be broken down in terms of the following questions. First, is it correct to seek the Pharisees in the earliest layers of rabbinic material? Second, if so, does that layer show that the group behind it was essentially a "pure food club", a group of laypeople who attempted to live in priestly purity? The Neusner of the early 70's answered these questions affirmatively. The earliest layer of the Mishnah is Pharisaic; it shows the Pharisees to have been haberim, "associates", who politically were pacifist and who wished to live in priestly purity.[18] In more recent years he has registered the fact that ancient

---

[17]. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, passim; Lohmeyer, Philipper, 130; Martin, Philippians, 128; J. B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians (London, 1890) 147; Bonnard, Philippiens, 62.

[18]. Neusner, Traditions, passim, e.g. Vol. 3, 305f; Piety.

authors who discuss the Pharisees, especially Josephus, do not support this definition.[19] His response to this has not been to re-examine the rabbinic evidence, but to become cautious about what he calls the group which stands behind the earliest layer of the Mishnah. He now hesitates to say that it was the Pharisaic party.[20]

It is beyond our scope to sort out this large problem, but there is a point on which we fit. Neusner himself will no longer maintain that the Pharisees were exclusively a pure food club, and we may take it that their legal concerns were broader. This point has been pressed by other scholars. Sanders, for example, maintains that correlations like Pharisees-rabbis, Pharisees-haberim and rabbis-haberim are dubious. In Sanders' view there was overlap between these groups, but this did not amount to an equation. There are several reasons for sharing Sanders' doubts. First, in the Mishnah the rabbis do not refer to their spiritual forebears as the Pharisees but as the hakamim (sages). The word perushim (separatist) is reserved for extreme groups. This failure by rabbis to label their religious ancestors Pharisees makes the simple identification between Pharisees and rabbis difficult.[21] Second is the point already referred to from Josephus. In the War (2. 162) the focus of Pharisaic activity is on accurate interpretation of the law. Third, the evidence that we possess from those who were Pharisees before 70 suggests that they had the following principal characteristics (1) zeal for the Torah; (2) a belief in the resurrection; (3) an acceptance of the traditions of the elders; (4) practice at interpreting the Torah. However,

---

[19]. Neusner, Piety, attempts to deal with the evidence of Josephus. The success of this effort is discussed by Sanders, Jesus, 388 n. 59.

[20]. Neusner, Purities, 108; Judaism, 70-71.

[21]. Sanders, Jesus, 187; see also E. Rivkin, "Defining the Pharisees: The Tannaitic Sources" HUCA 40-41 (1969-71), 234-238; M. Wilcox, "Jesus in Light of his Jewish Environment", W. Haase, ed., Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin and New York, 1982), Vol. 25.1, 176-177, 181-182, 184-185.

there is absent from these writings any emphasis on the Pharisees as a purity sect. Perhaps it is noteworthy that when Josephus refers to the Essenes he states that because they are bound by their oaths they are not at liberty to partake of other men's food (War 2. 143).[22] There is, however, nothing said about Pharisees observing any laws concerning food.

Therefore, there is some doubt about the view that before 70 the Pharisees were a sect solely concerned with purity. It is clear that the term φαρισαῖος did not have a static meaning before 70. When Paul includes in his list of Jewish attributes that his attitude towards the law was Pharisaic it is probable that this meant he was an accurate interpreter of Jewish laws and showed zeal for the Torah and its traditions. But did zeal for the traditions imply that lay people should act like priests? It is Sanders' insistence that we do not possess firm evidence to make such a decision, and this seems to be a reasonable conclusion.

We have been arguing that zeal was a characteristic which Paul shared in common with his opponents: zeal for his Jewish nationality and for a religion that placed accuracy in interpreting the Torah at its centre. We shall subsequently suggest that zeal for correct behaviour also formed part of what Jews shared in common.

There is a further way that Paul demonstrated his zeal. He attempted to refute anyone who presented a threat to the fundamentals of the Jewish religion. We are informed in Phil. 3 that "the Church" was one group whose aim it was to accomplish just this. Paul's response had thus been to try to destroy the Jesus movement (Gal. 1.13, 23). Much scholarly discussion has emerged as to how this was carried out and for what reasons.[23] Our intention is to make a more general point. Inherent within a Jew's

---

[22]. Sanders, Ibid., 188.

[23]. H.-W. Kuhn, "Jesus als Gekreuzigter in der frühchristlichen Verkündigung bis zur Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts" ZTK 72 (1975), 1-46 esp. 3lff.; K. Haacker, "Die Berufung des Verfolgers und die Rechtfertigung des Gottlosen", Theologische Beiträge 6 (1975), 1-19; J. Dupont, "The Conversion of Paul, and Its Influence on His Understanding of Salvation by

religious pride is a tendency towards zeal. Therefore anyone who attempts to overthrow the fundamentals of the Jewish religion is thus liable to attack from them.

One historical example which well exemplifies this is the Maccabean conflict. In the second chapter of Maccabees, we are told the story of Mattathias who attempted to combat Jewish apostasy because of his zeal for the Law. As a consequence he put to death a Jew who did not heed his plea. One passage will suffice as typifying the spirit of the Maccabean zeal:

> When he had finished speaking these words, a Jew came forward in the sight of all to offer sacrifice upon the altar in Modein, according to the king's command. When Mattathias saw it, he burned with zeal and his heart was stirred. He gave vent to righteous anger; he ran and killed him upon the altar. At the same time he killed the king's officer who was forcing them to sacrifice, and he tore down the altar. Thus he burned with zeal for the law as Phinehas did against Zimri the son of Salu. Then Mattathias cried out in the city with a loud voice, saying: 'Let every one who is zealous for the law and supports the covenant come out with me!' And he and his sons fled to the hills and left all that they had in the city. (1 Macc. 2.23-8).

Faith", in W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin (eds.), Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F. F. Bruce (Exeter, 1970), 183-191; D.R.A. Hare, The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St. Matthew (London and New York, 1967), 1-79; U. Wilckens, "Die Bekehrung des Paulus als religionsgeschichtliches Problem ZTK 56 (1959), 273-293; A.J. Hultgren, "Paul's Pre-Christian Persecutions of the Church: Their Purpose, Locale, and Nature" JBL 95 (1976), 97-111; W.D. Davies, "Paul: From the Semitic Point of View", L. Finkelstein and W. D. Davies (eds.), Cambridge History of Judaism (Cambridge), Vol. 2, 3-5 MS; Ph.H. Menoud "Le sens du verbe πορθεῖν (Gal. 1, 13, 23; Acts 9, 21)", in W. Eltester (ed.), Apophoreta Festschrift für E.Haenchen (Berlin, 1964), 178-86, S. Kim, The Origin of Paul's Religion (Tübingen, 1981), 44-50.

At two places common sentiments are evident between Paul and Mattathias. First, the motivation which led Mattathias to attempt to destroy those who obeyed the king's commands and Paul to persecute the Church of God was their zeal for God and his Law. This point with regard to Paul comes out clearly in Gal. 1. 13-14. Second, Paul and Mattathias attempted to destroy fellow Jews for behaviour which brought into question the validity of the Law of God. In the case of Mattathias several specific examples are given regarding the laws being violated (eg. offering sacrifice to idols, profaning the Sabbath, forbidding burnt offerings: 1 Macc. 1. 43-4.). Regarding Paul, however, exactly how the Christians were attempting to question the validity of God's Law is not explicitly stated. Nevertheless, one may assume that Christians were doing something clearly so antipathetic to Judaism (Gal. 1. 13-14; Phil. 3.5-6) that Paul wanted their extermination. No specific indication is offered as to what this may have been. We simply find Paul in his pre-Christian life attempting to destroy the Church.[24] This activity mentioned in Gal. 1 is directly tied to Paul's zeal for the "traditions". If Paul's persecuting was undertaken as a consequence of his zeal for the "traditions" perhaps the Jesus movement was attempting to overthrow their Torah-centred religion with a religion entirely focused on Christ. While this line of reasoning is argued by several scholars[25] one must concede that it requires some special pleading. Still without trying to claim that Paul was specifically following a tradition or succession begun with Phinehas or the Maccabees, it is evident enough from the brief

---

[24]. Contrary to this view is that of Menoud, Ibid., that persecution took the form of verbal harrassment rather than physical ravaging. Similarly, Davies Ibid., Hultgren, Ibid.

[25]. Wilckens, "Bekehrung", 276ff.; Dupont, "Conversion", esp. 185-193; R.P. Martin, Reconciliation (London, 1981), 29-30; G. Bornkamm, "The Revelation of Christ to Paul on the Damascus Road and Paul's Doctrine of Justification and Revelation. A Study in Galatians 1", in R. Banks (ed.), Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament on Atonement and Eschatology presented to L.L. Morris (Exeter, 1974), 90-103; J.C. Beker, Paul the Apostle (Philadelphia, 1980), 182ff.

comments we have offered that Jews persecuted each other. This may have been on account of their zeal for the Torah when it was being violated or when its validity was being threatened.

We turn to one final expression which Paul utilizes to demonstrate his Jewish pride of race. This relates to his impeccable religious behaviour. Paul's boast was that "as to righteousness [he was] in the Law blameless". His general point is in little doubt. Correct behaviour formed part of Paul's boast because of the central place it played in his outlook, and presumably in his opponents' as well. In Paul's view his behaviour was blameless when measured by the Law's standard of righteousness. Regardless of whether Paul's opponents would have agreed with Paul's ascription of such a high standard of behaviour to himself, as Jews they would not have queried the high regard given to right conduct. By concentrating on two words Paul uses in his self description we can draw out several nuances and add to this basic understanding of his point. These are δικαιοσύνη and ἄμεμπτος. In the letters of Paul the word δικαιοσύνη is frequently used in a forensic sense. For example, in Rom. 3. 22ff. he states that righteousness comes from God apart from the Law for all those who believe in Jesus Christ. A second example of δικαιοσύνη used forensically is in association with Paul's appeal to Gen. 15. 6 "Abraham believed God and it was credited to him as righteousness" (Rom. 4. 3; Gal. 3. 6). However, δικαιοσύνη bears no forensic sense at Phil. 3. 6. Rather, Paul uses the word to depict the essence of religious-ethical behaviour.[26] This point is evident from the fact that δικαιοσύνη is associated with ἄμεμπτος in the present context. This is the second word that requires comment. Although it is used in the Pauline corpus as something Christians are to emulate

---

[26]. Lohmeyer, Philipper, 130; K. Barth, The Epistle to the Philippians (London, 1962), 96, similarly J. Ziesler, The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul (Cambridge, 1972), 148.

(1 Thess. 3. 13, 5. 23; 1 Cor. 1. 8) these are not contexts where Jewish piety is being extolled.

In Luke 1. 6 a similar usage to Phil. 3. 6 may exist. Here the piety of Elizabeth and Zachariah, the parents of John the Baptist, is praised. They are both identified as being "righteous" -- that is, living in conformity to the will of God as expressed in the Torah (comp. Dt. 6.25). The sense intended here, especially with the addition of ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ, is of obedience to God's commands that goes beyond legal and external righteousness.[27] In addition, they lived "blamelessly", used here adverbially,[28] -- according to the requirements and commands of the Lord. While this did not mean they were sinless, it does suggest that their conduct was free from reproach.[29] It is in this sense that ἄμεμπτος may be understood also at Phil. 3. 6b and seen as a genuine reflection of how Jews thought about their own religious goals.

From the above analysis of the epithets considered in Phil. 3. 4ff. we have seen that Paul's boast consisted of (1) a strong sense of his Jewish pride of race, (2) a deeply Torah-centred religious outlook, (3) a conviction that correct praxis of religious behaviour mattered, (4) a belief that attempts to alter the fundamentals of the Jewish religion should be treated severely. Whether Paul's opponents would have laid claim to these same priorities is impossible to prove. Nevertheless, if Paul's argument was to be effective it is probable that as Jews his opponents would have shared a similar set of national and religious concerns to Paul's.

---

[27]. I. H. Marshall, The Gospel of Luke (Exeter, 1978), 52; J. Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke I-IX (Garden City, N.Y. 1981), Vol. 1, 322-323.

[28]. Marshall, Ibid., 53.

[29]. A. Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke (Edinburgh, 1905), 10.

Before we consider a second autobiographical passage on Paul's pre-Christian life we shall make several remarks on 2 Cor. 11. 24, which relates to the theme of persecution discussed above. At 2 Cor. 11. 24 we find reference to Paul receiving the thirty-nine stripes. This occurred five times, presumably when he visited local synagogues; it would have been administered by local Jewish synagogue officials. It has also been noted that the thirty-nine stripes are called elsewhere "persecution".[30]

Why was Paul punished? 2 Cor. 11. 24 is silent on the matter. However, from Galatians we learn that some Christian teachers preached circumcision and therefore avoided persecution (5. 11). As there were also others, like Paul who did not preach circumcision and did suffer persecution, it is a reasonable deduction that at Galatia persecution was related to the circumcision issue, and more generally is connected to obedience to the Law. If Paul received the thirty-nine stripes (e.g. at Galatia) the reason could well have been that he admitted Gentiles to the "seed of Abraham" without requiring them first to be circumcised. Such a teaching by Paul (from the point of view of local Jewish synagogue officials) would be a violation of the Torah. While the situation at Galatia cannot be automatically claimed for Corinth, it is not inconceivable that Paul received the thirty-nine stripes for violating some aspect of the Torah.[31] This can be no more than a suggestion however.

In this context there are two points to observe: Paul was punished by local Jewish officials of the synagogue and he willingly submitted to the punishment. Why did the officials punish Paul if they considered him outside of Judaism? Why did Paul bother to

---

[30]. E. P. Sanders, "Paul on the Law, His Opponents, and the Jewish People in Philippians 3 and 2 Corinthians 11" in P. Richardson (ed.), Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. (Waterloo, 1986), Vol. 1, 86; Hultgren, "Persecutions", 104

[31]. See A. E. Harvey, "Forty Strokes Save One: Social Aspects of Judaizing and Apostasy", in A. E. Harvey (ed.), Alternative Approaches to New Testament Study (London, 1985), 83-84, 93.

submit if he saw himself as excluded from Judaism? It is surely necessary to conclude that both Paul and the synagogue officials considered him to be within the confines of the Jewish community.

These brief remarks on 2 Cor.11.24 perhaps raise more matters than they answer. However, there is one secure point that has arisen: some Jews punished some Jewish Christian missionaries in some places. Whether this was for violating an element of the Torah is uncertain. But Paul was willing to be treated as a Jewish dissident. These remarks enforce the point argued above at Phil. 3.6 that those who threatened essentials of the Jewish religion could be punished.

This leads us to consider a second autobiographical text which reflects Paul's pre-Christian past (Gal. 1. 13-14). Even a cursory reading of the material of Gal. 1-2 would lead one to conclude that Paul is offering more than "autobiographical" information to satisfy casual interests.[32] He is involved in a debate with critics who are claiming, that in order to become properly a "seed of Abraham", in addition to faith in Jesus Christ one must be circumcised and keep the Sabbath as well as observe Torah.[33] Those who represented this view maintained that Paul had no authority except that which was bestowed upon him by the leaders of the Jerusalem church. To dispel this in what is a

---

[32]. J. T. Sanders, "Paul's 'Autobiographical' Statements in Galatians 1-2", JBL 85 (1966), 335-343.

[33]. F.F. Bruce, "Galatians Problem 3. The "Other Gospel", BJRL 53 (1970-1), 253-271; P. Bonnard, L'Épitre de Saint Paul aux Galates (Neuchâtel, 1972), 2-5; also W. Schmithals, "Paul and the Gnostics -- in Galatia", Studia Evangelica, (TU 102) (Berlin, 1968), 358-367; R. Jewett, "The Agitators and the Galatian Congregation", NTS 17 (1970-1), 198-212; Ellis, "Opponents", Vol. 1, 264-298; J.L. Martyn, "A Law Observant Mission to the Gentiles: The Background to Galatians", SJT 38 (1985), 307-324. For a treatment of the views of the opponents in Galatians see ch. 5 below.

markedly defensive argument[34] Paul makes the claim that he did not receive his apostolic authority and commission from any human intermediaries, least of all from the apostles or leaders of the Jerusalem church, but received it by a special revelation directly from Jesus Christ.[35]

In order to argue this point, from 1. 12 to 2. 14 Paul presents a sustained autobiography. He draws together various aspects of his career preceding his conversion up to his controversy with Peter at Syrian Antioch. This is with the purpose of showing that he could not have received his gospel from any human agency.

One example which Paul offers to demonstrate this point is that he was advancing in Judaism beyond many of his contemporaries. The implicit logic behind Paul's statement is that he could not have received the gospel from a mere human agency since among his contemporaries he was considered a pre-eminent figure of their Jewish community, and thus could not possibly have been searching for another religious outlook.

Who were Paul's "contemporaries"? Answers that have been offered to this question include (1) the Pharisaic movement, (2) inhabitants of Paul's own homeland of Tarsus, (3) those of his own race who fell within his own age-group.[36] Regardless of the specific

---

[34]. F. F. Bruce, "Further Thoughts on Paul's Autobiography 1. 11-2.14" in E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer (eds.), Jesus und Paulus, Festschrift für W.G. Kümmel (Göttingen, 1975), 21-29; J. B. Tyson, "Paul's Opponents in Galatia", NovT 10 (1968), 245ff.

[35]. On the nature of this "revelation" see Kim, Origin, 55ff.; A.M. Denis, "L'investiture de la fonction apostolique par 'apocalypse'. Étude thématique de Gal. 1, 16", RB 64 (1957), 339-342; D. Lührmann, Das Offenbarungenverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden (Neukirchen, 1965), 74-76; Dupont, "Conversion", 192.

[36]. Proponents of view 1 are E. Barnikol, Die vorchristliche und frühchristliche Zeit des Paulus (Kiel, 1929), 13 n. 2, 31-46; P. Bonnard, Galates, 29. Comp. H. Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater (Göttingen, 1962), 50 n. 8. The second view is put forward by T. Mommsen, "Die Rechtsverhältnis des Apostels Paulus", ZNW 2 (1901), 85. The third view is held by H.D. Betz, Galatians, (Philadelphia, 1979), 68 n. 116; M.J. Lagrange, Saint Paul Épître aux Galates (Paris, 1942),12; F.F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Galatians (Exeter, 1982), 91; W.

identity of this group, what is certain is that they were Jews and that Paul shared with them a zeal for the "traditions". However, in distinction from his contemporaries Paul claims that he was much more zealous for these traditions than they were. The pericope thus clearly informs us of some basic tenets that Jews of Paul's day shared in common. In order to determine what these were several points require clarification. First, what did Paul mean by ζηλωτής (zealous)? Second, what is the correct understanding of "traditions" in this context?

It was Lightfoot's view that ζηλωτής in this pericope offers evidence for Paul's association with the Zealot Party.[37] This judgement must be questioned in view of the fact that there is no documentation for the existence of a such a party during Paul's day. It seems to have been the case that there was no unified revolutionary movement, but indeed variously motivated groups or persons, one being John of Gischala. It is thus untenable to lump all revolutionaries under the name Zealot. In fact, in Ant. 18. 23 Josephus tendentiously claims the existence of a new philosophy with which the Pharisees agreed except for the new philosophy's passion for liberty. This group or tendency was called the fourth philosophy; they did not, however, represent the Zealot Party.[38] The term "Zealot" is absent from Josephus for the first two-thirds of the first century. When the term first occurs it is only when his account reaches AD 66 and it is used to designate the following

---

Bauer, W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek- English Lexicon of the New Testament (Chicago, 1952), 797.

[37]. J. B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistles to the Galatians (London, 1896), 81-82. However, see Schlier, Galater, 51; Betz, Galatians, 68; Lagrange, Galates, 13; M. Hengel, Die Zeloten (Leiden, 1961), 182; M. Borg, "The Currency of the term Zealot", JTS 22 (1971), 509.

[38]. Feldman, Josephus, Vol. 9, 21b.

of Menahem (War 2. 444). The emergence of a distinct party called the "Zealots" is thus best placed at the advent of the Jewish War, AD 66, when the term came into use. This point was made by the editors of The Beginnings of Christianity in 1920, but has gone relatively unnoticed.[39]

But what of the fact that in the Gospels we are told that one of Jesus' disciples was called Simon "the Zealot" (Luke 6. 15 comp. Acts 1. 13)? This translation is based on the view that the word "Cananaean"Καναναῖος , the designation given to Simon at Mark 3. 18, is a transliteration, and thatζηλωτής is a translation of the Aramaic wordקנאנא, which means "zealot".[40] However, the word in Luke could better be translated "the zealous" or "the zealous one", referring to a Jew who took the law into his own hands in punishing Jews who violated the Torah. If so, the word would refer not to a distinct party of which Simon was a member but merely stress an aspect of his personal character.[41] It is this emphasis that occurs in Luke's two other uses ofζηλωτής at Acts 21. 20 and 22. 3 and is similarly understood at 2 Macc. 4. 2 and Ant. 12. 271. This usage also occurs in the rabbinic

---

[39]. F.J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity (London, 1920), Vol. 1, 421-425. More recently see Borg,"Zealot", 504ff.; M. Smith "Zealots and Sicarii : The Origins and Relations", HTR 64 (1971), 1-19; W.D. Davies, The Gospel and the Land (Berkeley, 1974), 93, 336 n. 3; Hengel, Ibid., 57; E. Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, rev. & ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Black (Edinburgh, 1979), Vol. 2, 602; J.P.M. Sweet, "The Zealots and Jesus" in E. Bammel and C.F.D. Moule, (eds.), Jesus and the Politics of His Day (Cambridge, 1984), 5; Haacker, "Bekehrung', 10; D. Rhodes, Israel in Revolution: 6-74 C.E. (Philadelphia, 1976), 97ff.

[40]. Jackson and Lake, Beginnings, 425.

[41]. Ibid.; Borg, "Zealot", 506; Fitzmyer, Luke, Vol. I, 619; Marshall, Luke, 240, cites this view as a possible interpretation. For an example of the view we are objecting to see H. Schürmann, Das Lukasevangelium (Freiburg, Basel, Wien, 1969), 317.

evidence.[42] It would thus appear that there exists no class-name for ζηλωτής in the NT; it is best to regard the word simply as an ordinary adjective.[43]

This brings us to our second point. If the focus of the zealous activity Paul shared with his contemporaries was the "traditions of the fathers", we must ask what is being referred to by this phrase. To interpret it in a pre-70 document requires some delicate balancing. It is thought to refer to the traditions (both written and oral) of the Jewish fathers found in the later documentation of the Mishnah and Talmuds. In the first century, however, "oral law" was little used. Rather "tradition" (קבלה) was preferred, and the equivalent term occurs in the NT at Mark 7. 3, 5, 8 as παράδοσιν or in Josephus as "traditions" (παραδόσεις) (e.g. Ant. 13. 297, 408).[44] It is this latter use that occurs at Gal. 1. 14. We must attempt to elucidate what being zealous for these "traditions" tells us about matters considered important by Paul and his Jewish contemporaries. Whatever meaning we allocate to the word "traditions" or the phrase "traditions of the fathers" must be consonant with historical usage of the pre-70 period.

We begin with a general description of the aims of the "traditions". Fundamental to Judaism was the injunction to holiness. "Ye shall be holy, for I YHWH your God am

---

[42]. Specifically, the one use of קנאים in the rabbinic sources in the Gemara to m. Sanh. 9. 6 is a reference to private persons and not a party; so B. Solomensen, "Some Remarks on the Zealots with Special Regard to the term Qannaim in Rabbinic Literature", NTS 12 (1965-6), 164-176.

[43]. Borg, "Zealot", 509; E. de Witt Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians (Edinburgh, 1921), 47; Schlier, Galater, 51; Bruce, Galatians, 91; Bonnard, Galates, 29.

[44]. W.D. Davies, "Law in First-Century Judaism", in Jewish and Pauline Studies (Philadelphia, 1984), 8; E.P. Sanders, "Law (Judaism, NT Period)", in D. N. Freedman (ed.), The Anchor Bible Dictionary (Nashville, 1990), MS 18-19. See on the theme P.S. Alexander, "Jewish Law in the Time of Jesus" in B. Lindars (ed.) Law and Religion (Cambridge, 1988), 44-58.

holy" (Lev. 17. 2). This was the ideal that Jews were to emulate in all their affairs. In order to assist in such a task, the Torah was provided for instruction so that the Jew could be trained in moral and religious matters and live in accord with the Covenant.[45] However, the laws written in the Pentateuch could not possibly have been so exhaustive as to cover all the questions on conduct that life's intricacies would bring in the future.[46] Therefore, alongside the written Torah arose "traditions". These consisted of a large number of legal rulings that grew out of the needs of the times and changed with them; it is doubtful whether these "traditions" had the same authority as the written Torah.[47] In part these "traditions" interpreted and applied the written Torah, and in part they supplemented it. These legal sayings were primarily transmitted orally and were included under the collective concept of halakhah. This has been defined as follows:[48] Halakhah is the Law applied in a given situation and by the manner of its application renders the Law meaningful. It meant applying the Torah to a concrete contemporary situation, thus uncovering new levels

---

[45]. Sanders, PPJ, passim; I. Epstein, Judaism (London, 1979), 19ff.; Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, 305; A. Jaubert, La Notion d'alliance dans le judaïsme (Paris, 1963), passim.

[46]. Schürer, Jewish People, Vol. 2, 339-346; Moore, Judaism, Vol. 1, 251-262; J. Neusner, "The Meaning of 'Oral Torah' with Special Reference to Kelim and Ohalot", in Early Rabbinic Judaism (Leiden, 1975), 3-33; P. Schäfer, "Das Dogma von der mündlichen Torah im rabbinischen Judentum", in Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des Rabbinischen Judentum (Leiden, 1978), 153-197; Jaubert, La Notion, 389-391; M. D. Herr, "Oral Torah", Enc. Jud. Vol. 12, 1439-1440.

[47]. The case has recently been argued by J. Neusner, Torah (Atlanta, 1988), passim, e.g. 26, 105, 144; comp. 74-79 that the idea of an "oral Torah" equal in authority to the "written Torah" is a late creation. See also Sanders, "Law (Judaism, NT Period)", 17-24; Davies, "Law", 8.

[48]. E. Berkovits, "The Centrality of Halakhah", in J. Neusner (ed.), Understanding Rabbinic Judaism (New York, 1974), 69-70. See also J. Neusner, "The Task of Theology in Judaism', in Methods and Meaning in Ancient Judaism (Missoula, MT, 1979), 185-200 and Torah, 53; E.E. Urback, "Halakhah and History", in R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs (eds.), Jews, Greeks and Christians--- Essays in Honor of WD. Davies (Leiden, 1976), 112-128. However, this stress on halakhah must be complemented with that on covenant: so Davies, Rabbinic Judaism, xxix; Sanders, PPJ, passim.

of understanding of and meaning in the Torah. For example, as the interpreter and applier of written Torah, the halakhist would take a text such as Deut. 11. 22 "If you shall diligently keep all this commandment which I command you", and ask what in the contemporary situation "all this commandment" includes. Of special interest to us is that it was the Pharisees who were especially zealous concerning the "traditions" according to the NT (Mk. 7. 3; Mt.15. 2) and Josephus (Life, 191; Ant. 10. 111, 297).

Documentation for Pharisaic halakhic activity, however, comes from a period after 70 AD. We have indications that during the first century the Pharisees are associated with the "traditions of the fathers", but it is only with the traditions in the Mishnah that we gain evidence regarding the areas of debate, the subject- matter under discussion, the participants, etc.

Before this codification occurred there may have existed stages of development which occurred at three distinct historical periods.[49] The first was during the time of Ezra, when the exiles returned from Babylon and required assistance to resettle in Israel (see Ezra 7. 6ff.). The second period was when Persian control of Palestine was replaced by Greek influence. One consequence of this was that the previous situation, in which the Sopherim functioned as the authoritative body within Palestine, had to change. The new situation required the already existing interpretation of the Torah to be expanded. During this period added impetus was given to the development of the tradition when Antiochus Epiphanes had all Jewish books burnt. The third period in which we find the "traditions" further developed is the Roman era. The development was a consequence of the economic change taking place within the nation. For example, the remittance of loans in the seventh year (Dt. 15. 2). could have had the effect of paralyzing the economy; the seventh-year regulation could also encourage fraud and oppression (Comp. Dt. 14. 9). To avert these

---

[49]. Davies, "Law", 9-10.

possibilities the rule of Prosbul was established. The prosbul was a legal device for securing the repayment of loans in the Sabbath year. It was necessary, because otherwise moneylenders would hesitate to make loans in the sixth year of the seven-year cycle, since debts could not be collected in the seventh year (Neh. 10. 31). The prosbul is attributed to Hillel in Sifre Dt. 11. 3; Sheb. 10. 3-4, where the wording is less likely. That the prosbul was actually used is clear in a text from the Judaean desert. In a document dated the second year of Nero (13 Oct. 55 - 12 Oct. 56), a borrower promises to repay a loan, plus interest of one-fifth, "even if it is a year of rest".[50]

This example attributed to Hillel highlights the difficulties with the use of Mishnaic material in reconstructing pre-70 sentiments. This is especially the case if the distinction is made between history and redaction in the use of Mishnaic sources. Neusner maintains that if this distinction is observed, on form critical grounds the rule of Prosbul may have been attributed to Hillel purely as a convenient name with which to associate the rule. Hillel's association with the rule of Prosbul may actually serve better to show the important place Hillel held among various groups in the second century AD than to inform us about the "historical" Hillel. We are not able to answer detailed historical questions about how the stories came into existence, whether Hillel made a decree for the reasons given (e.g. on account of the economic situation at the time), nor can we say to what extent the rule would have affected great numbers of Palestinian Jews other than Pharisees.

Let us draw several conclusions regarding the identity of the "traditions of the fathers". First, the phrase which concerns us is documented in three witnesses clearly dated in the first century (Josephus, Paul and the Gospels); in Paul's case this testimony is dated

---

[50]. J. Neusner, Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity (London, 1984), 64ff. On the evidence of the DSS see P. Benoit, J.T. Milik and R. de Vaux Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (Oxford, 1961), Vol. 2, 100-104, no. 18.

around 50 A.D. Second, we have seen that these "traditions" were developed at least from the time of Ezra down to the second century AD when the Mishnah became codified. Third, we used the rule of Prosbul to suggest that the Mishnaic evidence relating to the "traditions" may be best seen in the first instance as something other than "history". If the difficulty of distinguishing history from redaction is as we have indicated, perhaps we must return to Josephus and the NT writers, who unambiguiously make the association between Pharisees and the traditions. And we must wait until the second century AD for a full explication of the "traditions of the fathers". Yet even if the pre-70 traditions within the Mishnah could be established, we still would not know precisely what Paul had in mind. We cannot suppose that the traditions which we happen to be able to identity were necessarily those for which he was the most zealous. What we can be sure of is the general point, that he was zealous to go beyond the written law.

We shall treat with greater brevity a further text relevant to the theme of Jewish pride of race, 2 Cor. 11. 22. Like Gal. 1 and Phil. 3, 2 Cor. 11 occurs in the context of a controversy. Paul's apostolic authority has been challenged, and one way he seeks to counter this is to appeal to his solid Jewish heritage. The intricacies of the debate regarding the identity of Paul's opponents are ably documented in scholarly literature.[51] Regardless of what precise definition one ascribes to them, for our purpose what is important is that there was some form of Jewish opposition to Paul. What is of greater

---

[51]. W. Lutgert, Freiheitspredigt und Schwarmgeister in Korinth: Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik der Christuspartei (Gütersloh, 1908); W. Schmithals, Gnosticism in Corinth, (Nashville and New York, 1971); Friedrich, "Korintherbrief", 181-215; D. Georgi, Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief (Neukirchen, 1964); C.K. Barrett, "Paul's Opponents in 2 Corinthians", Essays on Paul (London, 1982), 60-86; J.J. Gunther, St. Paul's Opponents and their Background (Leiden, 1973); Ellis, "Opponents", 284ff.; E. Käsemann, "Die Legitmität des Apostels. Eine Untersuchung zu II Korinther 10-13", ZNW 41 (1942), 33-71. On the debate in 2 Cor. see our discussion in ch. 5 below.

interest is that Paul appeals to his Jewish autobiography to defend himself against his opponents.

In order to confront these charges Paul defends himself by engaging in the "foolish" project of boasting about his own achievements. This he does, in part, out of a divine jealousy for the Corinthians (11. 2) as the one who had brought them into faith. Furthermore, it was done because the Corinthians had forced him into it (12. 11), not recognizing Paul for who he was. Finally, he does it to reach the Corinthians, that is, to bring them back to a recognition that he and the gospel he presented were genuine. This exercise of boasting was legitimate as long as it did not exceed the limits apportioned by God (10. 13).

Paul accomplishes his project of boasting by showing that he exceeded his opponents regarding both pedigree and Christian witness (only the former concerns us here). In what is perhaps the most extended autobiographical section in his letters (11. 22-12. 10) Paul appeals to several noticeable facts which inform us of common ground which he and his Jewish opponents shared. Are they "Hebrews" says Paul? So am I. Are they "Israelites"? Paul asserts that this too was part of his pedigree. These two descriptions have been considered above. The third epithet which Paul uses of himself and his opponents is "seed of Abraham". Paul's boast here is that he was a descendant of Abraham,[52] and to boast of such a descent was indeed the "pride of Israel" (Ps. Sol. 9. 17; 3 Macc. 6. 23).[53] In his use of Abraham Paul is offering a further way of indicating that he, like his Jewish opponents,

---

[52]. C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (London, 1973), 293; J. Lambrecht, "Abraham, notre père à tous': La Figure d'Abraham dans les Écrits pauliniens" in P.M. Bogaert (ed.), Abraham dans la Bible et dans la tradition juive (Louvain, 1977), 140. Windisch, Korintherbrief, 350, however restricts the term as being primarily a reference to the promises made to Abraham. See also Georgi, Gegner, 63ff.

[53]. TDNT Vol. 1, 8.

was a good Jew.[54] (Comp. Rom.11.1 where we find the juxtapostion of "seed of Abraham" and "Israelites"). In drawing attention to Abraham Paul was well aware of the high estimation which Judaism accorded to descendants of Abraham, and he is proud to declare that this is part of his heritage. Abraham was recognized both as the first to embrace monotheism, its first proselyte and first missionary. In addition, Abraham is the example of unshakeable devotion to God (Jub. 19. 8; m. Abot 5. 3).[55]

Furthermore, Paul had the privilege of addressing Abraham, the father of all Israelites, not as proselytes must, "your father", but as only Jews could, Abraham "our father".[56] Because of Abraham's perfect obedience in keeping the whole Torah, including those parts which had not yet been written,[57] he stored up on behalf of the nation of Israel זכות (comp. Rom. 11. 28), which the nation could draw upon when she required help during times of distress.[58] The penultimate example of this was the exodus, since it was thought that Israel was redeemed from Egypt because of the זכות אבות (Exod. Rabb. 1. 36).

---

[54]. V. P. Furnish, II Corinthians (Garden City, NY, 1984), 514; Lietzmann, Korinther, 150, similarly Goodenough and Kraabel "Hellenization", 26 n. 2.

[55]. Moore, Judaism, Vol. 1, 344 n. 1, Vol. 2, 105-106, 237; I. Ta-Shma, "Abraham" Enc. Jud. 2 col. 115; TDNT Vol. 1, 8; U. Luz, Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus (Münich, 1968), 178; O. Schmitz, Abraham im Spätjudentum und im Christentum (Stuttgart, 1922), 99-123; M. Dibelius and H. Greeven, James (Philadelphia, 1975), 168-174; Georgi, Gegner, 50-59.

[56]. C. K. Barrett, From First to Last Adam (London, 1962), 31.

[57]. See e.g., Jub. 16. 28; Syr. Bar. 57. 2; b. Kidd. 4. 14; b. Yoma 28b.

[58]. It must not be derived from the idea of זכות אבות that a repository existed that could be transferred at the last judgement to those who required help. See Sanders, PPJ, 183ff.; Moore, Judaism Vols. 1, 543-544; 3, 164; S. Schechter, Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (New York, 1975), 174-175; comp. Ziesler, Righteousness, 123-124.

Whether Paul had all these elements in mind in his appeal to the expression "seed of Abraham" is impossible to determine. We have shown the range of possible associations that the phrase could convey, but cannot say which were pre-eminent for Paul. This substantiates the distinction we are suggesting between hard generalizations and nuances. Whatever else may be conveyed by the phrase "seed of Abraham" it is quite probable that Paul appealed to it because he wanted to indicate a pride in his Jewish race.

We have now considered all the autobiographical material that is found in contexts where controversy between Paul and some Jewish and Jewish Christian opposition occurs. We now turn to a consideration of other data which may be classified as implicitly autobiographical and see how our initial picture may compare.

In each of the pericopes already considered we observed the reflections of Paul the Christian looking back at his past life in Judaism. In the pericope we will now consider, Rom. 9. 1ff., we have Paul the Jew in his present life as a Christian indicating what he shares in common with historic Israel. Romans 9 begins with words of great sympathy and solemnity, expressing Paul's sorrow and grief for the unbelief of his fellow Jews. The genuineness of Paul's sentiment is suggested by the statement that his conscience bore witness in the Holy Spirit to what he says. The sincerity of his grief is further indicated when he tells his Roman audience of his willingness to be "cut off" from Christ for the sake of his fellow Jews.

If any one has doubt about Paul's deep attachment to the Jews, these are dispelled in v. 3b, where Paul makes it clear, that speaking as a Christian, his declarations about the Jews certainly do not refer to the past. For Paul the Jews still remain his brethren and

kinsmen by race.[59] Since he now had the Christian community as his "brethren" he is careful to add that the Jews continue to remain his brethren Κατὰ σάρκα. Paul does not merely intend this to imply "as far as earthly relations are concerned".[60] Such a disparagement of his estimation of the Jews would not accord with their greatness and privileged place in God's economy as recorded in vv .4-5. The common ground that Paul mentions here between himself and his brethren thus require our consideration, especially since the privileges listed suggest an ongoing sense of pride he continued to feel in the Jewish race.

It is from this perspective that the list of Jewish privileges is to be considered. They are presented as four relative clauses (vv. 4-5a), all dependent on τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα(v3b). Structurally, however, it may be better to take the first relative clause (οἵτινες ἐἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται) as a general statement of the Jews' special place as the people of God. The following three relative clauses elucidate this.[61] Thus the Jews are seen as Paul's kinsfolk according to the flesh "inasmuch as" (οἵτινες) they are the elect people of God (Ἰσραηλῖται).[62]

---

[59]. M. Barth, People of God (Sheffield, 1983), 30. For a non-pejorative sense of the phrase see F. Dreyfus, "Le passé et le présent d'Israël (Rom. 9, 1-5; 11, 1-24)" in L. de Lorenzi (ed.), Die Israelfrage nach Rom 9-11 (Rome, 1977), 133ff., 139; also Beker, Paul, 89.

[60]. W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Edinburgh, 1902), 229.

[61]. C.E.B. Cranfield, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Edinburgh, 1979), Vol. 2, 450 n. 1; similarly, U. Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer (Zürich and Neukirchen, 1980), Vol. 2, 188. For a compositional and structural element in these verses also see Dreyfus, "Le passé", 133; Luz, Paulus, 270; B. Byrne, "Sons of God" -- "Seed of Abraham" (Rome, 1979), 81-82.

[62]. J.D.G. Dunn, Romans (Dallas, 1988), Vol. 2, 526. However, in addition to this religious connotation, some have suggested that physical descendance may also be implied by the word Paul uses. So Dreyfus Ibid., 134; O. Michel, Der Brief an die Römer (Göttingen, 1955), 196; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 2, 188.

We shall now turn to enumerate the privileges given, bearing in mind the distinction we have been observing in our treatment of previous pericopes between hard generalization and less certain definitions of detail.[63] The hard generalization of the present pericope is that Paul felt a deep sense of pride in the Jewish nation. The inherent nuance of his expressions can only be determined by attempting to define the list of Jewish privileges more closely. It must be remembered that this pericope is different from the others considered above in that here one term, Ἰσραηλῖται, is being defined by a series of words and associations, each with a shade of meaning of its own.

The first privilege attributed to Israel is υἱοθεσία, which in the present context is best to be understood against OT usage.[64] The time when Israel became God's adopted son was at the Exodus, when his long history of fatherly dealings began. Though God was the creator of all people, at the Exodus Israel became his son in a special sense (Hos. 11), with the status of the first-born (Exod. 4. 22; Jer. 31. 9) because of God's special commitment to Israel, an appropriate response of filial love and obedience was expected. Even when Israel did not respond as a whole, God did not withdraw his special care but restricted it to the God-fearing and righteous (Wis. 2. 16, 18; 5. 15; Jub. 1. 24-5; Ps. Sol. 13. 8, 17, 30; 18. 4). Paul identifies himself with these rightful inheritances.

The second privilege of the Israelite is δόξα. This word is the LXX translation of the Hebrew כָּבוֹד which the Rabbis called the Shekinah (שְׁכִינָה) (Comp. Targum of Onkelos Exod. 33. 18-19; 34. 40-1). The Rabbis chose this word in order to stress the

---

[63]. On these verses see especially L. Cerfaux, "Le Privilège d'Israël selon Saint Paul", ETL 17 (1940), 5-26; M. Rese, "Die Vorzüge Israels in Rom. 9. 4f und Eph. 2. 12: Exegetische Anmerkungen zum Thema Kirche und Israel", TZ 31 (1975), 211-222.

[64]. Byrne, "Sons of God", 81, 4.

personal presence of God and to dispel any idea of divine remoteness.[65] When Paul attributes δόξα to his fellow Jews he is perhaps affirming their possession of the visible presence of the invisible God on earth,[66] expressed in the theophany of Mt. Sinai (Exod. 24. 16-17), in the Mosaic tabernacle (Exod. 40. 34), and in Solomon's Temple (1 Kgs. 8.10-11) between the cherubim on the lid of the ark (Ps. 43. 1; Exod. 25. 22). Paul also may be drawing attention to God's presence in the Jerusalem Temple during his own day.[67]

The third privilege listed is αἱ διαθῆκαι. There is an alternative reading ἡ διαθηκη[68] which would point to the covenant at Sinai, but there are good reasons to retain αἱ διαθῆκαι .[69] First, by the process of difficulior lectio prior, the plural would be preferred.[70] Second, this reading can be confirmed independently from both Hellenistic and Rabbinic Judaism which testify to the covenants in the plural (Wis. 18. 22; Sir. 44. 12, 18; 2 Macc. 8. 15; Mek. Ex. 12. 6; 23. 9; b. Sota 37b; j. Sota 21c). Assuming that the plural

---

[65]. E. E. Urbach, The Sages (Jerusalem, 1975), Vol. 1, 37ff.

[66]. Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 230; T. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology (Oxford, 1958), 247; Michel, Römer, 196.

[67]. Luz, Paulus, 271; Cerfaux, "Privilège", 20-21; C. K. Barrett, The Epistle to the Romans (London, 1977), 177; M.-J. Lagrange, Saint Paul Épître aux Romains (Paris, 1950), 226.

[68]. In particular P46 BDG. For an advocate of this reading see Cerfaux "Privilège", 12ff.

[69]. Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 462; E. Käsemann, Commentary on Romans (London, 1980), 259; Byrne, Sons of God, 82 n. 11; Michel, Römer, 196; Dreyfus, "Le passé", 136.

[70]. Barrett, Romans, 175 n. 1; Luz, Paulus, 272 n. 24; Dunn, Romans, Vol. 2, 527; E. J. Epp, "Jewish-Gentile Continuity in Paul: Torah and/or Faith? (Romans 9:1-5)", in G.W.E. Nickelsburg and G.W. MacRae (eds.), Christians Among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl on His Sixty-fifth Birthday (Philadelphia, 1986), 83.

is intended, the covenants of Abraham, Moses, and David are probably to be included among those which Paul had in mind.[71]

The fourth privilege which Paul says he possesses along with his fellow Jews is the νομοθεσία (a NT hapax). This word has been taken to denote (1) the action of making or giving of the law[72] (2) the law considered in its entirety.[73] Examples of the second usage go back to the fourth century BC (Lysias, 30. 35), but this usage does appear in later literature as well (2 Macc. 6. 23; 4 Macc. 5. 35, 17. 16; Arist. 15). In view of the fact that the previous privilege does not denote "covenant-making" but covenants made, it is probably correct to understand the meaning here in the sense of the laws given collectively. If this is correct then νομοθεσία would be equivalent to ὁ νόμος which Paul elsewhere claims is "holy", "righteous" and "good" (Rom.7. 12). In view of the centrality of the Torah in Judaism it is indeed significant that νομοθεσία is placed alongside other accepted Jewish privileges which Paul and "Israel" shared in common.

The next Jewish privilege which occurs is signified by the Greek word λατρεία. In the LXX this word regularly corresponds to the Hebrew עבודה, and when used of serving God denotes cultic worship -- "Tempeldienst, Opferkult, Gottesdienst".[74] Simeon the Just

---

[71]. On covenants made with different Biblical characters see Jaubert, La Notion, 27-40.

[72]. M. Black, Romans (London, 1973), 130; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 231; Michel, Römer, 197; Käsemann, Romans, 259; Rese, "Vorzüge", 216; Luz, Paulus, 272; Epp, "Jewish-Gentile", 89.

[73]. TDNT Vol. 4, 1089; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 463; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 2, 188 n. 828; Dunn, Romans, 527; similarly, Cerfaux, "Privilège", 19-20.

[74]. Michel, Römer, 197 cf. Wilckens, Römer, 188 n. 829; Barrett, Romans, 178; Byrne, "Sons of God", 82 n. 12; Luz, Paulus, 272. For a sense of λατρεία in the present context that includes prayer, the reading of Scripture, reciting of the Shema, and the observance of Sabbath see Cranfield, Romans, Vol.2, 463. Comp. Siphre Dt. 11. 13.

clearly states the centrality of temple worship in Judaism in relation to the Torah. "By three things is the world sustained: by the Law, by the [Temple] service, and by the deeds of loving kindness" (m. Abot 1. 2).

One final noun describing Israelite privilege occurs in the present relative clause. The Jews possess "the promises" (αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι), the promises made in the OT, inclusive of the promise of the coming of the Messiah. This is a view held by various commentators.[75] There are several reasons that would suggest that this interpretation is correct. The focus of Rom. 9-11 is the discussion of why the chosen people of Israel did not recognize their promised Messiah when he came. One of the prerogatives given in the list of Jewish privileges that occurs later is the coming of the Messiah through the Jewish people. Both of these facts may suggest the idea that the Messiah's coming would be closely associated with the promises Israel could look forward to.

The next relative clause contains one element of Jewish privilege. The Jews have as part of their privileges οἱ πατέρες. This designation is not set in isolation from that which precedes it since it is the promises that are given to the patriarchs (Rom. 15. 8). It would appear that Paul intends οἱ πατέρες in the sense of the great patriarchs of the Jewish religion -- Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. However, in view of the NT identification of David as one of the patriarchs (Acts 2. 29; Mark 11. 10), it may be correct to draw a distinction between a narrow and broad sense of the term.[76] Those intended could in that case include the fathers of distinction from Abraham onwards.

---

[75]. Lagrange, Romains, 226; H. Lietzmann, An die Römer (Göttingen, 1933), 89; Käsemann, Romans, 259; J. Denny, "St. Paul's Letter to the Romans" in The Expositor's Greek Testament (Grand Rapids, 1974) Vol. 2, 42; comp. Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 464; F. F. Bruce, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (Leicester, 1976), 185.

[76]. Michel, Ibid.

This brings us to our final relative clause which depicts the supreme privilege of the Jewish people. It is also the culmination of all the previously enumerated privileges--that the Messiah (Χριστός) was to come and his physical descent was through the Jewish race (Comp. Rom. 1. 3-4 also Jn. 4. 22).[77]

This concludes Paul's depiction of what constituted the people of Israel, with whom Paul as a Christian identified himself without reservation. From our consideration of this pericope we can see that there is nothing that militates against the conclusion that Paul had a deep sense of pride in the privileges held by the Jewish race and utilized good Jewish confessions and institutions to demonstrate his case. This point is enforced by the fact that he uses several features which we observed in Josephus' summary on the Jewish religion in Contra Apionem. They are monotheism (i.e. reference to the "glory" of the one God), Jews as the covenant people of God, the Law, and the Temple.[78] In the course of our discussion we have suggested shades of meaning for the confessions and institutions Paul makes appeal to in his case for Jewish privilege. His aim is to define what it meant to be "Jewish". If this is what Paul the Christian continues to identify himself with it must be an accurate testimony of what the Jews of Paul's time considered important in their own religious self-identity.

A second pericope which enumerates Paul's pride of race from data which may be implicitly autobiographical is Rom. 2. 17-20. These verses form part of a larger argument (2. 1-29) in which Paul uses the literary device of diatribe.[79] The focus of this debate is

---

[77]. Dreyfus, "Le passé", 138.

[78]. This general point is noted by Dunn, Romans, Vol. 2, 528. But he does not suggest the common ground with Josephus.

[79]. Bruce, Romans, 86; Michel, Römer, 63; O. Kuss, Der Römerbrief (Regensburg), 1957, Vol. 1, 60; C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (London, 1932), 30; H. Moxnes, Theology in Conflict (Leiden, 1980), 34; S. Stowers, The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans (Chico, Ca. 1981), 93ff.; D. Zeller, Juden und Heiden in der Mission bei

over whether Jews will be judged at the last judgement by the same set of criteria as Gentiles. Paul's argument is based on the premise of God's impartiality (Rom. 2. 11).[80] To argue his case he attempts to dispel several objections that Jews would have raised to the claim that Jews and Gentiles will be judged at the last judgement by the same criterion.

Paul's debating partner, the critic, raises the disclaimer (2.17-20) "We cannot be judged by the same standards as Gentiles, we are Jews". Paul then presents the critic's reasons for maintaining this. The very fact that Paul and the "critic" had an agreed area of debate offers evidence for what was common ground within the Jewish religion. Even if the critic is an imagined rather than a real figure, since Paul uses the diatribe form it is quite plausible the outlook represented by the critic was one which was held by some Jews.

Let us now consider several details of the portrayal of Judaism offered at 2. 17-20. In these verses Paul's main intention is to take up points made by his fellow Jew, the critic. The assumption behind each of the claims is that the Jew thought that he possessed a privilege whereby he would be judged on the last day by different criteria than others on account of being a Jew. The first claim Paul puts in the mouth of the critic is "You have the name Jew". Ἰουδαῖος is a self-description, primarily in diaspora Judaism of an adherent to OT monotheism. It is a name of honour which distinguished him from the Gentile.[81]

Paulus (Stuttgart, 1976), 199; R. Bultmann, Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe. (Göttingen, 1910). For a treatment of Rom. 2. 1-29 as a diatribe argument see ch. 7 below.

[80]. J. Bassler, Divine Impartiality (Chico, Ca. 1982), 137ff., esp. 152-153 and "Divine Impartiality in Paul's Letter to the Romans", NovT 26, 1 (1984), 43ff.; Sanders, PPJ, 489; A. J. M. Wedderburn, The Reasons for Romans (Edinburgh, 1988), 126.

[81]. Käsemann, Romans, 69; H. Schlier, Der Römerbrief (Freiburg, Basel, Wien, 1977), 82; J.-M. Cambier, "Le jugement de tous les hommes par Dieu seul, selon la vérité, dans Rom. 2,1-3,20", ZNW 67 (1976-7), 205-206.

Next, the Jew relies on the Law. The striking features of the remaining claims are the central place which the Torah has in the affairs of the Jew, his own self-consciousness, and the description of Judaism offered.[82] The Jew was to rely on the Law, however, not in order to accumulate works to ensure a good verdict at the judgement. Rather, his possession of the Law was to fill him with confidence and give him a feeling of security. The apocalypse of 2 Bar. (48. 22) comes very close to this idea: "In thee do we trust, for lo! Thy Law is with us, and we know that we shall not fall so long as we keep thy statutes" (comp. Mic. 3. 11).

Associated closely with reliance on the law is the Jew's pride in God. It is his special relationship to God that forms the basis of his boast and gives him self-esteem.[83] καυχᾶσθαι is to be understood in relation to its objectθεός. The sense is of a Jew who prides himself in God. Ifκαυχᾶσθαι, taken withἐν, as Turner has suggested,[84] means "because of", the sense of Jer. 9. 24 would be recalled -- boasting is done out of reverence for the Lord because he is the one who exercises kindness, justice, and righteousness (Comp. Ps. Sol. 17. 1).

---

[82]. Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 1, 148; Lagrange, Romains, 51-53; Dunn, Romans, Vol. 1, 110, 112; Watson, Gentiles, 111; Schnabel, Wisdom, 232-234. However, we would contest the view of Watson (113ff.) that those whom Paul is arguing against are Jewish Christian critics. We would also question Schnabel's point that Rom. 2. 17-20 presupposes the identity of law and wisdom. In our view, the focus of these verses is primarily on the Torah and because Jews possess it they are able to offer discernment on matters relating to human life.

[83]. Stowers, Diatribe, 112; H. Schlier, "Von den Juden : Römerbrief 2, 1-29" in Die Zeit der Kirche (Freiburg, 1956), 43-44; Cambier, "Le jugement", 205. However, there is no sense of boasting here as "self- confidence" so R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament (London, 1952), Vol. 1, 243.

[84]. N. Turner, A Grammar of New Testament Greek (Edinburgh, 1963), Vol. 3, 223.

Two further claims are given in the list of appellations. First is that the Jew knows God's will. θέλημα is here intended in the sense of "God's will par excellence".[85] It is this divine will which in the OT and Judaism is the proper content of γνῶσις.[86] The second claim Paul offers is that the Jew is able to "distinguish the things that matter (or are essential)"[87] or as the NEB has it "know right from wrong" because of instruction received in the Law. Because the Jew has the knowledge of Scripture (such as Deut. 6. 4ff. and Lev. 19. 18) he is in a position to make important judgements on weightier matters of the Law (comp. Mt. 23. 23; Ap. 2. 183).[88]

In vv. 19ff. Paul takes up an enumeration of Jewish claims that since the Jew is the possessor of the Torah he is a world missionary. From the privileges in vv. 17-18 which concern the relationship with God, in vv. 19ff. we move on to prerogatives with respect to others. In fact, the expressions of vv. 19ff all point toward Israel as world leader.[89]

The four claims are as follows. (1) The Jew is a guide to the blind. This idea can be documented from a variety of sources:. Is. 42. 7; 1 En. 105. 1; Sib. Or. 3. 195-6; Ap. 2.41. (2) The Jew is "a light to those in darkness" (comp. Is. 29. 6; 42. 6, 60. 1; Wis. 18. 4; T. Levi 14. 4; 18. 9; 1QSb 4. 27ff.; 1QH 4. 27; 18. 29). (3) He is an "instructor of the foolish"; παιδευτής is probably to be taken in the sense of "practical guidance and direction".[90] (4)

---

[85]. Michel, Römer, 72; Wilckens, Römer, (1978), Vol. 1 ,148 n. 379; Lagrange, Romains, 51-52; Schlier, "Von den Juden", 44; Dunn, Romans, Vol. 1, 111.

[86]. Käsemann, Romans, 69.

[87]. Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 166 also Kuss, Römerbrief Vol. 1, 84; Cambier, "Le jugement", 206; Lagrange, Romains, 52.

[88]. Cranfield, Ibid.; similarly Schlier, Römerbrief, 83; A. Schlatter, Gottes Gerechtigkeit (Stuttgart, 1935), 102.

[89]. Cranfield, Ibid.; Bassler, Impartiality, 150.

[90]. TDNT Vol. 5, 620.

The critic's view affirms that Jews are teachers of infants. This idea is also found in the Jewish material (e.g. Ap. 2. 41; Sib.Or. 3. 195; 1QH 2.9).[91]

Confidence to carry out such tasks rests on the fact that the Jew possessed "in the Law the embodiment of knowledge and truth". He saw it [the Law] "as a physical representation, indeed, the actual embodiment of absolute knowledge and truth, as the true depiction and representation of the idea of divine norm".[92] And if γνῶσις in accordance with the OT דעת is to be seen as the knowledge of the will of God and ἀλήθεια is somewhat synonymous to it, then the confidence of Jews as world missionaries would be seen as that which consists of or embodies the knowledge of God and his will as declared in the Law.[93] It may thus be concluded that Paul presents some of Judaism's deepest convictions, as a Jew (represented by the critic) would have conceived them and does so by appealing to traditional Jewish imagery.[94]

From these brief remarks it is evident that Jewish advantage or privilege especially stems from the fact that the Jew possessed the Torah and boasted in his God. Accepting the significance of the diatribal structure of 2. 1-29 and especially vv. 17-20, we have evidence which illustrates common ground held between Jews. Paul's view was that national privileges could not be claimed as a guarantee of less severe treatment on the day of judgement (Rom. 2. 16). This seems to be the thrust of the argument of the chapter.

---

[91]. Zeller, Juden, 156-157; Schlier, "Von den Juden", 44.

[92]. TDNT, Ibid. similarly Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 1, 149; Schlier, "Von den Juden', 44; P. Althaus, Der Brief an die Römer (Göttingen, 1959), 24; Dunn, Romans, Vol. 1, 113.

[93]. Black, Romans, 59.

[94]. See chapter 7 below for details of the imagery used.

The critic's view, by contrast, was that because he was a Jew God would treat him more mercifully. What Paul and the critic shared in common was first a belief in monotheism. The fact that God had a special relationship with the Jewish people was also something to take pride in.[95] A second point of commonality between Paul and the "critic" was a belief that in the future God would judge Jews (as well as mankind in general). Third, they shared the view that Jews possessed the Torah as the divine revelation given to them. This fact enabled them to know God's will and to be world missionaries. Rom. 2. 17-20 testifies to a Jew's zeal for God and the Torah.[96] We can conclude that the general picture regarding "common denominators" within Judaism, as already noted in other pericopes, is confirmed.

Let us now consider another passage which takes up several of the themes we have been considering in Rom. 2. In Rom. 10. 1ff. Paul speaks of the Jews' relation to God. Specifically, they are "zealous" towards God. Paul offers this word of testimony on behalf of his countrymen because their present situation is one of unbelief regarding the Messiah. The fact that Jews are zealous towards God serves as an incentive for Paul's continued prayer for their salvation. What is being affirmed is Jewish zeal. But Paul complains about the blindness of this zeal and that it did not lead them to recognize Messiah.[97] If μαρτυρεῖν

---

[95]. However the distinction must be made that for Paul a Jew taking pride in his God, ancestry, and knowledge of God's will does not thereby qualify him for entry in the people of God. The burden of Paul's gospel is that entry comes not by boasting but by faith (Rom. 3. 27).

[96]. The distinction must be made that Paul and the critic agreed on these points as what Jews qua Jews claimed to distinguish them from Gentiles. Therefore, one could say that these are distinctive features of historic Judaism. But Paul disagrees that a special claim on God and the Torah as an expression of his revelation permits Jews to be judged on a different basis. For Paul all people are under sin (Rom. 3. 9).

[97]. Michel, Römer, 222 n. 1; Cf. Hengel, Zeloten, 182. Comp. Dunn, Romans, Vol. 2, 595, who maintains that Paul's complaint is that the Jewish zeal was too "nationalistically centered".

has been correctly described as "a declaration or confirmation based on first hand knowledge of individual acts or special facts of experience"[98] we have good reason to believe that Paul's attestation of Israel's zeal for God was something of which he had firsthand experience. Paul and his fellow Jews knew a similar piety -- one focused on zeal towards God. Paul could testify to this because it was part of what he shared with fellow Jews by virtue of his nationality. Moreover, he knew of their zeal because of his own ζῆλος for the "traditions" (Gal. 1. 14) which had earlier moved him to take action against the Jesus movement (Phil. 3. 4-5; Gal. 1. 13-14).

It is because the experience of the Israelites given at Rom. 10. 2, (i.e. their zeal) corresponds to Paul's own experience in several explicit autobiographical accounts that it is maintained that Rom. 10. 2 "exactly describes his [Paul's] own attitude before he met the risen Christ".[99] If so, when Paul testifies to the zeal Jews had for God he is identifying himself with one of the most fundamental features of the Jewish religion,[100] perhaps even more fundamental than zeal for the Torah.[101] Since earlier in this chapter we discussed the theme of zeal in connection with Phinehas and Mattathias it will suffice here only to give several references to support the point that Jews were zealous for their God: Jub. 9. 2ff.; 30. 18; T. Asher 4. 5; Sir. 45. 23; 1QH 14. 14; Num. Rabb. 25. 22). From these examples

---

[98]. TDNT Vol. 4, 496.

[99]. Bruce, Romans, 200. See also Kim, Origin, 3-4; W. Grundmann, "Paulus, Aus dem Volke Israel, Apostel der Völker", NovT 4 (1960), 268-269; E. Käsemann, New Testament Questions for Today (London, 1969), 184; H. G. Wood, "The Conversion of St. Paul: Its Nature, Antecedents and Consequences", NTS 1 (1954), 279-280; Hengel, Zeloten, 182; Dupont, "Conversion', 184; Blank, Paulus und Jesus, 91. For the same point regarding Rom. 10.4 so P. Stuhlmacher, "Das Ende des Gesetzes", ZTK 67 (1970), 30ff.; U. Wilckens, "Bekehrung', 277.

[100]. Hengel, Ibid., 182, 187-188.

[101]. W. R. Farmer, Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus (New York, 1956), 49.

we can see that Paul's statement regarding Jewish zeal for God is justified and his use of ζῆλος accords with specific Jewish sentiment as indicated in sources outside his writings.[102] We thus have further indication that Paul and the Jews of his time shared common ideals.

There is one final text to be added to our discussion. It has to do with a Christian reflection on Jewish attitudes towards the Torah. This is the pericope at 2 Cor. 3. 4ff., where Paul is engaged in a defence of his apostleship. In the course of the argument Paul indicates a view about the Torah which he claims is held by Jews of his day but which he as a Christian is no longer able to subscribe to. We thus have a reflection of Paul the Christian about contemporary Judaism seen through Christian spectacles. The common ground between Paul and Jews of his day is not that which he affirms as a Christian but that which forms part of his pre-Christian past.

The context of our pericope is that people in Corinth had been criticizing Paul, suggesting that he was not a real apostle since his claim to apostleship rested entirely on his conversion experience, a fact to which he was the sole witness. The charge against Paul was that he wrote his own testimonials, his own letters of reference. Paul, they claimed, was not confident about his apostleship, otherwise he been he would have accepted a salary for his service. Paul's reply was that he did not need testimonials---his testimonial was the Corinthians. This was evident, he states, because "we are all being transformed from one degree of glory (δόξα) to another" (v. 18). Paul's argument is that Christ's divine glory

---

[102]. Hengel, Zeloten, 160ff.; TDNT, Vol. 2, 880-881.

was visibly being reflected[103] within the Corinthian Church and that this is sufficient testimony of the genuineness of his apostleship.

δόξα has in fact occurred before v. 18, in the passage (vv. 7-11) where Paul is contrasting himself as a minister of the new covenant with Moses, who was a minister of the old covenant. The passage under consideration is often understood as a Midrash on Exod. 34. 29-35.[104]

When Moses went to receive the law we are told that the glory of the Lord shone upon him, glory here being the visible brightness that was a sign of God's presence. When Moses came down from the mountain his face shone with God's glory. After he had spoken to the Israelites he put the veil over his face until he went to speak with God again.[105] Paul, however, has given the story his own twist. The veil, rather was serving as

---

[103]. J. Dupont, Gnosis (Louvain and Paris, 1949), 120; R. Bultmann, Der zweite Brief an die Korinther (Göttingen, 1976), 93; Bruce, Corinthians, 193; W.C. van Unnik, "With Unveiled Face: An exegesis of 2 Corinthians III 12-18", NovT 6 (1963), 167; M.D. Hooker, "Beyond the Things that are Written: St. Paul's use of Scripture", NTS 27 (1981), 308 n. 12 contra M. Rissi, Studien zum zweiten Korintherbrief (Zürich, 1969), 38 n. 73; J. Lambrecht, "Transformation in 2 Cor. 3,18", Bib 64 (1983), 248-250. One point in favour of this translation of κατοπτριζόμενοι is that, like Moses, Christians reflect the glory of God -- that of Moses is temporary: that of Christians continuous and permanent. The context does not suggest that Moses was looking at God's glory: he was reflecting it. So must be the case for Christians.

[104]. J.D.G. Dunn, "2 Cor. 111.17 - The Lord is the Spirit", JTS 31 (1970), 311; Hooker, Ibid., 297; Barrett, Second Corinthians, 113-114; Windish, Korintherbrief, 112; Lietzmann, Korinther, 111; van Unnik, Ibid., 154; J. Goettsberger, "Die Hülle des Moses nach Ex. 34 und 2 Kor. 3", BZ 16 (1922-4), 1-17. However, Furnish, Corinthians, 230-243, maintains that Paul does not appeal to the whole of Exod. 34. 29-35 but only to Exod. 34. 29-30. On the other hand, E. Richards "Polemics, Old Testament and Theology. A Study of II Cor. III, I-IV, 6", RB 88 (1981), 340ff., suggests that more OT texts influence the line of argument than simply Exod. 34. For the view that our passage is Paul's reply to his opponent's use of a Midrash on Exod. 34 see S. Schulz "Die Decke des Moses: Untersuchungen zu einer vorpaulinischen Überlieferung in II Cor. 3,7-8", ZNW 49 (1958), 1-30; Rissi, Studien, 26; Georgi, Gegner, 282 contra L. Gaston, Paul and the Torah (Vancouver, 1987), 153

[105]. The few occurrences of the story in later Jewish tradition state nothing about the motives for Moses putting a veil over his face. Rather, when the glory of Moses' face is

a cover over Moses' face between the times God imparted his glory, was used to disguise the fact that the glory had faded. The veil was put over the face of Moses because the glory was gradually fading away only to be revived when Moses returned into God's presence.

Paul uses this story as a symbol[106] of the relationship between the old and new covenants -- the former being transient, temporary, and provisional; the latter permanent. This relationship between the two covenants is worked out by contrasting the ministry/dispensation of Moses with that of Paul.[107] The point that is made is the relative degree of glory associated with each of the covenants. This is demonstrated by showing that while the old covenant represented by Moses and the new covenant by Paul each contained glory, it was the glory of the new covenant that possessed a surpassing and permanent splendour.

Paul contrasts the two ministries as follows: the attributes associated with the ministry of Moses were death (v. 7) and condemnation (v. 9), and they were of a provisional or transitory nature (v. 11); the ministry of Paul was spiritual (v. 7), righteous (v. 9), and of a permanent nature (v. 11). By contrasting the two dispensations relative to

---

mentioned the stress is on the permanence of the glory; so H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash, (Münich, 1926), Vol. 1, 515-516.

[106]. Similarly Windisch, Korintherbrief, 117.

[107]. Hooker "Scripture" 297. Rissi, Studien, 25; Davies, "People", 129; Schnabel, Law and Wisdom, 283; Richards, "Polemics", 73; N. Hugedé, La Métaphore du miroir dans les Épîtres de saint Paul aux Corinthiens (Neuchâtel and Paris, 1957), 25-6. However, A. Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (Edinburgh, 1915), 92, 7 incorrectly implies that a Law-Gospel contrast occurs at vv. 7-11.

the δόξα that each contained, Paul is asserting that the glory of the covenant, the old regime, was not intended by God to be anything other than temporary or provisional.

As we have seen in vv. 7-11, the Midrash on Exod. 34 focused on the word "glory". The Midrash continues at vv. 12ff., where Paul now shifts his focus to the word "veil" (κάλυμμα) vv. 13, 14, 15, 16.[108] The section commences with an affirmation by Paul of the hope which he and the Corinthians have because of the permanence of the new covenant. This was not the case for Moses, who put a veil over his face so that the Israelites would not see the end of that which was temporary τὸ τέλος τοῦ καταργουμένου (v. 13b). To properly understand this part of the Midrash one must pay attention to what is temporary and passing away. Since the participle of καταργέω occurs at vv. 7, 11, 13 in a similar sense, these examples may be considered together. Whether one chooses between the old covenant or the Law, both concerned with what is temporary and passing away, may make little difference, especially since the old covenant is based on obedience to the demands of Torah.

While the essence of what Paul intends to depict -- the passing away -- is clear he is not entirely precise in several of his uses of καταργέω . At v. 7 it is a reasonable deduction that what is passing away is the glory on the face of Moses. This is obvious from the fact the word for glory, δόξα, is feminine, as is the participle for passing away, τὴν καταργουμένην. Paul thus means the glory represented by the ministry of Moses and the old covenant.[109]

---

[108]. Dunn, "2 Cor. 111. 17", 311; similarly J. Lambrecht, "Structure and Line of Thought in 2 Cor. 2.14-4.6", Bib 64 (1983), 354, 7; van Unnik, "Unveiled", 161. However, for J. F. Collange, Énigmes de la deuxieme épître aux Corinthiens (Cambridge, 1972), 73 δόξα is the key concept of the chapter.

[109]. Hooker, "Scripture", 299. contra, E.B. Allo, Saint Paul. Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens (Paris, 1936), 86.

However, at v. 11 the referent of τὸ καταργούμενον is clear because the participle is neuter. If τὸ καταργούμενον is interpreted in conjunction with τὸ μένον, what is permanent is the new covenant and what is temporary is the covenant of Moses.[110] This seems clear enough from the series of contrasts offered in vv. 7-11.

At v.13 a third use of the participle τὸ καταργουμένον occurs, as at v. 7, in association with the glory of Moses' face. Since the participle is neuter it would not appear that what is fading away is the glory (which would require a feminine participle) or the law (which would require a masculine form). Rather, what is fading away is the ministry of the old covenant.[111]

In vv. 14 and 15 we learn that what is being read in synagogues is the "old covenant" and "Moses". In this vein, one must think not simply of the old covenant as an idea but also of the signficance of reading this covenant: it is a recital of God's relationship with Israel based on the Torah which Moses received at Sinai.[112] Paul uses the temporary nature of the glory on Moses' face as a symbol for the similar fact about the old covenant and the Torah. The veil that hung over Moses' face hid from the Israelites the temporary nature of the old dispensation, the old covenant embodied in the Torah.[113] In v. 14 Paul

---

[110]. Bultmann, Korintherbrief, 86; Furnish, Corinthians, 205; Windisch, Korintherbrief, 117. For Sanders Ibid., the referent of τὸ καταργούμενον is "the Mosaic dispensation as such".

[111]. Barrett, Second Corinthians, 119; Hooker, "Scripture", 303, understands the reference to be "not to the law itself but what Paul terms the "ministry of Moses". This does not appear to me different in substance from Sander's reference to the "Mosaic dispensation", Ibid. Similarly, Davies, "People", 129; Bultmann, Korintherbrief, 88 n. 34; Furnish, Corinthians, 207. Comp. Watson, Gentiles, 85, who maintains "...the law itself is impermanent..."; R. P. Martin, 2 Corinthians (Waco (TX), 1986), 68 that what is passing is "nomistic religion".

[112]. Similarly, E. Stegemann, "Der Neue Bund im Alten: Zum Schriftverständnis des Paulus in II Cor 3", TZ 42 (1986), 98-9; Collange, Énigmes, 97-98.

[113]. Barrett, Second Corinthians, 119; Bruce, Corinthians, 192; Hooker, "Scripture", 303; Dunn, "2 Cor. 111. 17", 311.

extends his interpretation to the Jews of his day, the sons of the Israelites (v. 13).[114] When the old covenant (v.14) was read in the synagogue the same veil remained over the Jewish heart and resulted in a hardness of heart. This veil symbolized the recognition that the old covenant is temporary and provisional, only to be removed in Christ. If the reading of the old covenant (v. 14) is to be seen as synonymous with the reading of Moses (v. 15), then the reference to the veil (vv. 14, 15) must include the thought of the Torah's contemporary validity.

Several consequences can be drawn from the above analysis. First, when Paul treats the old covenant as temporary and provisional, this is a view that belongs entirely to his Christian theology. Before Paul's conversion the god of this world had blinded him so that he was unable to see the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ (2 Cor. 4. 4, 6).

Second, what Paul states about unbelieving non-Christian Jews is similar to his own experience as a Pharisee before he was converted. Paul's Jewish contemporaries are still unable to see the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. A veil of incomprehension lies over their hearts because they regard it as incredible that the Torah, the old covenant, should be merely temporary. It can be deduced that the nature of the veil is the Jewish conviction that in the Torah they possessed the full and final revelation of God. From the analysis we have thus uncovered a sentiment common to Jews in the synagogue during Paul's day which confirms the picture we have noted in our treatment of earlier pericopes (esp. Rom. 2. 18, 19). Accepting the Torah as the full and final revelation of God was a view which Paul the Christian could no longer affirm. But our analysis of 2 Cor. 3. 4ff. has

---

[114]. Rissi, Studien, 34; Windisch, Korintherbrief, 120; Furnish, Corinthians, 233; Kim, Origin, 12. However, for the view that the children of Israel refer to Paul's adversaries at Corinth see Collange, Énigmes, 88-94, esp. 92. Gaston, Torah, 164 maintains the reference is to the Corinthian Christians.

shown a further, less direct, way in which common denominators within Judaism may be derived from the evidence of Paul's letters.

Let us draw some conclusions from above.[115] We have been considering evidence within the Pauline corpus that may assist in an understanding of common ground shared among Jews of Paul's day. We have termed this endeavour a search for "common denominators" within Judaism. At the outset of the chapter we made a distinction between elements that were certain yet general and those that were of a more detailed nature, which are to be affirmed with less certainty. This initial distinction was made because we are concerned with what Paul may have held common with contemporary Judaism and not what his distinctive contribution was. This line of inquiry was based on the assumption that the greater degree of detail and specificity one attempts to find in the ideas used by an author, the more distinctive will the ideas be. Conversely, the less intent one is on unravelling specific minutiae the greater chance one has of finding common themes which a writer may have shared with those around him.

In our chapter we have drawn upon contexts that have yielded the presence of several categories of Jews: (1) Paul's Jewish-Christian opponents; (2) Paul's Jewish contemporaries, i.e. his countrymen who were his own age; (3) Jews of the synagogue; (4)

---

[115]. There are two further examples within Paul's letters which reflect implicit autobiography. These occur in the use made of ἔθνη (Gal. 2. 15; 1 Thess. 4. 6). Both uses of this word are derogatory in nature. Since we shall discuss this material in later chapters in other contexts we restrict ourselves here to a few remarks. First, 1 Thess. 4.6 states that the Gentiles are used as an illustration of how Christian converts are not to behave. The context is one in which Paul is instructing the Thessalonians that they know how to treat their bodies. This is to be done not like the Gentiles, who are characterized as those with a passion of lust. It is interesting that though the promises of God are available to Gentiles Paul still refers to non-Christian Gentiles in a distinctly Jewish way. (See below ch. 6). The second example which refers to Gentiles in a derogatory sense is found at Gal. 2. 15. Paul is contrasting "Jews by race" with Gentiles, whom he characterizes as "sinners". It is noteworthy that in spite of the fact that the controversy at Galatia involves Jewish Christian opponents to whom Paul is absolutely opposed, he still identifies himself with this group of Jews as against Gentile "sinners" when he is describing his racial identity. (See ch. 5 below).

historic Israel; (5) the imaginary Jewish critic. From the evidence considered (explicit and implicit autobiographical material concerning Paul's pre-Christian life) we have argued that Paul shared the following features with Jews of the time. First, Jews had a pride in their nationality or descent and the privileges accorded to them because of it. Second, they were zealous for the God of Israel. Third, their zeal was focused on the Torah which was the norm, final revelation and the centre of their religious outlook. Fourth, Jews had a conviction that correct behaviour was of fundamental importance, if not in fact the essence of their religious ideals. Fifth, Jews had an absoluteness concerning their fundamental beliefs such that any group or person who attempted to undermine these fundamentals, may be liable to severe treatment. We maintain that these five characteristics are common features of the Jewish religion, attested by the evidence we have considered. If we were to include those elements that are of a more detailed nature but which can only be affirmed with a lesser degree of certainty our list would no doubt be very much longer. This, however, was not the primary concern of our chapter. Our main aim was to ask what were the areas of common ground shared by Paul and other categories of Jews, as witnessed in Paul's letters. Within these parameters we have arrived at a limited number of general characateristics; but these are certain and undisputed.

CHAPTER 4

JEWISH ELEMENTS IN PAUL'S THEOLOGY

In our analysis of Contra Apionem 2.190-219 we argued that many of the ideas presented in these paragraphs contain material that may be classified as commonly held Jewish opinion. Our method for this analysis was to present alongside Contra Apionem corroborative evidence from a wide body of Jewish material to confirm that Josephus' portrayal of the Jewish religion was not simply his own but part of the larger Jewish tradition. In addition to this criterion, we also noted that the material occurs in list form. Specifically, the material is presented as a definition of what is meant by the "precepts and prohibitions of our Law". In the process of defining this expression Josephus presents his ideas in a manner that does not require him to argue for the centrality of any of the ideas he includes. Rather, he assumes their importance by virtue of their inclusion in his definition.

In our last chapter, on autobiography, we noted criteria similar to those just mentioned -- material is presented in the form of a list; and ideas are included whose general meaning and centrality are presupposed. However, the criterion that formed the major part of our analysis of autobiography consisted of the distinction to be made between sure/probable generalizations and less certain nuances. From the previous classification we suggested five hard or certain general "facts" which emerged about what Jews held in common.

In the present chapter our concern will focus on evidence that may be classified as Jewish ideas contained within Paul's Christian theology whose meaning is presupposed. Paul makes no attempt to argue from the evidence that the ideas are significant or central within the Jewish religion. The logic implicit in this type of argument is as follows: if you

asked a Jew if he believed in some basic tenets---that there was one God who created the universe or that there was a future life or that the Law was to be obeyed or that correct behaviour mattered or that circumcision was a requirement of being Jewish---these would not be points that would require much debate. The reason is that on these general points there is common consent among Jews. We can thus infer conversely that ideas mentioned without argument in the course of Paul's exposition were regarded by him as matters of such common consent among Jews that defence or justification would be superfluous. I shall of course exclude specifically Christian ideas which Paul presupposes. Some times ideas which Paul purports to be Christian will also turn out to be distinctly Jewish as defined by the Jewish sources broadly speaking contemporary with the NT.

What we intend to do in the present chapter is to bring together ideas that satisfy the above criterion. This will be done by showing on internal grounds that there exists a body of Jewish opinion that is commonly consented to. The inclusion of these supposed common ideas in arguments, dialogue and ethical teaching in the letters of Paul is based on the assumption that the general meaning and significance of the ideas are understood. It is a reasonable deduction that where unexplained Jewish ideas are discernible in Paul's letters, they represent commonly held Jewish opinion. Our aim first will be to make some broad generalizations. This will be followed by a more precise interpretation of the data, especially as they relate to Contra Apionem. In the course of our analysis, and when required by the evidence, we shall distinguish what was common from what was disputed by considering some evidence in more detail.

We shall begin by assessing those places where a monotheistic view of God is reflected. While everyone already knows that Gentile Christians accepted Jewish monotheism the point of proving it is twofold: (1) The discussion is a good introduction to the method of identifying presuppositions. It will be seen that monotheism is a basic belief

which all appeal to, none argue for. (2) The debate in 1 Cor 8 shows that even when Gentiles accepted Jewish presuppositions, there were still areas of conflict or difficulty. Debates over the consequences drawn from presuppositions illustrate the principle that one may be certain about common Judaism at a general level, less certain at a more particular level. Even when all agree, as in the case of monotheism, points of disagreement still exist. We shall confine ourselves to three passages (1 Cor. 8. 4-6; Rom. 3. 29-30; Gal. 3. 20) where influence of the Shema may be detected. The influence of the Shema is evident in a wide variety of sources at the beginning of the Christian era (e.g. Ant. 5.112; Ap. 2.193; Sib. Or. 3. 629, 4.30; Arist. 132; Philo, Spec. Laws 1.67 comp. 2 Macc. 3.37; Ant. 8.335,7; Sib. Or. 3.760; Apoc. Abr. 17), where the formula εἷς ὁ θεός (or some variant) formula is found.[1] On account of the continued repetition of the opening words of the Shema κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστιν(Deut. 6. 4), there was tendency to shorten the confession to the form εἷς θεός. It is the shortened or abbreviated form that occurs in the three pericopes that concern us.

At the time of Paul universal monotheism was a fact "indisputably self-evident in Israel".[2] It was on the confession of one God that all Judaism was united according to Josephus (Ant. 5. 112). The central place held by the Shema in Jewish liturgy confirms this point. The fact that the Shema was the confession of faith and the ideal was for it to be read and acknowledged by all Jews and recited by males twice daily (m. Ber. 1. 1-4)

---

[1]. E. Peterson,ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ (Göttingen, 1926), 255. Also for inscriptional evidence see J. Frey (ed.), Corpus inscriptionum iudaicarum (Roma, 1952), Vol. 2, 207, 217, 221; P. Rainbow, "Monotheism and Christology in 1 Corinthians" (diss., Oxford, 1987), 22-106. On the NT generally Mk. 12. 29-30; Eph. 4. 6; 1 Tim. 1. 17, 2. 5; Rom. 16. 27.

[2]. F. Mussner, Tractate on the Jews (Philadelphia and London, 1984), 56 also F. Hahn, "The Confession of One God in the New Testament", HBT 2 (1980), 72.

contributes to this general view.[3] And, as the significance of the Shema lay in the fact that it was the central premiss of Jewish thought from which all other Jewish beliefs originated, this adds further support to the central place of Jewish monotheism.[4]

At 1 Cor. 8. 4-6 the monotheistic formula occurs in two forms: οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς (v. 4) and εἷς θεός (v. 6). These formulations occur in a debate that has arisen in the Corinthian Church over the significance which should be given to meat sacrificed to idols. The situation has been perceptively summarized by Godet. Although the Christians at Corinth have come to faith they found themselves in a difficult position. They continued to have non-Christian friends and relations, and could not cut themselves off from them. It was thus possible for them to receive invitations to participate in banquets. As in Judaism, sacrifices were followed by feasts (comp. Dt. 27. 7), and in paganism this meant that one might well partake of meat sacrificed to idols at the temple -- at the worshiper's home or by purchasing leftover meats in the market place.[5]

How was the convert to respond to such a situation? The answer depends on what significance one ascribes to idol worship. If as "those with knowledge" (8. 1) claim idols do not exist (8. 4), then participating in idolatrous feasts would have little significance. Conversely, if one had a robust conscience the matter was very different. The instruction to the "weak" is "beware lest your conscience may be defiled". Whichever of the views towards idols one considers to be the central focus of the pericope, the matter cannot be isolated from the belief that there is one God (8. 4, 6).

---

[3]. Schürer, Jewish People, Vol. 2, 455; V.P. Neufeld, The Earliest Christian Confession (Leiden, 1963), 35.

[4]. J.H. Hertz, The Pentateuch and the Haftorahs (London, 1936), Vol. 5, 100.

[5]. F. Godet, St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians (Edinburgh, 1886-7), Vol.2, 140-142 comp. J. Héring, The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians (London, 1962), 66-67.

A fundamental concern of the pericope is Jewish monotheism[6] and for this to be relevant here we must establish that Paul's use of the idea at 1 Cor. 8. 4-6 is presupposed and not argued. There are several reasons which suggest that the Corinthian converts shared the presupposition. First, Paul appears to be quoting "slogans" from a source at v. 4bc whose attitude is reflected by "we know there are no idols in the world" and "there is no God but one".[7] One indication that this is the case is the formula οἴδαμεν ὅτι. Arndt-Gingrich-Bauer maintain that the inclusion of this phrase shows that a well-known fact is being introduced.[8] The ὅτι has a function similar to the ὅτι recitative, which frees the material from its grammatical context. Furthermore, Paul's style supports the view that what is being alluded to are ideas considered common among the Corinthians. This is evident from the fact that οἴδαμεν ὅτι (4b) is followed by καὶ ὅτι (4c) and in each case the ὅτι introduces parallel clauses: οὐδὲν εἴδωλον.... οὐδεὶς θεὸς....εἷς. By contrast, where Paul is thought to be giving his own ideas the construction is ὅτι followed by a correlative clause.[9] A comparison between 1 Cor. 15. 3b-4 and 1 Cor. 3. 16 illustrates the point. At 1 Cor. 15, where it is generally thought that Paul is quoting a known kerygmatic formula,[10] we find ὅτι followed by καὶ ὅτι (3 times). Conversely, at 1 Cor. 3

---

6. So H. Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians (Philadelphia, 1975), 142; J. Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief (Göttingen, 1910), 219; Lietzmann, Korinther, 37.

7. J.C. Hurd, The Origin of 1 Corinthians (London, 1965), 120f; Lietzmann, Ibid.; C.H. Gilbin, "Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul", CBQ 37 (1975), 530; S. Demke, "Ein Gott und viele Herren", EvTh 36 (1976), 478. For the view that 1 Cor. 8.6 is a community formulation see W. Thüsing, Per Christum in Deum (Münster, 1965), 225.

8. Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich, Lexicon, 558b.

9. eg. 1 Cor. 3. 19, 10. 1-4a, 12. 3, 16. 15; Gal. 4. 13-14a; Phil. 1. 25.

10. So Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, 251ff.

we simply read ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε. The context of 1 Cor. 3 confirms that Paul is giving his own view.

The second reason why Jewish monotheism can be shown to be an idea held by Christians within the Corinthian Church is that the argument of v. 5f presupposes the accuracy of the monotheistic assertion of v. 4. At v. 5 Paul offers a qualification to the general view of one God that takes into account the practical situation confronting the Corinthian church.[11] However, once he has allowed for the qualification of v. 5 he returns at v. 6 to the assertion of God's unity which originated at v. 4. Because of the inherent relationship between v. 4 and vv. 5f the ideas in them must have been true or false. The relationship between vv. 4-6 may be sketched. Notwithstanding that there is one God this does not preclude the possibility (at least for argument's sake)[12] that for some (i.e. "the weak") there may exist "other gods" besides the one God. The disclaimer of v. 5 against polytheism is brought out by the contrast between εἷς θεός (v. 6) and θεοὶ πολλοί (v. 5).[13] Specifically, it is against the view that idols continue to possess some power over those weak

---

[11]. Giblin, "Monotheism", 530; Hurd, Origin, 122; Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, 143.

[12]. καὶ γὰρ εἴπερ is best translated here with Arndt-Gingrich-Bauer, Lexicon, 558b "for even if". This rendering is also supported by Weiss, 1 Korinther, 220 and Hering, 1 Corinthians, 68. However, F. Blass, A. Debrunner and R. Funk, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament (Cambridge and Chicago, 1961), 454 (2) render the concessive in accordance with the Homeric usage "how much". C. K. Barrett, The First Epistle to the Corinthians (London, 1968), 192 maintains Paul is not expressing any definite opinion. "It would exaggerate in one direction to suppose that he denied the existence of beings neither truly God nor human, but it would exaggerate in the other direction if we were to take his 'there are' to affirm the realities of the beings mentioned." (comp. 1 Cor. 10. 20-1.)

[13]. W. Kramer, Christ, Lord, Son of God (London, 1966), 95; R. Kerst, "1 Kor 8.6 - ein vorpaulinisches Taufbekenntnis', ZNW 66 (1975), 132; Hering, 1 Corinthians, 68. For the view that one of the forces against which the Rabbis had to assert belief in God's unity was idol-worship see A. Marmorstein, "The Unity of God in Rabbinic Literature", HUCA 1 (1924), 470ff.

in conscience. The inclusion of v. 5 serves to refocus the monotheistic assertion in the context of the community's practical problems (vv. 7-11). Before addressing the issue Paul asserts (v.6) God's unity a second time and identifies himself and the Corinthians with those who hold such a belief.[14]

From our treatment of 1 Cor. 8.4-6 several conclusions emerge. First, the central place held by Jewish monotheism in the pericope is self-evident. Second, we have shown that Jewish monotheism was a common idea shared by Paul and the Corinthians. It follows from this that the same sentiment held about God's unity present in the Jewish sources of Paul's day was commonly shared by the Christians in Corinth as refelected in 1 Cor. 8. 4-6. Finally, it shows that Gentile Christians took over commonly held Jewish beliefs about God.

The second passage where Jewish monotheism is assumed occurs at Rom. 3. 29-30. The formula present is εἷς ὁ θεός, which serves to confirm the point of v.29, that God shows no partiality: he is the God of both Jews and Gentiles. Paul appeals to this fact to show that "boasting" and the acceptance of the gospel are incompatible. In order to accomplish this Paul appeals to a fact that no Jew would have questioned, namely, God's unity. Paul makes no attempt to argue the centrality or importance of this fact but assumes that this is self-evident and uses the fact in his argument at 3. 27-31 to show that there is one way of salvation for Jews and Greeks.[15]

There are several reasons why 3.27-31 may be instructive for an inquiry which attempts to access the use Paul makes of presupposed ideas relating to Jewish monotheism.

---

[14]. A further point may be added which supports the view that a belief in one God was a commonly held idea is that at v. 6 Paul Christianizes the Shema. Had the belief in one God been questionable the formulation one God - one Lord Jesus Christ does seem very odd.

[15]. H. W. Schmidt, Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer (Berlin, 1963), 74.

In our pericope Paul appears to be in debate with an imaginary Jewish critic.[16] The debate focuses on a Jewish belief which Paul finds antithetical to the gospel. In a moment we shall come to a precise definition of this attitude. There seem to be several internal clues which support the view that Paul is in debate with an objector. The principal one is the diatribal form of the discussion.[17] Paul raises an objection (ie. of his debating partner) (v. 27), and then seeks to answer the objection by appealing to direct rhetorical questions. There are two other features which Stowers lists as characteristic of diatribe that occur in our passage: first, a sudden turning to address an interlocutor; second, the address comes as a response to an objection.[18]

We must now define what is meant by καύχησις , often translated "boasting". There has been much discussion over the referent of this word.[19] While the noun is present here the verb occurs at 2. 17, 23 in connection with θεῷ and νόμῳ respectively. This fact may help in determining the meaning of καύχησις at 3. 27.[20] The relevant point to

---

[16]. Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 1, 244, 7; Barrett, Romans, 82; Michel, Römer, 96; Beker, Paul, 82. While N. A. Dahl, Studies in Paul (Minn., 1977), 198, and Bassler, Impartiality, 158, do not identify the imaginary interlocutor as Jewish the context would seem to require this, especially in the light of Rom. 3. 29-30.

[17]. The diatribal form is noted by Dahl, Paul, Ibid., Michel, Ibid., 95; Käsemann, Romans, 102; Moxnes, Conflict, 34; H. Schlier, Der Römerbrief (Freiburg, Basel, and Wien, 1977), 115 comp. Dunn, Romans, Vol. 1, 184.

[18]. So Stowers, Romans, 99.

[19]. Sanders, Paul, 32-33; H. Räisänen, "Legalism and Salvation by the Law", in S. Pedersen (ed.), Die paulinische Literatur und Theologie (Aarhus, 1980), 70; also Paul and the Law (Tübingen, 1983), 170; H. Hübner, Law in Paul's Thought (Edinburgh, 1984), 115ff; Bultmann, Theology, Vol. 1, 264-267; U. Wilckens, "Was heisst bei Paulus: 'Aus Werken des Gesetzes wird kein Mensch gerecht?'", in Rechtfertigung als Freiheit: Paulusstudien (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1974), 77-109.

[20]. so Raisanen, "Legalism" Ibid.; Wilckens, Romer, Vol. 1, 247; Schlier, Romerbrief, 116; Sanders, Law, 33; N.T. Wright, "The Paul of History and the Apostle of Faith", Tyndale Bulletin 29 (1978), 82; R.W. Thompson, "Paul's Double Critique of Jewish Boasting: A Study of Rom. 3.27 in Its Context,: Bib 67 (1986), 523-524; Dunn, Romans, 185f also "Paul's Epistle to the Romans: An Analysis", in W. Haase (ed.), Aufstieg und Niedergang

be noted is that both of the verbal usages of Καυχᾶσθαι are associated with Jewish status. Specifically, there are national, racial overtones implied in the meaning of the verb at 2. 17, 23 by virtue of the context in which they occur. If a similar meaning is to be allocated to Καύχησις at 3.27 what is intended is boasting of one's Jewish nationality. Since God has entrusted the Jews with the oracles of God (3.2) and chosen them as his special people this implies automatic and permanent privileged status.[21] While the interpretation offered here cannot be proved, it does make reasonable sense of the contents of the pericope. When Paul asks "What becomes of boasting"? he refers to a Jew boasting in his national position and the place allocated to him by God.

If the discussion of 3. 27-31 has as its focus the relationship between the Gospel and the Jew boasting in his status we must ask on what grounds Paul excludes this boast. The answer to this will enable us to establish what Paul and his debating partner agreed on and thus what may be considered commonly held opinion. Paul's answer is twofold: first, Jewish boasting is to be excluded because justification is based not on something that is the unique possession of Jews, it is based on the principle of faith (vv. 27b-28).[22] "For we hold that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law". This is the first point which Paul and his critic shared in common.[23]

der römischen Welt (Berlin and New York, 1987), Vol. 25.4, 2854.

[21]. Cf. Moxnes, Conflict, 40; G. Howard, "Romans 3. 21-31 and the Inclusion of the Gentiles", HTR 63 (1970), 232; Watson, Gentiles, 133-135; Thompson, "Boasting", 522; also J. Barclay, Obeying the Truth (Edinburgh, 1988), 244-245; Dunn Romans, Vol. 1, 185ff.

[22]. On this phrase see most recently H. Raisanen, "Das 'Gesetz des Glaubens' (Rom. 3.27) und das 'Gesetz des Geistes' (Rom. 8.2)", NTS 26 (1979-80), 101-117; "Paul's Theological Difficulties with the Law", in E.A. Livingston (ed.), Studia Biblica 1978 III. (Sheffield, 1980), 308; C.T. Rhyne, Faith Establishes the Law (Chico, 1981), 67-70; and the literature cited by these authors. See also the older literature cited by Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 1, 219-220.

[23]. Dahl, Paul, 189.

More important for our discussion is the second point that Paul shares with the interlocutor. To exclude Jewish boasting Paul appeals to the axiomatic statement on the unity of God: θεὸς εἷς [24] Is God the God of the Jews only or also of the Gentiles? Paul answers emphatically "indeed God is one". He is the creator, ruler, and judge of all mankind. It is this well-known fact, that no Jew would have questioned, that Paul draws upon to support his case. The point Paul is putting to his Jewish critic which the gospel enabled him to see in a new way is that Jews should not boast of their privileged status, otherwise they fail to uphold the picture of God as one who treats his creatures without partiality, both Jews and Gentiles.[25]

From the above it may be deduced that what Paul and the critic agreed upon was first, universal monotheism and second, that justification is effected by God's grace alone. What they did not agree on was the specific application of universal monotheism to the justification of Gentiles. For Paul if God is one it follows that justification was offered to the circumcised and uncircumcised on the same basis by the one God. Paul is thus appealing to a traditional belief about God that all Jews would have shared (God's unity) and drawing a conclusion that most Jews would have disagreed with (salvation is given to all on the same basis).[26] Regardless of this one point of disagreement, Rom. 3. 27-31 serves as a splendid example of how the idea of universal monotheism is used in Paul's letters as a common and understood belief that required no argumentation to enforce its significance and importance.

---

[24]. Moxnes, Conflict, 40. The presupposition of Jewish monotheism here is virtually axiomatic among scholars: Bassler, Impartiality and "Divine Impartiality in Paul's Letter to the Romans", NovT 26,1 (1984), 55; Wilckens, Römer, Vol., 1, 248; Schlier, Römerbrief, 118; Michel, Römer, 96; Cranfield Romans, Vol. 1, 221f; Giblin, "Monotheism", 544.

[25]. Bassler, "Letter", 55.

[26]. Dahl, Paul, 189; Bassler, Ibid.; Moxnes, Conflict, 41.

The third text we shall discuss is Gal. 3. 20. There is a great diversity of opinion about our passage -- there are said to have been between 300 and 430 different interpretations given to Gal. 3. 20.[27] Even if the large numbers of suggested interpretations are exaggerated there is great difficulty surrounding our text.[28]

The context of our verse is a discussion of why God gave the Law (3. 19-25). In an attempt to answer this question the following points are made. First, the Law was added because of transgression. Second, this function of the Law was to last until the offspring comes to whom the promise had been made. Third, the law was administered through angels. Fourth, this administration was accomplished by a "mediator". Then comes the the obscure language of v. 20: the mediator is not one, but God is one. One thing that is self-evident or presupposed in this statement is God's unicity: θεὸς εἷς .[29] The other is that the "mediator" is not "of one" (ἑνός). What is disputed is the relationship between the two parts of the verse: God possesses the quality of "oneness"; the mediator does not. These facts are presented almost as datums, no evidence is offered to substantiate either point. This reasoning supports the general view of Bruce, who maintains that the two statements

---

[27]. F. Sieffert, Der Brief an die Galater (Göttingen, 1899), 209-218; A. Oepke, Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater (Berlin, 1960), 82; Lightfoot, Galatians, 146; F. Lacan, "Le Dieu unique et son médiateur, Gal 3, 20", in L'Homme devant Dieu, Mélanges Henri de Lubac (Paris, 1964), Vol. 1, 113-125.

[28]. Schlier, Galater, 161 n. 2.

[29]. Betz, Galatians, 172; V. Stolle, "Die Eins in Gal. 3, 15-29", in W.Dietrich, P. Freimark, and H. Schreckenberg (eds.), Festgabe für K.H. Rengstorf zum 70 Geburtstag, (Theokratia 2) (Leiden, 1973), 212; Oepke, Galater, 84; Bruce, Galatians, 179. A. Stegmann, "Gal. 3,20", BZ 22 (1934), 35, understands the two-sided claim of v. 20 as an "incomplete syllogism" : two assumed propositions with a common term in each premise. This view is also shared by F. Mussner, Der Galaterbrief (Freiburg, 1974), 249. On the theme of God's unity as it relates to univeral salvation in the present context see R. Bring, Christus und das Gesetz (Leiden, 1968), esp. 86-93; U. Mauser, "Galater III.20: Universalität des Heils", NTS 13 (1966-7), 258-270; Moxnes, Conflict, 213f.

of v. 20 are "completely intelligible if each is taken by itself".[30] If this judgement is correct we need go no further in our inquiry into Gal. 3. 20 to find ways of establishing that the phrase "God is one" is common opinion. Since no proofs or arguments are offered to support the claim for God's unicity, it stands that this assertion is common belief. This same line of reasoning could equally apply to the claim that a mediator lacks the quality of oneness.

There are two objections, however, that could be made against this line of reasoning. First, it does not take into account the fact that v. 20 is an explication of v. 19: δ ε΄ here is explicative. Second, v. 20 a and b are set in an adversative relationship to each other.[31] It is this second point, namely the relationship between the two clauses, that presents the interpretative problem.[32] Whatever is the most suitable solution, it must satisfy the thrust of the context which is to show that the Law is inferior to the promise.[33] One explanation would be that the Law is inferior because of the way it was communicated, that is, through angels by the hand of the mediator (Moses),[34] in distinction from the promise which was given directly from God. The underlying premiss of this type of reasoning is that mediation is inferior to direct intervention.[35] Because the mode of

---

[30]. Bruce, Ibid.

[31]. so Giblin, "Monotheism", 542; Lagrange, Galates, 85.

[32]. See e.g. Stolle, "Eins", 204; Lacon, "Le Dieu", 113ff; Bruce, Galatians, 178; Schlier, Galater, 161.

[33]. Moxnes, Conflict, 212; Hübner, Thought, 26; Mussner, Galater, 247.

[34]. There is general agreement that "the mediator" (v. 20) referred to here is Moses. However, comp. A. Vanhoye, "Un médiateur des anges en Ga 3, 19-20", Bib 59 (1978), 403-411; also Räisänen, Law, 130-131.

[35]. T. Callan, "Pauline Midrash: The Exegetical Background of Gal. 3.19b", JBL 99 (1980), 565; similarily; Betz, Galatians, 171f.

communication of the Law was less direct than that of the promise, the Law was inferior. And to make this case Paul contrasts the way the Law was given, namely, through a multiplicity of mediators (angels and Moses), with the one God who was the direct agent of the promise.[36] It is in the contrast between the direct means of communication of God (3. 6-18) and the non-direct twice removed communication of the law that Paul appeals to the "acclamation" of universal monotheism. However, he does not feel compelled to give arguments for the importance of this idea but assumes that this is self-evident, and appeals to God's unicity to assist in formulating an answer to the question why the law was given.

From a discussion of monotheism we proceed to consider another aspect of Paul's attitude towards God i.e. his just and righteous character. We shall limit our discussion here to the Letter to the Romans. The frequent occurrence of the word θεός in this letter gives some indication of the importance Paul attaches to the task of informing his audience about God. The word θεός, for example, occurs more in Romans than in any other NT document except for the Acts of the Apostles, and with more frequency than in any of Paul's own letters except for the short 1 Thess.[37] Paul's appeal to traditional beliefs about God is especially evident in chapters 2-4, where the following statements occur: "For he will render to every man acording to his works" (2. 6), "For God shows no partiality" (2. 11), "Let God be true" (3. 3), "God is one" (3. 28), God "who justifies the ungodly" and "gives life to the dead" (4. 5, 17).

---

[36]. So Giblin, "Monotheism", 541f; Mussner, Galater, 248-250; Lacan, "Le Dieu", 113ff; Schlier, Galater, 161; Oepke, Galater, 84 comp. Callan, Ibid., 566.

[37]. Moxnes, Conflict, 15ff. On Paul's understanding and use of God in Romans see also L. L. Morris, "The Theme of Romans", in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin (eds.), Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F. F. Bruce (Leicester, 1970), 249-263 esp. 263.

Perhaps more striking than the frequency of statements about God is that throughout chapters 1-4 and 9-11 (in contrast to 5-8) there is sparseness of explicit Christian language and content. Rather, it is God who plays the prominent place in these chapters -- we might even say the "Jewish God", while the figure of Christ remains in the background. Facts like this may lead one to affirm the primary importance Paul gives to presenting a correct understanding of God. Scroggs has described the situation as follows: "Paul has turned the traditional picture of Jewish piety and its interpretation of its history to the wall. He must answer the questions put by that piety, questions stemming out of the awareness that its very existence has been called in question. In the face of Israel's rejection of God's righteousness, both the value of the actual Israel and the trustworthiness of God are at stake".[38] We shall not offer a full-scale treatment of Paul's view of God in Romans, as the study by Moxnes has covered the subject in detail. Our concern is much more limited. We intend to take two pericopes (3. 3-8, 9. 14-21) which indicate Paul's concern to vindicate God's righteousness and determine what may be deemed "undisputed" about God from this evidence.

We must first offer several reasons which suggest that Rom. 3. 3-8 satisfies the criterion given at the beginning of the chapter. The focus of our inquiry is to collect evidence that reflects common ideas among Jews. As indicated already, one way this may be evident is when we find the meaning and importance of a given Jewish idea not explained or elucidated but simply stated and incorporated into an author's argument. In our pericope there exist four clues which suggest that common Jewish ideas are present that satisfy this criterion. The first is that Paul does not engage in detailed discussion with

---

[38]. R. Scroggs, "Paul as Rhetorician: Two Homilies in Romans 1-11," in R.Hammerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs (eds.), Jews, Greeks and Christians Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Studies in Honor of W.D. Davies (Leiden, 1976), 277.

his opponent; rather, he replies by absolute denial.[39] This point is based on the view that the form/structure of the discussion here is that of diatribe.[40] This point gains support from Stowers's analysis, where he suggests that the pericope is best described as "Paul's Dialogue with a Fellow Jew".[41]

The second clue, which follows from the present point, is that Paul's refutations are expressed by emphatic denials (vv. 4, 6) which serve to express "the apostle's abhorrence of an inference which he fears may be (falsely) drawn from his argument".[42] What Paul abhors at v. 4 is the view that because the Jews have not obeyed the covenant promises then God's faithfulness is shown to be ineffective. At v. 6 he denies the view that if Jewish disobedience makes more clearly visible God's righteousness, then is it not unjust that he should inflict his judgement upon Jews? Paul rejects such a deduction completely. There is a third clue. Paul follows each of his denials by appealing to traditional teaching about God: v. 4, God is true (ἀληθής v. 3) to his promises; v.6 God will judge the world, therefore it is impossible for him to be unjust.

---

[39]. Moxnes, Conflict, 39; C. J. Bjerkelund, " 'Nach menschlicher Weise rede Ich'. Funktion und Sinn des paulinischen Ausdrucks", ST 26 (1972), 95. However, Käsemann, Romans, 83 and G. Bornkamm, "Theologie als Teufelkunst", Geschichte und Glaube, (Münich, 1971), Vol. 2, 142, both doubt whether Jewish opponents form part of the background to our verses beyond v. 4.

[40]. So Barrett, Romans, 63; Michel, Römer, 81f; Lagrange, Romains, 62; Bruce, Romans, 95-6; C. H. Cosgrove, "What if Some have not Believed? The Occasion and Thrust of Romans 3. 1-8", ZNW 78 (1987), 93, 96, 101; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 1, 164; Stowers, Diatribe, 119-120; J. Jeremias, "Zur Gedankenführung in den paulinischen Briefen", J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik (eds.), Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan septuagenarii (Haarlem, 1953), 146-149; J. Piper, "The Righteousness of God in Romans 3. 1-8", TZ 36 (1980), 4-5. For a challenge to the view that diatribe influences these verses see D. R. Hall, "Rom. 3. 1-8 Reconsidered", NTS 29 (1983), 183ff.

[41]. S. K. Stowers, "Paul's Dialogue with a Fellow Jew in Romans 3.1-9", CBQ 46 (1984), 717ff; similiarly Jeremias, "Gedankenführung", 147.

[42]. E. de Witt Burton, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek (Edinburgh, 1976), 79 (177).

There is one final indication which suggests that the view of God Paul presents here is traditional. Specificially, at v. 5 we find Paul offering an apology for raising the thought that God could be unjust: κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω .[43] The assumption behind this inclusion is that it is absurd to think that God could be anything other than just in his activity towards his creation. We suggest, therefore, that the above points support the claim that the ideas of our pericope are presupposed and unexplained. Consequently, the view that God is just and deserving of vindication must be a common Jewish sentiment.

We are now ready to consider in greater detail the view of God that Paul offers. We have already indicated that there are two characteristics Paul appeals to: first, God is true/faithful to his promises. Second, he is judge of the world. How does Paul arrive at his view? We may be assisted in answering this question if we observe the structure of vv. 3-8. These verses are focused around three questions, each introduced by εἰ (εἰ δέ) + μή + the negation μὴ γένοιτο (v. 4, 6) followed by a positive statement:

vv. 3f γινέσθω δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἀληθής

vv. 5f ἐπεὶ πῶς κρινεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον

vv. 7f ὧν τὸ κρίμα ἔνδικόν ἐστιν.[44]

From the structure of these verses it is self-evident that the referent of these positive statements at vv. 3f, 5f is God. At v. 7 the referent is those who accuse Paul of teaching the attitude he is repudiating. In order properly to appreciate these statements about God we must clarify the questions that are raised, which these positive statements serve to

---

[43]. Daube, Rabbinic Judaism, 394ff.; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 1, 184; Denny, Romans, 604; C.H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (London, 1932), 45; Kuss, Römerbrief, Vol. 1, 103. Alternatively, see Bjerklund, "Menschlicher", 97f.

[44]. J. Weiss, "Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik", Theologische Studien B. Weiss. zu seinem 70 Geburtstage dargebracht (Göttingen, 1897), 220f. On the question-and- answer structure of these verses see also Stowers, "Dialogue", 715, as well as Rhyne, Faith, 41ff.

answer. The context for 3. 3f is 2. 1f, where Paul argues that Jews will be judged at the last judgement by the same criteria as Gentiles in spite of the fact that Jews do have advantages (2. 9-10; 3. 1-2).[45] It is in this context, where Paul both affirms Jewish native advantages and the Jews' equality with Gentiles, that 3. 3f comes into focus. Paul intends in these verses to curb conclusions about God that could be drawn from the fact that although he has entrusted Jews with advantages some (in fact most) Jews have not been faithful to the promises given to them.[46]

Thus the first question, vv. 3f: if some Jews have been unbelieving or unfaithful to the covenant promises[47] does not this make the faithfulness or reliability of God ineffective? Paul emphatically denies this correlation. He does so first by appealing to the "axiom" that God is true to his promises regardless of man's response. Second, this claim is supported by OT Scripture (Ps. 50. 6 LXX). This text envisages a law-court scene where God is accused of being unjust.[48] The psalmist maintains (and Paul concurs) that whenever God and man plead against each other it is always God who will emerge vindicated (ie. in the

---

[45]. Beker, Paul, 79, however, considers the thought of 3. 1-9 an intrusion to the main argument---a Pauline "aside"---which was necessitated by the polemic of Rom. 2. 26-9.

[46]. Bornkamm, "Teufelkunst", 141; Lietzmann, Römer, 45; Stowers, Diatribe, 119f.

[47]. This content of is maintained by Käsemann, Romans, 79; P. Stuhlmacher, Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus (Göttingen, 1966), 85; Zeller, Juden, 180; K. Kertelge, "Rechtfertigung" bei Paulus (Münster, 1967), 67; Lagrange, Romains, 63; Schlier, Römerbrief, 93; Watson, Gentiles, 124ff esp. 126; Hall, "Rom. 3.1-8", 183. S.K. Williams, "Righteousness of God in Romans", JBL 99 (1980), 268-269, however, specifies the content more precisely as God's covenant with Abraham. Yet Piper, "God", 14, argues that the righteousness referred to here is both God's faithfulness to his promises and punitive judgement. See Cosgrove, "Occasion", 92 (comp. 98), for the view that the unfaithfulness referred to here is Jewish unbelief in Jesus as Messiah.

[48]. Barrett, Romans, 63; A.A. Trites, Witness in the New Testament (Cambridge, 1977), 201; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 1, 165; Rhyne, Faith, 42; Watson, Ibid. 125.

right). Consequently, the opponents' accusation against God and Paul's defence of him is treated as an open and closed case: charge, denial and one case reference (i.e. Ps. 50. 6).[49]

The objector raises a second question at v. 5, which follows naturally from the previous line of inquiry. The focus of the debate is, however, no longer Jewish disobedience to the covenant but false consequences that may be drawn from Paul's use of the Psalm.[50] The question of v. 5 is thus formulated: If our unrighteousness brings to light God's righteousness what should we say? Is God unjust if he inflicts his judgements on Jews on the same basis as Gentiles?[51] Paul's reply is with brevity. First, he offers an apology for entertaining the thought that God could be unjust. Second, he gives a firm denial to the assertion that God could possibly be unjust. Third, he appeals to what is axiomatic in the Jewish tradition: God will judge in the future the entire world[52]. If he is the future judge it is not possible for him to be unjust. For this would be a contradiction in terms.

---

[49]. Moxnes, Conflict, 39. For details regarding Paul's use of Ps. 50.6 see eg. Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 1, 182-183; Lagrange, Romains, 64; Hall, "Rom. 3.1-8", 186-187.

[50]. So Lagrange, Romains, 65; Bornkamm, "Teufelkunst", 144. Watson, Gentile, 126, contends that vv. 5-8 arise from the fact that Paul and his opponent disagree on the nature of "saving covenantal faithfulness". Kuss, Römerbrief, Vol. 1, 103, maintains that vv.5-7 form an excursus to the main line of the argument.

[51]. The word-play between ἀπιστία and πίστιν at v. 4 is evident at v.5: ἀδικία-δικαιοσύνην (also v.7f ἀλήθεια-ψεύσματι); so Michel, Römer, 82; Lagrange, Romains, 64; Williams, "Righteousness", 268; Stuhlmacher, Paulus, 86; Piper, "God", 6; Justification, 105; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 1, 182; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 1, 164; Cosgrove, "Occasion", 101. The connection between God's faithfulness to his people and his righteousness is affirmed by J.C. Beker, "The Faithfulness of God and the Priority of Israel in Paul's Letter to the Romans", HTR 79 (1986), 13-14.

[52]. So Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 1, 166; Schlier, Römerbrief, 95; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 1, 184f; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 73; for documentation of our theme see Zeller, Juden, 151-2.

But it is notable that Paul does not give anything that could be called an argument.[53] Rather, he simply appeals to what was a commonly known truth.

The objector, not satisfied, therefore raises a further question, vv.7f: If through Jewish falsehood (disobedience-unfaithfulness) God's truthfulness abounds and his glory is made more visible as a result why are the Jews judged as sinners? This objection follows from what was said at v. 5 -- is it not enough that Jewish unrighteousness brings to light God's righteousness? Why must the Jews be judged by the same criteria as Gentiles? Paul does not respond to the question but concludes the pericope (v. 8) with the affirmation that those who make false charges against Paul will receive a judgement (presumably from God) which is just.[54] However satisfactory this reply to charges against God's righteousness is to us, Paul felt compelled for the moment, at least, to bring this discussion to a close.

Let us now draw some conclusions from our analysis. First, we have argued that the structure of the material is that of question-answer followed by positive statement. Second, we have assumed with a majority of scholars that a diatribal form of discussion is evident and that the objections are those of an imaginary Jewish critic. Third, we have shown that Paul responds to the objector by appealing to traditional beliefs about God. In addition to God being just and worthy of vindication (a point Paul and his critic must have shared in common), we learn from this pericope that God is faithful to his promises and is the future judge of the world. Consequently, due to the axiomatic character of these statements about God as well as lack of explanation of these statements within their contexts, we maintain that common Jewish sentiments about God are confirmed by our analysis of Rom. 3. 3-8.

---

[53]. Dodd, Romans, 45.

[54]. Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 74.

We shall now proceed to the second pericope (Rom. 9. 14-21) relevant to the theme of the character of God in Romans.[55] We must first establish that Paul presupposes without argumentation his view of God in these verses. At v. 14 the question is raised about the injustice of God. This objection arises as a result of the statement made in the previous paragraph (vv. 10-13) that God's choice of Jacob and his rejection of Esau had nothing to do with what they had done but were due to the call of God. Mal. 1. 2-3 is used to support his view.

In order to avert possible misunderstanding of this assertion Paul attempts to clarify his statement.[56] Specifically, he questions whether this sort of selectivity impugns God's justice. The assumption behind the charge of God's injustice[57] here is that he should choose persons based on racial or moral "distinctives". Consequently, by this criterion God could be pronounced unrighteous in choosing Jacob over Esau.[58] In answer to this charge two points are noteworthy. First, Paul's rebuttal takes the form of an emphatic denial. "Is God unjust? μὴ γένοιτο. Second and equally significant is the form of the question

---

[55]. It is a disputed point whether it is accurate to speak of our pericope as "theodicy". Those in favour of this depiction are E. Kühl, Zur paulinischen Theodicee (Göttingen, 1887), 67ff; Dahl, Paul, 144; Denny, Romans, 664; J. Piper, The Justification of God (Grand Rapids, 1983), 74ff. From an earlier period see also W. Beyschlag, Die paulinische Theodicee (Halle, 1868); E. Weber, Das Problem der Heilsgeschichte nach Römer 9-11 (Leipiz, 1911). However Käsemann, Romans, 267, C. Müller, Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk (Göttingen, 1964), 83ff. and J. Munck, Christ and Israel (Philadelphia, 1967) 44, dispute this view.

[56]. While the diatribal style in these verses is evident the presence of actual opponents is contested (esp. vv. 14-18); so Käsemann, Romans, 267; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 253; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 482 n. 2. The case is otherwise regarding vv. 19ff so Stowers, Diatribe, 99. For the view that the objectors here are Jewish see Denny, Romans, 661; Michel, Römer, 238; Müller, Gottes, 85; Schlier, Römerbrief, 294; Luz, Paulus, 73.

[57]. The Greek word ἀδικία is thought to refer to God acting in a way that is incompatible with who he is so: Piper, Justification, 71-3, similarly Kühl, Theodicee, 18.

[58]. Piper, Ibid., 71. In addition to the cited material on vv. 14ff. see F. Siegert, Argumentation bei Paulus (Tübingen, 1985), 128-131.

μὴ ἀδικία. What is important in this regard is that Paul uses the negative μή, which expects a negative reply. The form of the question itself suggests that Paul's view of God's justice was a presupposed, unargued-for idea (comp. also Rom. 3. 3, 5f; 11. 1, 11).[59] Dunn rightly maintains that Paul's question forms part of "an in-house discussion". Thus, we have questions posed by a Jew for Jews who would not have debated the point that God was righteous.[60]

Nonetheless, Paul supports his denial by appealing to OT scripture at vv. 15, 17 (vv. 16, 18 draw out the consequence of Paul's use of each of the OT texts). Vv. 15, 17 and 16, 18 are each set in parallel to support the claim at v. 14b.[61] The point to be noted from the emphatic way Paul negates the question about God's justice is that he presupposes that even accounting for God's selectivity he is just.[62] Therefore, a distinction can be made between the presupposition that God is just and "proofs" adduced for the μὴ γένοιτο denial of God's injustice. Thus, we maintain that the content of vv. 15ff is not a proof for God's justice but a denial of his injustice.[63]

If God's justice is presupposed in these verses, are there other commonly held Jewish beliefs about God present in Paul's argument? Let us begin with a brief analysis of vv. 15-

---

[59]. Piper, Justification. 70.

[60]. Dunn, Romans, Vol. 2, 551.

[61]. Kuhl, "Theodicee", 67 n. 2; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 485; Lagrange, Romains, 233f; Käsemann, Romans, 267; Munck, Israel, 45; Schlier, Römerbrief, 295; Piper, Justification, 138-9; Siegert, Paulus, 129-130.

[62]. Michel, Römer, 207, has correctly stated the matter: "Die scharf Abwehr μὴ γένοιτο (חָלִילָה) zeigt, dass Paulus auf keinen Fall Gott und Gerechtigkeit auseinanderreissen kann (Rom 3,5)".

[63]. So Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 253; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 482; H. Hübner, Gottes Ich und Israel (Göttingen, 1984), 39.

21. We have already noted that v. 15 serves as one reason for the denial of v. 14b. Paul appeals to Exod. 33. 19 in the LXX, which reproduces the Hebrew quite accurately. However, he uses this text with a different emphasis. Unlike the MT or LXX, which both stress the certainty of divine grace for God's elect, Paul wishes to emphasize the freedom and independence of God's choice. Yet this freedom is not without qualification. Paul infers from the Exodus text that God's freedom is qualified by his mercy (v. 16). Consequently, God's activity is not based on desire or human effort (i.e. a striving towards a goal) but on his merciful character.[64]

A second text is now adduced to support the claim of v.14b. The text cited is Exod. 9.16, whose meaning approaches that of the MT more than the LXX.[65] In its original context the citation serves to show that God prevented Pharaoh from being slain by boils in order to magnify his mighty power. Paul alters the language of the original by generalizing its meaning in order to exonerate God's name.[66] Yet his appeal to Exod. 9. 16 serves to exhibit the extent of God's absolute sovereignty, as the summary at v. 18 confirms: God shows mercy on whom he wishes and hardens whom he wishes.

---

[64]. This interpretation is held by Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 483-485; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 254; Denny, Romans, 662; Barrett, Romans, 185f; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 2, 200; H. Räsänen, "Römer 9 -11: Analyse eines Geistigen Ringens" in W. Haase (ed.), Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin and New York) Vol. 25.4, 2902; Kuhl, "Theodicee", 70f.; similiarly Luz, Paulus, 74.

[65]. For the important alteration in the LXX see Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 486; Hübner, Gottes, 40.

[66]. The point of exonerating God's name is a central emphasis in Piper, Justification, passim e.g. 161 : "It can scarcely be overemphasized that, for the sake of Paul's defense of God's righteousness, in Rom 9:15 and 17 Paul employs OT texts in which the exercise of God's sovereign freedom, in mercy and in hardening, is the means by which he declares the glory of this name!"

It is at vv. 19f that the presence of an imaginary objector is clearly evident. Stowers gives four indicators of this fact:[67] first, a sudden turning to address a partner in the dialogue; second, the use of ὦ ἄνθρωπε (v. 20) to address this partner; third, the use made of rhetorical questions (vv. 20, 21). Fourth, the address is a response to an objection. The objection raised here directly follows from v. 18. If God shows mercy to some and hardens others how can God blame those who have "resisted" his will? The answer given is not that of a rational explanation. Rather, the rebuttal comes in the form of rhetorical questions.[68] The language of these questions is focused on the imagery of the potter and the clay (comp. Is. 29. 16, 45. 9; Jer. 18. 2-6; Wis. 15. 7; Sir. 33. 13) and serves to enforce the point of God's ulitimate sovereignty.[69] Since God is the creator and man his creation, man is in no position to question the will of God.[70] As a potter makes some vessels for noble use and others for menial ones so too God exercises selectivity in his dealing with man. Nevertheless this activity is an expression of his merciful will.

From this analysis several points emerge which suggest that Paul incorporates without argumentation other commonly held Jewish ideas about God. First, God has power to do in his world as he wishes and by so doing determines the events of history. The appeal to the OT citations confirms this (also Jer. 32. 17ff; Wis. 12. 12). Second, God as creator can deal with his creation in whatever way he chooses (v. 20f.) Third, God's

---

[67]. Stowers, Diatribe, 99; also Kuhl, "Theodicee", 71; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 489; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 258; Hübner, Gottes, 46. Comp. Dunn, Romans, 555, who maintains that although a diatribe style is clearly in view, a specific objector may not be. However, Dunn does concede that the discussion continues here to be about topics which would have been of concern to Jews.

[68]. Dahl, Paul, 144; similarly Munck, Israel, 58.

[69]. See Piper, Justification, 174-178, for the view that Sir. 33 best corresponds to Paul's language.

[70]. Dahl, Paul, 144; similarily Barrett, Romans, 187f.

absolute freedom of choosing and rejecting whomever he wishes is not exercised in the manner of a tyrant. His freedom is tempered by his mercy (so vv. 15, 16, 18). [71] Fourth, God's freedom tempered by mercy is balanced by his justice.[72] It is precisely the two attributes, mercy and justice, that form, according to Moore, "the two primary 'norms' of God's dealing with men individually and collectively".[73] Finally, God always exercises his absolute freedom tempered by mercy with a good end in view. The purpose of divine selectivity in the present context was to create a new community of God's people consisting of Gentiles and a Jewish remnant (vv. 24ff; comp. e.g. Gen. 12. 3). These five general points are widespread within the Jewish tradition.

From Paul's attitude towards God we move to his insistence that Jews possess native advantages or privileges. We have already seen evidence for this in our discussion of Rom. 9. 4ff. This, however, is not the only place where Jewish advantage is mentioned by Paul. In the Epistle to the Romans several other texts may prove illuminating (e.g. 1. 16; 2. 9-10; 3. 1-2; 11. 28b-29). Before considering these texts we must first establish that the notion of Jewish advantage in each of them is not argued for but assumed because its significance is self-evident. At 1. 16 and 2. 9-10 we find the formula "to the Jew first and also to the Greek". What is striking about this is that it occurs in contexts where he is

---

[71]. On the theme of God as merciful see esp. Sir. 50.19; also Ass. Mos. 12. 7; IQH 4. 32f, 7. 27, 9. 8, 9. 14, 10. 14-23, 11. 29-32, 13. 17, 15. 13-16, 16. 9.

[72]. This point is amply testified in the Jewish tradition: Ex. 34. 7; Hos. 2. 19f, 11. 8-9; Ps. 145. 8; Dan. 9. 7, 9; 2 Macc. 1. 24; Wis. 11. 21-12. 2; Philo, On Creation 6. 7f; Gen. Rabb. 12. 15, 39. 6; Lev. Rabb. 10. 1; Mek. Besh 6.

[73]. Moore, Judaism, 1927, Vol. 1, 387, also 379ff., 386ff. See also L. Silbermann, "God: Justice and Mercy", Enc. Jud. Vol. 7, 669-670, and A. Marmorstein, The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God (New York, 1968), Pt. I, 43-53, 181f. On the relation between justice and mercy in Palestinian literature see Sanders, PPJ, passim esp. 124-125, 421; M. Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind (New York, 1965), esp. 219.

arguing for the equality of Jews and Gentiles. At 1. 16 the subject is that of the offer of salvation while at 2. 9-10 it is the final judgement of God. More importantly, in these contexts where the equality of Jews and Gentiles is referred to the word πρῶτον occurs. Davies maintains that its inclusion is "highly noticeable and awkward".[74] This is especially so because it does not accord with the universalistic thrust that predominates in Romans (e.g. 3. 22; 10. 12). Paul inserts the highly noticeable word πρῶτον to point out that Jews are in some sense to be considered "first". The point is not argued for but presupposed, which justifies its inclusion in the present discussion.

The second text that suggests Jewish advantage is Rom. 3. 1-2. Here in fact the Greek word for advantage (περισσόν) occurs in a context where the discussion is focused on whether Jews possess advantages. Paul affirms that Jews can claim advantages, and supports this by offering what begins like a list of advantages themselves. Thus, he begins with πρῶτον μέν ; however the list is cut short and the expected ἔπειτα δέ is absent. Rather, we are given only one point which serves to show that Jews do possess advantages: They were "entrusted with the oracles of God". The remainder of the list is deferred until 9. 4ff., where Paul states what the other Jewish privileges were. It may be of some importance to observe both at 3. 1-2 and 9.4-5 that the advantages are presented in list form. Paul makes no attempt to argue that Jews in fact had advantages: he simply assumes this and proceeds to list them, presumably because Jews of Paul's day (at least those in Rome) would have not contested his list of attributes.

This brings us to the third text relevant to our discussion (Rom. 11. 28b-29). In these verses we are presented with two distinct attitudes regarding Jews. From the point of view of their relation to the Gospel the Jews are referred to as enemies. Conversely, from the point of view of God's elective plan and purposes they are beloved. The

---

[74]. Davies "People", 147.

parallelism reflected in these verses is clearly evident and may suggest that we are dealing with undisputed realities from two different points of view. These brief comments made on the three texts suggest that Paul did not offer arguments to sustain his view of Jewish advantage. He assumes the importance and validity of this idea, and appeals to the notion in connection with his detailed concerns about the Roman church.

We must now attempt to determine what is meant by Jewish privilege or advantage from the above texts. If we begin at 1. 16 and ask in what sense the Jews are "first", scholarly opinion gives us two main suggestions. (1) The Jews were the first to have been offered the Gospel.[75] This was attested by the fact that evangelists portray Jesus going to the Jewish nation (Lk. 4. 16). This point is also made in Acts (13. 14ff.) where it is stated that the normal practice was to begin a work in a new city by first going to the synagogue. (2) A second view is that the Jews were considered first because they held a special place in Heilsgeschichte.[76] The difficulty with both of these suggestions is that they cannot be tied directly to the context of either 1. 16 or 2. 9-10.[77] Both suggestions have some plausibility but neither can be proved. We shall be on firmer ground if we appeal in the first place to examples where Jewish advantage is stated explictly.[78]

One such example is Rom. 3. 1-2. Here Paul raises the logical question that follows from chapter 2. 1ff. "What advantage has the Jew?" In chapter 2 Paul has conducted a

---

[75]. Dodd, Romans, 9; Barrett, Romans, 29; TDNT Vol. 6, 869; Lagrange, Romains, 19.

[76]. Käsemann, Romans, 23; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 1, 86; Althaus, Römer, 12; comp. Black, Romans, 44.

[77]. Dunn, Romans, Vol. 1, 40 seems to adopt both views.

[78]. So Kuss, Römerbrief, Vol. 1, 22; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 1, 91.

fourfold attack on the Judaism of his day (by means of the imaginary critic).[79] The focus of the attack is whether it is legitimate for a Jew to appeal to moral superiority, the possession of Torah, Jewish nationality, and circumcision to justify the view that at the last judgement Jews will be judged by a different set of criteria than Gentiles. Paul responds in a clearly negative way to each of the critic's objections. Yet, contrary to what one may expect, he enthusiastically affirms that Jews do still have advantages (3. 2). Is this an example of Pauline incoherence? One possible explanation is to recall that in the OT God chose Israel out of all the people of the earth to become his special people and instituted circumcision as a token of this relationship. If, however, the Jews have no advantages, then either the OT as a true witness to this or God's faithfulness is called into question.[80] The problem that confronts Paul is how God's impartiality towards Jews and Gentiles alike can be reconciled with faithfulness to the covenant promises and to the Jews as recipients of these promises.

Paul attempts to refute the conclusion that could be drawn from Rom. 2 (i.e. that Jews have no advantages) by giving what appears at first sight to be a list of advantages Jews possessed. However, he interrupts himself and gets no further than point one of his refutation -- the Jews were entrusted with the λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ . In order to appreciate how the λόγια are indeed an advantage we must determine what is meant by this phrase. Commentators affirm two predominant views. (1) the phrase can refer to the OT in its entirety.[81] (2) it is the OT promises that are meant.[82] A third view is that of Doeve, who

---

[79]. See details on the use of diatribe in Romans 2 in the discussion in ch. 8 below.

[80]. Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 1, 176f.

[81]. Kuss, Römerbrief, Vol. 1, 100; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 1, 179; Hübner, Law, 56, 89 n. 16; Barrett, Romans, 62; Lagrange, Romains, 62.

[82]. Denny, Romans, Vol. 2, 604; Althaus, Römer, 26; Räisänen, Law, 70; T. W. Manson, "St. Paul's Letter to the Romans--and Others", Studies in the Gospels and Epistles (Manchester, 1962), 97; Lietzmann, Römer, 45; Black, Romans, 62; Piper, Justification, 105.

maintains that the λόγια refer to the Holy Scripture as God's revelation.[83] The concept of Scripture, however, has two separate yet related functions. It may function as divine utterance to be carried out by man as well as prophecy for the future. The former places its emphasis on directives for living in the present (halakah) while the latter on the story of God's plan and purpose for his creation in the future (haggadah). Both aspects can be encompassed by the term λόγια (comp. Philo, Praem 1). Paul is distingishing between Scripture as commandment/injunction and as the story of what will occur to God's people in the future.[84] Paul asserts that Jews have advantages, one being the OT revelation. However, it is not an advantage if one regards it only as a commandment. In chapter 2 Paul has already argued that the Torah is not an advantage if one conceives of it solely in terms of νόμος, because Torah can only be an advantage to a Jew if he keeps the law. It is here, according to Paul, that the Jews have failed (2. 12f.). However, the OT is an advantage when the Jew considers that he has been entrusted with God's future promises. In particular, God has not completed the process of bringing to fruition his promises, and the Jews shall be recipients of these gifts.

What is lacking in each of the above three explanations is that none of them makes the best sense of the flow of the argument. Having concluded chapter 2 with the claim that

---

An exception to either of the suggested views is Stuhlmacher, Paulus, 85, who maintains the λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ may be interpreted by the δικαιώματα τοῦ νομοῦ at Rom. 2.26.

[83]. J. W. Doeve, "Some Notes with Reference to τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ in Romans 3.2", Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan septuagenarii (Haarlem, 1953), 111-123.

[84]. This sort of distinction is what J. A. Sanders has classified under the rubric of muthos and ethnos and story and laws. See "Torah and Christ", Int. 29 (1975), 372-373, and "Torah and Paul" in W.A. Meeks and J. Jervell (eds.), God's Christ and his People: studies in honour of N. A. Dahl (Oslo, 1977), 138 also L. M. Pasinya, La Notion de Nomos (Rome, 1973).

Jews have no privileges and begun chapter 3 with the point that they do have advantages, what is required is a point that supports either claim. To suggest that an advantage the Jews still retain is either the OT in its entirety, the OT promises, or Holy Scripture as testimony to God's activity in the future seems to break the thrust of the argument begun at 2.1ff.

We do better justice to the flow of the argument if we recognize that the subject of 3. 1ff. focuses on God's covenant with Israel.[85] At Rom. 9.4ff., when Paul continues his list of Jewish privileges, they are focused precisely on a definition of what it means to be a member of the people of God. Therefore, notwithstanding that the "oracles" at Rom. 3. 2 refer in some sense to the OT, perhaps the distinction made by Davies between privilege and advantage is relevant here.[86] While it is true to say that Jews by virtue of their ethnicity or nationality do have advantages, this must not be understood as a privilege or as a preference. To quote Davies, "Paul's quandary was precisely this: how to do justice to the historical role of his own people without thereby, ipso facto, elevating their ethnic character to a position of special privilege."[87] It is this quandary which is at play between the lack of privilege for which Paul argues in chapter 2 and the advantage he confirms that Jews still possess at Rom. 3. 1ff. To what advantage, then, is Paul referring? It is the fact that in the OT the Jews remained by virtue of historical priority and ethnicity the covenant people of God. Paul maintains that this was the Jews' "first" advantage, of which 9. 4-5 gives a more detailed definition.

---

[85]. Hall,"Rom. 3:1-8", 184-185; Williams, "Righteousness", 268-267; Watson, Gentiles, 124, similiarly W.S. Campbell, "Romans III as a Key to the Structure and Thought of the Letter", NovT 23 (1981), 33.

[86]. Davies, "People", 147.

[87]. Davies, Ibid.

The third text relevant to our theme is Rom. 11. 28b-29. This pericope is of interest to us since in these verses Paul presents a contrast between two sentiments regarding Jews. One is with regard to the Gospel. A second focuses on the historic plan and purpose of God. In these verses we find set in antithesis the Jews portrayed both as enemies of God and as his beloved ones.[88] They are enemies by virtue of their rejection of the Gospel. Yet they are beloved on account of God's faithfulness to the promises made to the patriarchs and secured for their descendants. Proof of God's consistent love toward the patriarchs is the fact that he has never revoked the χαρίσματα or κλῆσις τοῦ θεοῦ from them.[89]

We should begin by noting an interpretation generally agreed upon among commentators: that χαίσματα (gifts) at 11. 29 refer to the privileges bestowed upon the "Israelites" at 9.4-5.[90] This suggests a close relationship between 9. 4-5 and 11. 29. There is a second way in which these two texts are interrelated. If the κλῆσις τοῦ θεοῦ at 11. 29 is understood as God's calling of Israel to be his special people then this word expresses the

---

[88]. On the rhetorical nature of these antitheses see B. Reiche, "Um der Väter willen (Röm 11.28)", Judaica 14 (1958), 106-114; also Dunn, Romans, Vol. 2, 684.

[89]. How one understands the phrase at v. 29 depends in part on the meaning given to καί. If καί is taken in a copulative sense then the two nouns are separate elements, which offer proof for God's faithfulness: so Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 581; Black, Romans, 148; Denny, Romans, 684; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 2, 258. Conversely, if the καί is taken explicatively, then κλῆσις is considered to be a particularization of the χαρίσματα : so Michel, Römer, 252; Blass, Debrunner, and Funk, Grammar, 442 (9); comp. Schlier, Römerbrief, 342. For the interpretation of the phrase as hendiadys see J. Calvin, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians (Edinburgh, 1961), 257; C. Spicq, "Ἀμεταμέλητος dans Rom 11.29", RB 67 (1960), 210ff; also Käsemann, Romans, 316. However, Dunn, Romans, Vol. 2, 686, sees no reason to choose between these two views.

[90]. e.g. Denny, Romans, 684; Käsemann, Romans, 316; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 581; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 2, 258; Dunn, Ibid.

same reality as the clause of 9.4-5 οἵτινες... Ἰσραηλῖται.[91] It is precisely these privileges at 9.4-5 which may be considered just as irrevocable as the χαρίσματα καὶ... κλῆσις τοῦ θεοῦ at 11.29. If this is so, then we must be close to bedrock Jewish thought (i.e. what was common to its ranks).

We have presented an argument from the association of ideas. First, we have suggested that there exists a correspondence between Rom. 9. 4 and 3. 2. This is especially so if the advantages which the Jews continue to possess (3. 2) are those which are more fully elucidated at 9. 4-5. Thus, the λόγια intended at 3.2 are the OT revelation, which bears witness to the fact that the Jews for reasons of ethnicity continue to have advantages. Second, we have suggested that there may exist a similarity of ideas between 11. 29 and 9.4-5. And if the irrevocable character of the χαρίσματα and κλῆσις τοῦ θεοῦ of 11.29 equally applies to the privileges of 9.4-5 then we must be near to commonly held Jewish sentiment.

We have left our previous discussion on Paul's attitude towards God with the affirmation that God's selectivity has the end result of producing a new people of God consisting of Gentiles and a Jewish remnant. First, God's selectivity was to provide for Gentile entry into God's family. Second, it was to enable believing Jews to possess all the privileges God had intended for them. We now consider the evidence relating to these two points.

Let us begin with Paul's attitude to the Jewish remnant. In spite of the fact that it was God's intention that all Jews would accept his promises, Jewish history proves that they do not. In fact, when one recalls Israel's past the notion of a faithful Israel within Israel is self-evident. Alongside national Jewry a remnant community also existed. This idea of

---

[91]. The interpretation taken here is noted by Cranfield Ibid. as possible.

a remnant served to help resolve the tension between the actual experience of Israel's failure, disobedience and defeat and the fact that she was God's divinely elected people.[92] Because Paul's problem was the incompatibility between historical reality (the rejection by a majority of Jews that Jesus was Messiah), and divine intention (the promise of Messiah was to arise from within the Jewish people), it was appropriate that Paul appeal to precisely the idea used by OT writers to help resolve a problem similar to that with which Paul was confronted in Rom. 9-11: the hiatus between intention and reality.

The idea of the remnant in the Pauline material occurs at 9. 24ff. and 11. 1ff. These pericopes enhance the general point that God's word has not failed despite Jewish unresponsiveness to the Gospel (9. 6). As we have seen in our discussion of Jewish privilege and Paul's attitude towards God, he does not argue for the primacy of these ideas within the Jewish tradition; he assumes them. This is equally the case in Paul's appeal to the notion of a Jewish remnant. This point can be illustrated by the fact that Paul's method of referring to the idea of the remnant is simply to quote OT Scripture. The reason for this seems to have been that the authority of OT Scripture spoke for itself. Indeed, if the notion of a remnant did not have the place of importance within the OT which Paul seems to assume, his appeal to a remnant theology at 9. 27ff. and 11. 1ff. would have proved very ineffective.

At 9. 27ff. Paul utilizes Is. 10. 22 and 1. 9 to make the point that selectivity within Israel is borne out from Scripture. These Isaiah references occur in a catena of OT texts which are adduced in order to apply to a concrete situation Paul's discussion of 9. 14ff.[93]

---

[92]. R. E. Clements, "'A Remnant Chosen by Grace' (Romans 11.5"), in D. A. Hagner and M. J. Harris (eds.), Pauline Studies: Essays presented to F. F. Bruce (London and Grand Rapids, 1980), 107-108. See also G. Hasel, The Remnant (Berrien Springs, 1974), for a full treatment of remnant in the OT.

[93]. Dodd, Romans, 160. On these verses see also Hübner, Gottes, 49-59.

As we have noted in an earlier connection, Paul maintains that God's justice is not impugned inspite of divine selectivity. This is so because the positive result of his selectivity is the creation of a universal community of God's people. To substantiate the point Paul cites from the OT.[94] He first cites from Hos. (2. 23; 1. 10) to show that Gentiles were to be part of God's new community. Second, Paul appeals to Is. 10. 22ff. and 1. 9 to show that the other part of God's new community includes a believing Jewish remnant. Therefore, we can see that both Gentile entry and the notion of a Jewish remnant are ideas assumed within the OT.

The second reference to the idea of the remnant (11. 1ff.) occurs in a context where Paul is refuting the idea that God has rejected his people. Paul maintains that this is not so by first appealing to his own experience and second to OT Scripture. The disclaimer from the OT begins with the affirmation that God did not reject his people (as a whole). This could not have been so, since he had foreknowledge and chose the Jews as his special people.[95] Yet when we recall Israel's past it shows that faithful Israel always consisted of a remnant. Paul argues his case by quoting three texts from 1 Kgs. 19 (vv. 10, 14, 18) which serve as a reminder to his audience. The significance of these quotations is evident in the contrast made between 1 Kgs. 19. 10, 14 and 1 Kgs. 19. 18. The historical situation to which these texts refer is as follows. As Elijah perceived the religious situation of his day the nation was in complete apostasy. The consequence of this was a uniform revolt against God. This was the case except for the example of Elijah (1 Kgs. 19. 10, 14) and the faithful remnant of 7,000 men who did not submit themselves to the pagan deity, Baal (1 Kgs. 19.

---

[94]. See Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 499-503, for alternatives between the Greek text of 9. 27ff and that of the LXX and MT.

[95]. Munck, Israel, 107; Cranfield, Ibid. Vol. 2, 545.

18). It is at this place that the illustration from history ends and Paul's application to the present (ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ) is taken up.[96] Just as Israel had not completely rejected God in Elijah's day, so too the same may be said during the time of Paul. The situation of his own day may be seen as an "analogy" to that of Elijah's.[97] During both historical periods God had his remnant (λεῖμμα), which consisted during Elijah's day of 7,000 faithful Jews and in Paul's day of Jewish Christianity. Therefore, Paul can conclude, as had Elijah, that God has not cast off his people.

In our treatment of the idea of a Jewish remnant we have shown that in Paul's appeal to this idea common Jewish sentiment is reflected because he offers no argumentation for the importance or significance of the notion of remnant. Rather, Paul simply quotes OT texts that reflect the existence of a Jewish remnant in Israel's historical past. This was done, we suggest, because the notion of a remnant was genuinely acknowledged as part of what constituted known Jewish beliefs of Paul's day.

We turn now to the second category of evidence relating to the creation of another "Israel" -- Gentile entry into the people of God. We must at the outset state that the idea of offering the Gentiles membership in the people of God can be documented from the time of the Abrahamic covenant (Gen. 12. 3; 18. 18).[98] This view is reflected in Daniel as well, e.g. 7. 14 "And to him was given dominion and glory and kingdom that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall

---

[96]. Barrett, Romans, 208.

[97]. So Siegert, Paulus, 164; Clement, "Remnant", 105. It is held by some that a typological relationship between the time of Elijah and Paul is suggested by this verse. See e.g. Munck, Israel, 108; Käsemann, Romans, 300; Müller, Gottes, 44f; comp. Wilckens, Römer, II, 237; Luz, Paulus, 81. Dunn, Romans, Vol. 2, 638, prefers an eschatological understanding of the relationship between the time of Elijah and Paul: "...election and remnant 'now' being experienced in and through Paul's ministry are part of the climax of salvation-history thus foreshadowed in the Elijah episode".

[98]. J. D. G. Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul", BJRL 65 (1983), 114.

not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that should not be destroyed" (comp. Dan. 2. 44; 7. 22; Is. 66. 12, 19-21; Ps. 72. 11; Zech. 14. 16f). This view of Gentile entry is not restricted to the OT. It is also a view reflected in contemporary Jewish material, e.g. Ps. Sol. 17.33 " And he shall purge Jerusalem and make it holy, even as it was in the days of old, so that the nations may come from the ends of the earth to see his glory, bringing as gifts her sons that had fainted and may see the glory of the land wherewith God had glorified her" (comp. 1 En. 90. 30; Sib. Or. 3. 710). In spite of the fact that later Judaism had more diverse views on the fate of the Gentiles, the Judaism of Paul's day retained the general sentiment of Daniel and the Psalms of Solomon.[99]

This point is confirmed by the Pauline corpus. In Galatians, for example, where the Gentile problem is fiercely debated, the controversy is not over whether Gentiles should become members of God's family.[100] This fact neither Paul nor his opponents doubted. In fact, it formed the basis of their debate. The controversy was over terms or conditions for entrance into the "seed of Abraham". In 1 Corinthians Gentile entry is understood in the missionary maxim : to the Greek and also to the Jew (9. 1). Similarly, in Romans the offer of righteousness to the Jew is extended also to the Greek (1. 16; 3. 22). In Rom. 9-11 the point regarding Gentile entry is also clearly evident. Here the foci of discussion relating to Gentiles are twofold: first, they are to assist in bringing Jews to the recognition of Jesus as Messiah; second, Gentiles will go to Jerusalem when the Messianic deliverer comes. Let us consider these two points in some detail. The idea that Gentiles played a part in the salvation of Jews is first found at 11.11ff. The context in which this occurs is

---

[99]. Sanders, PPJ, 206-210 esp. 210 n. 27; also Jesus, 213-218; D. Sperber, "Gentile", Enc. Jud. Vol. 7, 410-411

[100]. Sanders, Law, 18ff.

a discussion of the question of the extent of Jewish rejection in light of the fact that a remnant exists. Paul responds to the question first by denying emphatically that Israel has completely rejected the promise of Messiah. Second, he contrasts two verbs and by so doing draws a distinction between a fall that could be restored (ἔπταισαν) and one that was final (πέσωσιν). Therefore, Paul's question at v. 11a may be formulated thus: have the Jews outside of the remnant fallen so as never to return to the place of accepting the Messianic salvation?

In vv. 11b-14 Paul proceeds to offer a reason for refusing to think Israel's fall was conclusive.[101] He maintains that Israel's fall was to serve a definite purpose. In the present context Paul makes clear that the process of Gentile entry is directly related to Jewish "trespass" (παράπτωμα). The immediate result of Jewish apostasy was to introduce a new universal community which includes the nations (comp. Acts 13. 46, 18. 6). However, in addition, Gentile entry was to serve the purpose of provoking the Jews to jealousy which in turn was to have the overall effect of eliciting a favourable Jewish response to the Messianic promises.[102]

From the above it is evident that Paul associates four ideas together in his scenario: first, the trespass of the Jews; second, the entry of the Gentiles; third, the jealousy of the Jews and finally the salvation of the Jews. The interrelationship of these four ideas is undisputed, as the context makes clear. The interdependence of these ideas on one another would seem to preclude the possibility that an "argument" for Gentile entry exists or was required. The central role Gentiles play in this pericope supports this contention. Jewish

---

[101]. M. Rese, "Die Rettung der Juden nach Römer 11" in A. Vanhoye (ed.), L'Apôtre Paul (Leuven, 1986), 426.

[102]. J. W. Aageson, "Scripture and Structure in the Development of the Argument in Romans 9-11", CBQ 48 (1986), 282; Räisänen, "Römer 9-11", 2913, 2919. The interrelatedness of ideas may also be noted by observing the rhetorical features in the argument. On this see esp. Siegert, Paulus, 165-167.

disobedience allowed for the salvation of Gentiles. As a consequence of their new status, Gentiles were to provoke Jews outside the remnant to be saved.

There is additional evidence at 11. 25 relevant to the discussion of Gentile entry. Paul states that Jewish hardening will only last "until the fullness of the Gentiles". The issue raised by this phrase is how long the entry of the Gentiles will continue. Sanday and Headlam suggest that the noun πλήρωμα refers to the totality of the Gentile world.[103] Therefore, Jewish hardness will remain until the totality of the Gentile world believe the Gospel. They support their view by appealing to Jewish texts on completed numbers, e.g. Syr. Apoc. Bar. 23.5 and 2 Esdras 2.40f. This view, however, is not convincing because Rom. 11. 25 makes no attempt to specify what "the full number" might amount to. Therefore, the notion of a numerus clausus is to be rejected.[104] Furthermore, if (as seems likely) Paul's use of πλήρωμα is here similar to that of πληρόω at Rom. 15. 19 we would have additional reasons against the views of Sanday and Headlam. At Rom. 15.19 Paul uses the word with emphasis on the Semitic idea of representation. In this verse it is recorded that Paul went "from Jerusalem as far round as Illyricum", fulfilling the mission of preaching the Gospel of Christ. This mission came to completion when every province between the limits mentioned had heard the Gospel being preached. This completion of Paul's mission, however, did not involve the Gospel being preached to each individual in these provinces. Similarly, it is probable that πληρόω is intended in this sense at 11.

---

[103]. So Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 335; comp. Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 575; similarly Dahl, Paul, 154.

[104]. Dunn, Romans, Vol. 2, 680; Munck, Israel, 133.

25.[105] If so, the duration of time for Jewish hardening would be until a "representative" number of Gentiles hear and believe the Gospel. Regardless of whether this interpretation would receive unanimous consent, it is undisputed that Gentiles will become members of God's people. This point is undeniable in Paul's salvific programme.

There is a second way that Paul depicts Gentile entry into the people of God. Specifically, at the time of Messiah's coming there will occur a national pilgrimage of Gentiles to Zion (11. 25-27).[106] L. Baeck has depicted this event thus: "The coming of the Messiah and the 'coming' of the Gentiles are interconnected. This is Jewish faith and such was Paul's faith."[107] This notion had common consent within the Jewish tradition, as OT, intertestamental, and Rabbinic sources indicate. First, we may appeal to Isaiah: "And it shall come to pass in the latter days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord...and ... out of Zion shall go forth the Law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem". (Is. 2. 2-4; comp. Mic. 4. 2; Is. 56. 7, 60. 3). Second, as an example from the intertestamental literature the Testament of Benjamin states "the temple of God shall be in your portion, and the lost (temple) shall be more glorious than the first. And the twelve tribes shall be gathered together there, and all the Gentiles, until the most High sends forth his salvation in the visitation of an only begotten prophet" (9. 2-3; comp. Sib.

---

[105]. Munck, Ibid., 134; J. Jeremias, "Einige vorwiegend sprachliche Beobachtungen zu Röm 11.25-36", in L. de Lorenzi (ed.) Israelfrage nach Röm 9-11 (Rome, 1977), 197. The view is advocated also by Siegert, Paulus, 172 n. 42, who maintains that we have here an example of synecdoche.

[106]. Cf. Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 2, 255; C. Plag, Israels Wege zum Heil (Stuttgart, 1969), 43-46; P. Stuhlmacher, "Zur Interpretation von Römer 11. 25-32", in H.W. Wolff (ed.), Probleme biblischer Theologie, Festschrift für G. von Rad (Münich, 1971), 560f.

[107]. L. Baeck, "The Faith of Paul", JJS 3 (1952), 108.

Or. 3. 727f; Ps. Sol. 17. 30ff; Tob. 13. 11f, 14. 6f). Finally, we shall cite a saying of the Rabbis: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: "In Jerusalem all the nations and kings will be gathered together in the [messianic future] as it says, 'all the Gentile nations are gathered in the name of the Lord in Jerusalem'" (Aboth R. Nath. 35; comp. Mid. Ps. 72 (5), 21 (1); Gen. Rabb. 99). Therefore, we can see the existence of common consent for the idea that in the messianic time Gentiles will make a pilgrimage to Zion.[108]

If we return to 11. 25-7, we can see that this sentiment of the Jewish sources is assumed. In this context, where a scenario is offered for the salvation of Israel, we find Gentiles not only entering themselves but doing so in Jerusalem at the time of the Messiah's coming. This point is suggested from Paul's citation of Is. 59.20 (LXX). This view is based on two points of detail. First, that the intended deliverer here is the Messiah. Second, that Zion refers to the earthly Jerusalem, not its heavenly counterpart. Both of these views are well attested by the critics.[109] Therefore, within the scheme of the hardening of Israel as well as the entry of the Gentiles is the assumption that Gentiles will take part in the national pilgrimage to occur at the visitation of the Messiah.

---

[108]. See on this point Sanders, Jesus, 214, and J. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations (London and Nashville, 1958). A further text that may suggest the notion of a Gentile pilgrimage is Rom. 15. 16, where it is thought that appeal is made to Is. 66. 20. See R. D. Aus, "Paul's Travel Plans to Spain and the 'Full Number of the Gentiles' of Rom. 11.25", NovT 21 (1979), 36ff; contra Zeller, Juden, 283f. Luz, Paulus, 391f. similarly objects, and maintains that the allusion here is not to Is. 66. 20 but to Is. 61. 6.

[109]. E.g. Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 2, 256-257 adheres to both views. Others who maintain the deliverer referred to here is the Messiah are Zeller, Juden, 258ff; Stuhlmacher, "Römer 11, 25-32", 561; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 578; Schlier, Römerbrief, 341; Aageson, "Scripture", 285. N. T. Wright, "The Messiah and the People of God" (diss. Oxford, 1980), 207 affirms that the reference here is to the earthly Jerusalem. Hübner, Gottes, 115-116, 120, however makes the point that in the NT there is no indication of anything other than a heavenly Jerusalem. But would it not make more sense, given that engathering of the Gentiles is to the earthly Jerusalem, that the reference to Jerusalem is to be taken similarly?

In our discussion of Jewish remnant and entry of Gentiles it was clear that the election of Israel formed an essential part of the background. We have already discussed two aspects of what Paul refers to as the mystery: first, that Israel would be hardened; second, that this would last until the time when a "representative" number of Gentiles entered God's family. The third aspect of this mystery is that "all Israel will be saved".

For Paul this was a dogmatic assertion that required no justification: the election of Israel is axiomatic within the Jewish tradition. The primacy of election is assumed by Paul. There are several internal reasons which confirm this. First, no arguments are offered to justify Israel's election. Rather, the idea is appealed to when Paul intends to describe the process that Israel must undergo before she will enter salvation. Second, the descriptive nature of this process also offers further support for the view that Paul presupposes Jewish election. Third, Paul's use of terminology offers additional weight to our claim. For example, in the two main pericopes where election is discussed (11. 11ff; 11. 25-27) Paul states without explanation that Israel will be saved (all of them at 11. 26; some of them at 11. 14). In addition to this terminology, two other words occur with reference to salvation -- Israel's "fulness" (11.12) and her "acceptance" (11.15). In Paul's use of these words we find no justification for the view that Israel will not be saved, at least some of them. Finally, when Paul raises the question whether Israel has fallen to such an extent that her return is improbable he replies with the emphatic denial μὴ γένοιτο (11. 11; comp 11. 1). The idea of the election of Israel on internal grounds is thus presupposed. Notwithstanding this fact, points of detail have been debated in relation to this election.

First, what is meant by πᾶς Ἰσραήλ? Second, in what sense will Israel be "saved"? The phrase πᾶς Ἰσραήλ is often understood as a Hebraism for כל ישראל,[110] and

---

[110]. Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 2, 255; Blass-Debrunner, Grammar, 275 (4); TDNT, Vol. 3, 387 n. 133.

analysed in conjunction with m. Sanh. 10. 1 "All Israel is to have a share in the world to come".[111] In connection with this acclamation, however, there is found a list of exceptions of those who will not enter the world to come. This list includes, for example, those who think there is no resurrection or that the Torah is not from heaven, and those who doubt or disregard belief in God. From this it would appear that the language cannot be intended in a strictly numerical sense to imply that every individual Jew will be saved.[112] Therefore, when Paul refers to πᾶς Ἰσραήλ the phrase must be intended in a similar way. Thus, those who will enter salvation will not include Israel, i.e. every individual Jew, but "Israel as a whole" -- the "remnant" plus the "rest".[113] In conjunction with our interpretation of τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν (v. 25), which forms a contrast to πᾶς Ἰσραήλ, as well as Paul's phrase σώσω τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν (11. 14), one here obtains further corroboration for the view being offered. This is especially so if, as Munck maintains, the phrase does not refer to a small group but one that contains an indefinite number of Jews.[114]

---

[111]. So Jeremias, "Beobachtungen", 199; Wilckens, Römer, Ibid.; Bruce, Romans, 222; Barrett, Romans, 223; Käsemann, Romans, 313; Michel, Römer, 249 comp. Hübner, Gottes, 113f.

[112]. Comp. on the point Aquinas, Super epistolas, 170 (916) "non particulariter sicut modo, sed universaliter omnes" also K. L. Schmidt, Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kap. 9-11 des Römerbriefes (Zürich, 1947), passim, esp. 38f.

[113]. Davies, "People", 133 n. 34; Munck, Israel, 136; Barrett, Romans, 224; Dahl, Paul, 153; Rese, "Rettung", 427; Sanders, Law, 196; Lagrange, Romains, 285;, Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 335; Watson, Gentiles, 229 n. 38; Käsemann, Romans, 313; Barth, People of God, 43f; Siegert, Paulus, 173; Jeremias, "Beobachtungen", 200; Schlier, Römerbrief, 340; Hübner, Gottes, 113 n. 404. But, it is the view of Mussner, Tractate, 34, that although all Israel will be saved it will not be by means of the Gospel but by a "Sonderweg". See also "Ganz Israel wird gerettet werden" (Röm 11,26), Kairos 18 (1976), 241-255. Against this view see Dunn, Romans, Vol. 2. 683. The view that "all Israel" refers to the whole Christian church is advocated by Wright, "Messiah", 200ff.

[114]. Munck, Israel, 133.

The matter we must now turn to is Paul's understanding of salvation at 11. 26. Does he imply by the word σώζω the passage from one religion to another, as for example in the conversion from paganism to Judaism or Christianity? Is Israel in some sense to re-enter salvation -- especially in the light of the datum of m. Sanh. 10. 1?[115] The locus classicus on the salvation of Israel in the Pauline letters occurs at Rom. 11. 25-7. Paul verifies his claim of Israel's salvation by appealing to several citations both from the LXX of Isaiah (ch. 59. 20, which we noted earlier and 27. 9a). These texts could be interpreted in either of two ways, depending on whether the emphasis is placed on theology or christology.

Let us sketch each of these interpretations beginning with the theological emphasis. This view would argue that salvation cannot be seen as a radical break or change of religion because God allowed the condition of the Jews to be one of hardening. In addition, the distinction is made between all Israel being "saved" and the belief in Jesus as Messiah. This particular reading of the citations from Isaiah would seem to have several points in its favour. For example, one text which Paul cites is the LXX of Is. 59. 20. In accord with the LXX version, Paul retains the words ὁ ῥυόμενος, whereas the MT reads וְלֹאֵל. Yet there is nothing in the immediate context that demands that ὁ ῥυόμενος refers to Christ.[116] It could, in fact, equally refer to God.[117] This understanding has OT warrant, since the word ῥυόμενος can mean the "glory of God" and is not used in a Messianic sense. The fact that

---

[115]. My debt to Davies, "People", esp. 139ff, in the following discussion will be clear.

[116]. Yet Räsänen, "Rettung", 2920, and Aageson, "Scripture", 285, maintain that the referent of ῥυομενος is Christ, by comparison with Rom. 9. 5, 11. 28.

[117]. T. Zahn, Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer (Leipzig, 1925), 525 n. 70 also F.W. Maier, Israel in der Heilsgeschichte nach Röm 9-11 (Münster, 1929), 144. However, Sanders, Law, 194, maintains that whether it is Christ or God is unimportant since Paul could not think of Christ apart from God. This view is also adopted by Rese, "Rettung", 429.

Paul does not mention Christ between 10. 17-11. 36 may add further force to this interpretation. On this view the covenant that is referred to at 11. 27 is not the future covenant (2 Cor. 3. 6; 1 Cor. 9. 25) but the eternal covenant God made with Israel (Is. 59. 21). Consequently, Israel is not brought into contact with Christ of the new covenant even at the end of history. Rather, salvation consists in a return to the eternal covenant which is to be accomplished through the forgiveness of sins.

From our sketch of the theological emphasis we can observe two ways in which the notion of the election of Israel is shaped by ideas that have Jewish precedent. First, ὁ ῥυόμενος is understood in a non-messianic sense in accord with the LXX. Second, Israel is to experience a restoration to the covenant God made with her.

The second interpretation, which places its emphasis on christology, is also rooted in traditional Jewish material. One example is the messianic reference to the redeemer at Is. 59. 20-1 in b. Sanh. 98a. It reads as follows: "R. Johanan said: When thou seest a generation overwhelmed by many troubles as by a river, await him [the Messiah], as it is written, when the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him [Is. 59. 19] which is followed by, And the Redeemer shall come to Zion [Is. 59. 20]."[118] Similarly the Targum of Isaiah 59.20 takes a Messianic interpretation of the text.

---

[118]. Cf. Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 2, 257; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 336; Schlier, Römerbrief, 341.

A second example of Jewish ideas evident in association with the christological interpretation is found in the allusion to the new covenant (Jer. 31. 31).[119] At the time of the Messiah's coming the Jewish people will be forgiven for their hardness of heart, accept Jesus of Nazareth as the promised Messiah and share in the promises of the new covenant. By this means the Jews will become recipients of Jeremiah's prophecy of hope whereby restoration and renewed commitment to God will come upon Israel.

A third indication of Jewish ideas appealed to in formulating what is meant by salvation is evident if 11. 26 is interpreted in connection with 11. 15, where Paul speaks of one consequence of Jewish acceptance of the messianic promises: "For if their rejection [means] reconciliation of the world, what shall their acceptance [mean] but life from the dead?" If as Lüdemann[120] maintains, Paul's phrase "life from the dead" is synonymous with the resurrection of the dead, the meaning of salvation here is further shaped by Jewish ideas.

From the above sketch of the theological and christological interpretations offered of 11. 25-7 we have shown that neither emphasis allows for the view that salvation meant the changing of one's religion, since on both readings Paul's idea of salvation is deeply rooted in the OT and Jewish material. Thus, one could suggest that common ground between Paul and Jewish tradition is shared in both interpretations. There are several reasons, however, which suggest that the christological approach is to be preferred. First, a Christological understanding of ὁ ῥυόμενος best fits Pauline usage elsewhere (1 Thess.

---

[119]. so Bruce, Romans, 222; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 579; Black, Romans, 147f; Wright, "Messiah", 206. Michel, Römer, 251, is ambiguous on this point. Conversely Dodd, Romans, 182, indicates that although the concept of a new covenant refers to the church in several instances in Paul, here the covenant is to the Jews only.

[120]. G. Lüdemann, Paulus und das Judentum (Münich, 1983), 34.

1. 10). Furthermore, the concerns of Rom. 9-11 focus on the failure of most Jews to recognize the coming of the Messiah. It would be somewhat against Paul's aims to come to the high point in his scenario and shift his focus way from the central problem of these chapters. Second, the notion of covenant at 11. 27a accords better with 2 Cor. 3. 6 and 1 Cor. 11. 25 than with God's eternal covenant. Indeed it would seem rather anti-climactic for Paul to construct a scenario for the Jews which amounts to a return to the eternal covenant without any place allocated to the return of the Messiah, especially since to deny Messiah is good grounds for one to be refused entry to life after death.[121]

Let us now draw some conclusions from the above analysis. We made a distinction at the outset between ideas presumed and those argued for in two pericopes relating to election of Israel. We maintain that Paul did not argue for the notion of Israel's election because it was a commonly held opinion, which Jews by virtue of their nationality consented to. This status between God and Israel was virtually impossible to alter. We maintain, therefore, that the notion of Israel's election was assumed in Rom. 11.

However, we "argued" for the view that when Paul referred to the salvation of Israel, "Israel" did not imply each individual Jew but a representative group of Israelites. In addition, we suggested that it is probable that Paul's appeal to the citations from Isaiah is to be interpreted Messianically, and that the covenant intended is the new covenant prophesied by Jeremiah. Finally, we affirmed that salvation is conceived at 11. 26 to be synonymous with "life from the dead" (11. 15). These three points are interpretations of the evidence shaped and shared by Jewish ideas. Yet in each case this shaping of the Jewish tradition has as its incentive the undisputed fact of Israel's election. In fact, it is this assumption which provides the context for Paul's appeal to the citations from Isaiah and his discussion of the Jewish people in Rom. 11. These arguments lead us to add the

---

[121]. P. Blackman (ed.), Mishnayot: Nezikim (London, 1954), Vol. 4, 285 n. 8.

election of Israel as a "common denominator" additional to those already considered. God's intention, then, is the creation of a new community of his people consisting of Gentiles, the remnant, and "all Israel".

We must now investigate what God's aims were for his people. Fundamental to this was their holiness. It is evident from Paul's letters that Christians were to live blameless and holy lives both for the present (e.g. Phil. 2. 15; 2 Cor. 7. 1; 1 Thess. 4. 3-7) and in anticipation of the coming judgement at the parousia (1 Thes. 3. 13, 5. 23; 1 Cor. 1. 8). Since God out of his grace has created a new community of his people, the convert, in gratitude for what God has done, is to behave in a way that shows he is part of the "in-group". This continuing exchange between God and the convert can be described in terms similar to the relationship between the indicative and the imperative. Since God has set you free (indicative), therefore, shun idolatry (imperative). It is this interplay between the grace of God and the response of the believer that forms a vital element in Paul's expectations for his converts. It was also fundamental in the Jewish tradition, and indeed is the essence of "covenantal nomism".[122]

Integral to such a scenario was the place of the Torah's fulfilment. Rom. 8. 3 informs us that God's purpose in the condemnation of sin and the sending of Christ was that the righteous requirements of the Law be fulfiled in the believer by the Spirit. This text is not couched in specific terms. If we recall where Paul makes explicit rulings on concrete aspects of the Jewish Law, we can see that Paul made de facto distinctions between what he taught on the Law's fulfilment and the way concrete situations were handled. For example, circumcision, the keeping of food laws, and the observance of special days were matters

---

[122]. See on the relationship between indicative and imperative in Pauline ethics in connection with Galatians Barclay, Obeying, 225-232.

of indifference (1 Cor. 7. 18f; Gal. 6. 15; Rom. 14. 1-5).[123] Nevertheless, Paul recognizes that Jews will probably carry on traditional Jewish commandments. I Cor. 7. 17 expects Jews to remain circumcised. 1 Cor. 8 and Rom. 14 allow for divergent views on food; Rom. 14 recognizes the existence of divergent practices concerning special days. In Galatians, on the other hand, it is wrong for Jewish Christians to follow food laws when in company with Gentile Christians as well as to observe special days and seasons, this being tantamount to returning to idolatry (4. 10). Notable in these distinctions is that they were the same elements in Judaism which drew criticism from pagan authors and which the Law required to be fulfilled as part of living within the confines of the covenant, as various Jewish texts indicate (Gen. 17. 9-14; Lev. 11. 1-23; Dt. 14. 3-21; 1 Macc. 1. 62-63; Dan. 1. 8-16; Tob. 1. 10-13; Jub. 10. 5; 12. 1-20; Ex. 20.8-11; Dan. 5. 12-15).[124] Since for Paul the Gospel was offered to the Gentile as well as the Jews, it was appropriate in practice to eschew in the case of the Gentiles certain aspects of the Law's requirements, e.g. circumcision, Sabbath and food laws.

From these general reflections several points emerge relevant to our task of determining common Jewish sentiment. First, the idea of the Torah's fulfilment continued to be a definitive category within the Pauline churches. Second, the symbols of Jewish self-identity in the Jewish sources which demonstrated obedience to Torah (i.e. circumcision, keeping of the Sabbath, food laws, and the festivals) were precisely those whose application in the letters of Paul were disputed. This disputation originated because Gentiles had now become members of God's family. The controversy caused by Gentile entry, however, did not mean that Jewish Christians were not to keep traditional Jewish commandments. In

---

[123]. Sanders, Law, 100ff.

[124]. M. Stern, "The Jews in Greek and Latin Literature", in S. Safrai and M. Stern (eds.), The Jewish People in the First Century (Philadelphia and Assen, 1976), Vol. 1, 1101-1159; Sanders, Ibid., 102; Dunn "Perspective", 114.

fact, there were diverse views regarding how Jewish Christianity was to react to the symbols of Jewish ethnicity.

However, this is only one way of analysing what Paul meant by fulfilling the law and the common ideals he shared with his contemporaries on this topic. When Paul does offer concrete instruction about the fulfilment of the Torah it is summarized by the love commandment: love your neighbor as yourself (Lev.19. 18). This formulation occurs at Rom. 13. 8-10 and Gal. 5. 14, where Paul's understanding is shaped around the Decalogue.

What is instructive for our purpose is that the OT text Paul cites functions to "summarize" what is meant by the Torah's fulfilment. This point is stated explicitly at Rom. 13. 8f and is assumed at Gal. 5. 14. In this "summary" of what it meant to fulfil the Torah it appears that we may have common Jewish opinion. If Paul's case is going to prove effective at Galatia or Rome, where Jewish Christian self-definition formed a crucial theme for these churches, this fact becomes all the more important.

Let us look more closely at these pericopes. In Rom. 13. 8-10 Paul informs his readers that they are to show love, both to those within the church and to those outside of it. In so far as one does this, one will show oneself to have fulfilled the Law (i.e. the Mosaic law).[125] Paul offers specific examples at v. 9 to show what he meant by loving your neighbour as yourself. From the LXX he utilizes the sixth, seventh, eighth, and tenth commandments of the Decalogue, which prohibit adultery, murder, theft, and coveting respectively (Ex. 20. 13-17; Dt. 5. 17-21). These commandments as well as others are

---

[125]. C. Spicq, Agapé dans le Nouveau Testament (Paris, 1958), Vol.1, 259ff, however, takes exception to the view that νόμος 8b refers to the Mosaic Law. He maintains that the word refers to the "regle de vie" or "principe de la morale chrétienne". For the view accepted here see Käsemann, Romans, 360; A. Feuillet, "Loi ancienne et Morale chrétienne d'après l'Épître aux Romains NRT 92 (1970), 796; Denny, Romans, 698; Lagrange, Romains, 316; W. Schrage, The Ethics of the New Testament (Edinburgh, 1988), 216.

summarized[126] (ἀνακεφαλαιοῦνται) in the single commandment of Lev. 19.18 "Love your neighbor as yourself". For Paul the love commandment meant treating his "neighbour" as the law requires -- that is, not to offend him in such matters as adultery, murder, theft, and coveting.[127] If one does this one has fulfilled the Torah and has accomplished its righteous requirements. Paul concludes his reflections on the Christian's responsibility (v. 10) by restating what was said at v. 8b in a chiastic form: love does no wrong to one's neighbour, love is the fulfilment of the law.[128] The outlook presented at Rom. 13. 8-10 occurs in a more succinct form at Gal. 5. 14. In order to redress the balance to what appears like a negative picture of the Law in chs. 2-4 Paul in his ethical section (chs. 5-6) offers a more positive outlook. In this connection we find him again appealing to Lev. 19. 18 to shape his ethics. Since at Gal. 5.14 the use is similar to that of the Romans text, we shall simply comment on several details. First, Paul employs the phrase ὁ πᾶς νόμος , which is thought to refer to the law as a whole in distinction from the law as a sum-total of its precepts.[129] This point is emphasized by the attributive use of πᾶς in Paul's phrase.[130] Therefore,

---

[126]. The rabbinic method of summarizing commandments is here reflected in Paul's language; so Käsemann, Romans, 361. Similarly Denny, Romans, 698; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 677; Schlier, Römerbrief, 395; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 3, 69.

[127]. Barrett, Romans, 251.

[128]. Schlier, Römerbrief, 395; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 3, 69; Käsemann, Romans, 361. This point is assumed by V. P. Furnish, Theology and Ethics in Paul (Nashville, 1968), 199f.

[129]. Bruce, Galatians, 241; Betz, Galatians, 274 comp. 259f.

[130]. Blass-Debrunner-Funk, Grammar, 275 (7); Schlier, Galater, 244; E. de Witt Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians (Edinburgh, 1921), 296.

νόμος in this context is a reference to the Mosaic law.[131] Second, in accord with usage at Rom. 13. 8-10 πεπλήρωται is intended in the full sense of the perfect and rendered "stands fulfilled".[132] Third, as in Rom. 13. 9 the law is summarized[133] in the single injunction "love your neighbor as yourself" (Lev. 19. 18). We can therefore see that Paul has formulated

---

[131]. Barclay, Obeying, 137; Sanders, Law, 96-97; Räisänen, Law, 27 n. 72. However, H. Hübner, "Das ganze und das ein Gesetz", KD 21 (1975), 240 (also Thought, 37), maintains that νόμος at 5. 14 does not refer to the Mosaic Law but is used as a ironic expression set over against "the whole law" (ὁ πᾶς νόμος) at 5. 3. See also U. Luz, review of Hübner in ThZ 35 (1979), 121-123.

[132]. Schlier, Galater, 244f; Bonnard, Galates, 109; Lietzmann, Galater, 39; Lagrange, Galates, 145; H. Lyungmann, Das Gesetz erfüllen (Lund, 1954), 57. However, the point is made by Barclay, Ibid., that the use of πᾶς with νόμος to convey observance of the Mosaic law is unprecedented in Jewish tradition. Therefore, Paul's distinctive contribution is not νόμος as Mosaic Law but the verb πληρόω in association with νόμος. Thus Barclay understands πεπλήρωται "filling" and "completion" to imply "the total realization and accomplishment of the law's demands" (139). This realization is further defined in relation to the "eschatological fulness of time in the coming of Christ" (140).

[133]. This seems to be the sense intended in spite of the fact that ἀνακεφαλαιόω does not occur at 5. 14. However, Hübner, Thought, 83ff, has put forward the view in this connection that Paul's use of Lev. 19. 18 is conceived in a form radically reduced from its orginal intention: when Paul speaks of the whole law, what is meant is not the law in its entirety but a reduced form of it. But, is it a necesary deduction that because Paul summarizes the law's fulfilment in a single sentence he has reduced its intention radically? There are several considerations which tell against this suggestion. First, at Rom. 13. 9, where Lev. 19. 18 is also quoted in a way similar to that of Gal. 5. 14, we find itemized four of the ten commandments, and then the words occur "if there are any other commandments". The meaning is that not only those commandments cited but any others are also included under the prescription of Lev. 19. 18. Second, the way Paul formulates the idea of the fulfilment of the Torah is consonant with rabbinic practice, which considered Lev. 19. 18 to be the 'the great כלל of the Torah' (Gen. Rabb. 24. 7 on Gen. 5. 1 comp. Sifre Qedôšim 2. 4). Similarly, Hillel summarized and explained Lev. 19. 18 by quoting the negative golden rule to a proselyte "What is hateful to you, do not do to your neighbour, that is the whole law, everything else is commentary, go and learn it" (Shabbath 31a; comp. Tob. 4.5; Tosf. Peah 4. 19). Therefore, Paul's formulation of Torah's fulfillment is in keeping with Jewish tradition of his own time. For these reasons we suggest that Paul had not radically reduced the general intention of the prescription of Lev. 19. 18.

his ethics by appealing to ideals shaped from the Decalogue. Paul's method was to cite OT Scripture and allow its authority to speak for itself. In so doing he is making certain assumptions about the fundamental importance an appeal to the love commandment would have for his audience. If this was not the case, Paul's correlation between the love commandment and the fulfilment of the Torah would have proved ineffective in communities where Jews formed part of the audience. Furthermore, it is to be noted that although there is a difference in context between the use made of Lev. 19. 18 in Rom. and Galatians there is not a substantative difference in content. Both in Romans and Galatians fulfilment of the Mosaic law results from loving your neighbour as yourself. Therefore, while it may be that Romans offers a more explicit definition of what this means it cannot be said that Romans is a "development" of Galatians.[134]

We have already shown in our treatment of Rom. 13. 10ff. and Gal. 5. 14 Paul's debt in shaping his ethics to the OT, and especially the Decalogue. At Gal 5. 19ff. Paul includes in his list of vices two examples relevant to our present discussion. There are several points worthy of mention. First, the whole list of vices is prefaced by the statement that the works of the flesh are "well known" (i.e. what constituted improper behaviour was self-evident). Second, two of the works included in the list of vices are πορνεία and εἰδωλολατρία. The first of these is thought primarily to refer to one who consorts with harlots. The word can mean unlawful sexual intercourse, however (e.g. Mt. 5. 32; Acts 15. 20, 29, 21. 25; 1 Cor. 5. 1), or sexual irregularity in general. Here it is most likely intended in a more general sense.[135] The second word, εἰδωλολατρία, is related to a pre-Christian Jewish term like εἴδωλον in the sense of idol, and therefore the "work" Paul has in mind is the worshipping of any substitute for the living and true God, a graven image or

---

[134]. Contra Hübner, Thought, 83.

[135]. Bruce, Galatians, 247; comp. Burton, Galatians, 305.

otherwise.[136] The significance of these observations for our discussion is that idolatry and sexual misconduct are prohibitions that come directly out of the OT (the Decalogue) and that are emphasized in Philo's Hypothetica, Josephus' Contra Apionem, and Pseudo Phocylides (as we have shown in an earlier chapter). Therefore, we may conclude that the "works" in which Paul prohibits Christians to engage are commonly known as equally improper ways for Jews to behave. This evidence may thus be added to that already noted on the theme of the Torah's fulfilment as a commonly held Jewish sentiment for two reasons. First, Paul includes idolatry and sexual misconduct in his list of character traits not to be emulated as self-evident. Second, the surety that idolatry and sexual misconduct are behaviour Jews commonly thought should be shunned is confirmed in the widespread Jewish material that supports the point. These results can thus be added to the picture being presented of common denominators in Judaism.[137]

If, as we argued, correct behaviour mattered to Jews and functions to show that one is a member of the "in group", what happens when the Torah or the "commandments of God" (1 Cor. 7. 19) are trangressed? The answer to this question lies in the attitude the Jewish sources and the letters of Paul have to transgression, rewards, and punishment.

Sanders maintains that the common Jewish attitude toward transgressions, punishments and rewards can be summarized as follows. (1) If a Jew is obedient to the Torah he is rewarded. (2) If, however, one is disobedient one is punished. (3) If a Jew transgresses the requirements of the Torah his sins may be atoned for. This is the common view even though the Jewish material testifies to diverse means of atonement.[138] (4) If

---

[136]. TDNT, Vol. 2, 380.

[137]. For further discussion on idolatry and sex ethics in Paul see ch. 6 below.

[138]. See on this point Sanders, PPJ, e.g. 161f, 300ff, 368f, as well as the index, s.v. atonement.

major transgressions were not corrected this could lead to expulsion. These tenets can be documented from literature between 200 BC and AD 200. Ample evidence has been given by Sanders in PPJ.[139] When we consider this basic structure in the light of Paul's attitude towards transgressions within the community, rewards and punishments, and post-conversion atonement, we find that he dealt with transgressions within the Christian community in general terms consonant with the above structure. Paul's sentiment may therefore be viewed as "thoroughly Jewish".[140] If this argument can be sustained then we have a further category of ideas that can be termed "common" between Paul and the other Jews of his time.

The Pauline evidence relevant may be classified in the following way. (1) Good deeds are rewarded in the present (2 Cor. 9. 6-15); (2) Bad deeds are punished in the present (1 Cor. 5. 1-5; 11. 27-34); (3) Rewards and punishment are inevitable in the future (1 Cor. 3. 10-15; 2 Cor. 5. 10; Rom. 2. 16; 14. 10); (4) Atonement is possible for those who transgress the will of God (2 Cor. 12. 21; comp. 1 Cor. 5. 1-5; 1 Cor. 11. 27-34); (5) Expulsion from the community may occur (1 Cor. 5. 5; 1 Cor. 5. 9-13); (6) The loss of one's Christian status is possible (Gal. 1. 7-9, 5. 1-4; Rom. 11. 22). Permanent expulsion is possible (1 Cor. 8. 11). Let us test the evidence to see whether Jewishness extends to

---

[139]. Sanders, PPJ index, s.v.v. "repentance", "reward" and "punishment", "obedience", 622-4 also; "Jesus", 436-439. For others who affirm the presence of reward and punishment in Paul see F. Filson, St. Paul's Conception of Recompense (Leipzig, 1931); G. Didier, Désintéressement du Chrétien (Paris, 1955), 13 n. 25, 17, 219; E. Synofzik, Die Gericht- und Vergeltungsaussagen bei Paulus (Göttingen, 1977), 9; K. P. Donfried, "Justification and Last Judgement in Paul", ZNW 67 (1976), 90-110; L. Mattern, Das Verständnis des Gerichts bei Paulus (Zürich and Stuttgart, 1966); C. J. Roetzel, Judgement in the Community (Leiden, 1972). Alternatively, G. P. Wetter, Der Vergeltungsgedanke bei Paulus (Göttingen, 1912), 155.

[140]. So Sanders, Law, 105: "As far as I can tell from the somewhat slight evidence, he did [fit the Jewish pattern]"; comp. Synofzik, Ibid.

the content as well as to the categories and structure. The first tenet is that good deeds will be rewarded in the present life. This point is illustrated at 2 Cor. 9. 6-15 where the maxim of sowing and reaping is found. Here it occurs in a context where Paul appeals to the Corinthians to exercise charity towards the Jerusalem saints. He also affirms that there is a reward for generous giving: he who sows generously will reap generously (9. 6). This sentiment is reinforced at 9. 11, where the point is made that generosity will yield a handsome return. This is so because God is the supplier of all good things and he will permit the generous to prosper so that their good deeds (here called their "righteousness") may be carried out. Thus Paul's promise is that good deeds will be rewarded in the present life. To make this point Paul neither appeals to Scriptural authority nor gives any citation formula to support his maxim.[141] He simply appeals to this "common prudential maxim" on human conduct and assumes that the use being made of it is self-evident[142] (Comp. Provb. 11. 24, 5; 22. 8, 9; T. Levi 13. 6; Mt. 7. 16-20; Lk. 6. 43f). The maxim of sowing and reaping reflects the broader concept of rewards and punishment common among Jews. However, these maxims were not only Jewish but shared by others as well. Betz maintains that the metaphors of sowing and reaping were "common in all ancient literature".[143] Several examples will have to suffice: Plato, Phdr. 260d; Geogias ap. Aristot., Rhet. 3.3.4; Plut., De Pythiae oraculis 394; Cicero, Orat. 2. 65. None the less Paul's appeal to this known maxim on human conduct serves to illustrate the broader point that good deeds are rewarded.

---

[141]. Barrett, Second Corinthians, 239.

[142]. Bruce, Galatians, 264.

[143]. Betz, Galatians, 307; also Bruce, Galatians, 264; Barclay, Obeying, 164, refers to the saying as a "well-known illustration".

The second tenet is that transgressors will be punished. Two examples illustrate this point well. At 1 Cor. 5. 1-5 it was reported that πορνεία was being committed.[144] Specifically, Paul states that a man is living with his father's wife. The situation at Corinth had deteriorated so much that incest was being tolerated.[145] This kind of behaviour was prohibited according to OT law (Dt. 27. 20 comp. Lev. 18. 8; Dt. 27. 20). The recommended punishment for the offence in the Corinthian situation was the delivery of the man over to Satan for the destruction of his "flesh" (i.e. his physical body). In the present context this probably meant physical death.[146]

Several points can be noted from this example. First, the prohibition of immorality with one's stepmother and the punishment of death were consonant with Jewish tradition (e.g. Ant. 3. 274; Ap. 2. 200; Jub. 33. 9-12; m. Sanh. 7. 4; b. Sanh. 54a).[147] This suggests the common nature of the indictment and the verdict given by Paul. Second, this point is enforced by the fact that immorality with one's stepmother was not only abhorred among Jews but also among Gentiles. Paul indicates that the type of immorality committed by the man in Corinth was unknown among the Gentiles. Whether it is correct that Paul intends the Gentiles to be seen as a "foil" to sharpen his own indictment against his community is

---

[144]. On these verses see esp. Mattern, Paulus, 103-8; Synofzik, Vergeltungsaussagen, 53-6; Forkman, Community, 139ff.

[145]. Forkamm, Ibid.

[146]. Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, 97; Roetzel, Community, 121; E.-B. Allo, Première Épitre aux Corinthiens (Paris, 1934), 124. The view of these commentators is favoured by the fact that at 1 Cor. 15. 39 σάρξ (flesh) and σῶμα (body) are used interchangeably. See also on this point A. Sand, Der Begriff "Fleisch" in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen (Regensburg, 1967), 129, 144f. Bruce, Corinthians, 55, that what is in evidence here is discipline comparable to that of Ananias and Sapphira in Acts 5. 1ff; so also Mattern Paulus, 105.

[147]. Comp. Ps. Phoc. 179, where the same sin is abhorred but the death penalty is absent; so van der Horst, Sentences, 229-230.

difficult to prove. What is certain is that the abhorrence towards the immorality described at 1 Cor. 5.1 is supported by Roman law (Cicero, Cluento. 6 (15); Caius, Instit. 1. 63). Third, Paul gives no reason for his judgement against the man. Conzelmann maintains that this was so because his reason was "self-evident".[148] At any case, the example at 1 Cor. 5. 1-5 illustrates that sin was punished and in this case by death.

The second example occurs at 1 Cor. 11.27-34. In this context the Corinthians were deemed guilty of behaving in an "unworthy manner" at the Lord's Supper.[149] This was evident in their riotous behaviour (vv. 20ff) and lack of reverence. Paul states that the Corinthians did not exercise discernment and self-examination before partaking of the "symbols" of Christ's body and blood. By this behaviour they profaned the Lord. Consequently, the Corinthian church brought divine judgement upon itself, which was evident in the illnesses, bodily weakness and death that permeated their community. From the two examples given it is clear that sin was punished sometimes by death and at other times by lesser forms of retribution.

A third tenet is that rewards and punishment will take place in the future. As indicated above the primary texts are 1 Cor. 3. 10-13; 2 Cor. 5. 10; Rom. 2. 16; 14. 10. Little comment is required of these text because of their self-evident nature. The examples from 2 Cor. and Rom. simply state that the Christian must stand before the judgement seat of God. 1 Cor. indicates that a day is coming when a person's works shall be disclosed. What sort of works a person has done is related to whether the foundation was Jesus Christ and what was added to this foundation.

---

[148]. Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, 96.

[149]. See for a full treatment of these verses G. Bornkamm, Early Christian Experience (London, 1969), 123-160; E. Käsemann, Essays on New Testament Themes (London, 1964), 108-135; R. Pesch, Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverständnis (Freiburg, 1978), 53-69; P. Neuenzeit, Das Herrenmahl (Münich, 1960); I. H. Marshall, Last Supper and Lord's Supper (Exeter, 1980), 107-123.

We now proceed to the fourth tenet -- atonement. Specifically, how is one to be restored to a right relationship with God if one has transgressed the commandments? In Palestine this was done by Jews having their sins atoned for through sacrifice at the Temple; in the diaspora sins were atoned for by repentance and forgiveness. Sacrifice is clearly not part of Paul's scenario. None the less, there is some indication that post-conversion forgiveness was to play some part in Christian practice. The one explicit example of this occurs at 2 Cor. 12. 19-21.[150] Here we find Paul reflecting on the condition of the church in Corinth in anticipation of a forthcoming visit. Paul's reaction seems to be one of fear. First, he is fearful that he may find the church in disorder and the members bickering among themselves. Second, the Christians who have sinned in the past had not repented of their evil ways. Paul's fear is that he may have to "mourn over" their condition.[151] The status implied here is not excommunication of some of the brethren but what Paul calls "the sins which they have committed beforehand" (προημάρτηκασι). The context suggests that the sins of v. 20 and those unrepented sins of v. 21 are different in kind. The sins of v. 20 relate to disunity while those of v. 21 are of a sexual nature. Barrett explains this difficulty by first rejecting the view that the sins at v. 21 refer to sins before conversion. Neither is he convinced by the suggestion that v. 20 and v. 21 have little connection with each other.[152] Positively, Barrett maintains that the correct explanation lies in making a distinction between two groups of sinners. In 2 Cor. Paul's worry is for a group

---

[150]. On the absence of this idea from Paul's letters see Sanders, PPJ, 499-501; M. Z. Andrews, "Paul and Repentance", JBL 54 (1935), 125.

[151]. Mourning here is not over being excommunicated so Barrett, Second Corinthians, 332; contra, Bruce, Corinthians, 252. Sanders, Law, 108, however maintains that the force of "mourn over" cannot be specified.

[152]. C. K. Barrett, "Paul's Opponents in II Corinthians", NTS 17 (1971), 247f.

of sinners who had fallen into strife, envy, and disorder. These sins are similar to those described at Gal. 5. 19 as works of the flesh. In 1 Cor., however, Paul's concern was over libertinism and it is these sins (e.g. licentiousness, impurity, and immortality) that have reappeared within the Corinthian church. It is the fact that those with libertarian tendencies have not repented of their sins that leads Paul to mourn. What is evident from these observations is the assumption that post-conversion sin must be dealt with. In spite of the fact that no details are given regarding the process one is to follow to obtain forgiveness, nor is any theological significance attributed to how the work of Christ effects forgiveness, it is none the less clear that unrepented post-conversion sin was a grave concern to Paul.[153]

The final category of evidence has to do with the possibility of expulsion from within the community of faith. One pericope that allows for this possibility is 1 Cor 5. 9-13. Paul has admonished the Corinthians not to associate with immoral people. Some confusion, however, arose as to whom Paul meant by the "immoral people" (πόνηροι). The Corinthians had understood (or misunderstood) Paul to mean byπόνηροι all those who had committed sins such as greed, the worship of idols, or robbery in Corinthian society. If Paul's admonition meant they had to dissociate themselves from this group he would be asking the Corinthian converts to follow an ascetic style of life. However, it was not Paul's intention to direct his injunction at society at large. Rather, he had in mind those who identified themselves as members of the Christian community yet were guilty of sins such as idolatry, robbery, or drunkenness (v. 11). Against those people Paul's indictment was clear: "Drive out the wicked person from you". Paul's sentiment here follows that of OT

---

[153]. There may be another means of post-conversion atonement in Paul: suffering can produce atonement. In 1 Cor. 5. 5 we find that the person is destroyed because of committing incest; however, it is the body that suffers destruction while the soul or spirit is saved.

covenantal law, where one found guilty of sin may be expelled from the community (Dt. 17. 7 (LXX); comp. Dt. 13. 5; 19. 19; 22. 21, 4; 24. 7). While it cannot be deduced from 1 Cor. 5.9ff that someone was in fact expelled from the church on these grounds, none the less one form of provision or justification for expulsion is certainly laid down.

There is a second example that may also suggest that expulsion from the church is possible. At 1 Cor. 8. 10f we are told that one Christian can contribute to undoing what Christ's death accomplished for another brother. The circumstance that allows for this to occur is extremely subtle, as the context of 1 Cor 8. 10f makes clear.[154] At 1 Cor. 8. 1ff a distinction emerges between two competing views regarding the effective powers of idols (as we have already noted in our discussion of monotheism). Some considered idols to have real existence and effective powers. Alternatively, there were others who maintained that although there were many "so-called" gods there is only one true God.

Paul now applies this distinction to the problem of eating meat sacrificed to them. He assumes that there is a correlation between the existence of idols (or the lack of their existence) and the significance attributed to eating meat sacrificed to them. One reaction is that eating meat sacrificed to idols is meaningless. The sentiment is reflected in the words: we are no worse off if we do not eat [meat sacrificed to idols], and no better off if we do. There is a second view also mentioned at 1 Cor 8. It is that of the "weak" whose conscience is defiled if meat sacrificed to idols is eaten. Paul warns the strong (i.e. those with a strong conscience) not to encourage the weak in idol-worship. If the strong eat meat sacrificed to idols, the weak may interpret this activity to mean that the idol to whom the meat was sacrificed still possessed powers.[155] The sin then is that the behaviour of the strong in conscience is understood by the weak to signify something that was never

---

[154]. Sanders, Law, 110.

[155]. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, 194.

intended. The consequence of this action towards the weak is their "ruin". What is implied by this, as the verb (ἀπόλλυμι) suggests, is the bringing about of a loss of one's share in eternal life (i.e. salvation) (comp. Rom. 14. 15).[156] Although Paul presents this situation in terms of a possibility (v. 10f), the presumption must be that if the conditions are met a Christian can have the work which Christ accomplished on his behalf overturned. We thus maintain that this pericope illustrates that expulsion from within the community of faith is within the realm of possibility.[157] Let us now draw some conclusions from our treatment of rewards and punishment in Paul's letters. We have argued that the common denominators in Second Temple Judaism relating to rewards and punishment suggested by Sanders are evident in Paul's letters. We have seen first that good behaviour is rewarded while transgressions are punished. We have also seen that the metaphors of sowing and reaping used by Paul to express the idea of rewards and punishment are found both in the Jewish tradition and in Hellenistic sources of the ancient world. Therefore, we affirm that Paul's language is shared by Jewish and non-Jewish sources. Yet the structure of obedience leading to reward and disobedience to punishment was a common Jewish sentiment. Second, though emphasis on post-conversion forgiveness is slight in Paul's letters, it formed a part of Christian practice. We also noted that the emphasis on diverse means of atonement in the Jewish sources is reflected in Paul. Finally, expulsion from the community was within the realm of possibility. What may be concluded is that the basic attitude towards transgressions, punishment, and rewards known from the Jewish evidence is evident in the letters of Paul.

---

[156]. Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 2, 715 n. 2; C. Senft, La Première Épître de Saint-Paul aux Corinthiens (Neuchâtel, 1979), 114.

[157]. On the theme of loss of status outside the sphere of specific acts of transgressions see Gal. 1. 7-9, 5. 1-4.

However, unlike the previous ideas discussed, the evidence for rewards, punishment, and transgression occurs much less frequently. This does not necessarily weaken the argument for a common outlook between Paul and the Judaism of his time. This point is enforced when we recall two specific details that show Paul's distinctly Jewish attitude---his attitude towards sexual behaviour (1 Cor. 5. 1-13) and his view(s) on idolatry (1 Cor. 5. 9-13; 8. 1ff).[158] Both appropriate sexual behaviour and shunning idolatry play a central role in Paul's discussion of rewards, punishment and transgression. The plea for appropriate sexual bevaviour occurs in connection with punishment for disobeying God's will, post-conversion forgiveness, and grounds for expulsion, while instruction against idolatrous practices is found in association with grounds for expulsion. Therefore, we affirm first that Paul's treatment of rewards, punishment, and transgressions reflect concerns that are genuinely Jewish; second, that a primary concern within this material is the abhorrence of sexual sins and idolatry, features that Jews of the first century would likewise have abhorred.

Let us now turn to a discussion of the common ground shared between Paul and contemporary Judaism on the theme of membership into the people of God. The point we shall focus on is the negative assertion that entry into God's people does not come "by works". It is this element of Sanders's reconstruction of Second Temple Judaism that is the major concern of his treatment in PPJ. In the letters of Paul we find it given as a datum that membership into God's family is not based on works.[159] It would take a study on its

---

[158]. The point is simply stated here; it will be argued below ch. 6.

[159]. The understanding of δικαιόω is forensic in nature: to be made right with God. The formulation "not by works" occurs frequently in the Pauline material (e.g. Rom. 3. 20, 28; 4. 5; 10. 5f; 11. 6; Gal. 3. 11; Phil. 3. 6-9). This theme will be considered more fully in the next chapter.

own to take each of the relevant passages and discuss them in detail.[160] We limit ourselves for the purpose of analysis to one passage: Gal. 2. 15-16. The reason for isolating these verses is that they satisfy the criteria of reflecting sentiments held by Jews qua Jews and of containing ideas that are presupposed and not argued for.

There are several reasons that suggest it is right to classify the ideas of Gal. 2. 15ff in this way. H.D. Betz, in his celebrated commentary on Galatians, has analysed the epistle from the point of view of ancient rhetorical speech-writing (e.g. Quintilian, Cicero).[161] He maintains that Gal. 2. 15-21 forms what he calls the propositio or the summing up of Paul's contention in the light of the previous narrative (narratio) (1. 6-2. 14). This summary occurs before the "proofs" (probatio) are presented in the succeeding chapter (3. 1-4. 25) for the basic assertion of 2. 15ff. Betz makes the further suggestion that the propositio is packed with "dogmatic abbreviations ie. very short formulaic summaries of doctrines" which reflect the essential burden of the Galatian letter. If the distinction of ancient rhetorical writing between summary and proofs can be sustained regarding Gal. 2. 14-4. 25 we can then affirm that 2. 14-21 contains dogmatic abbreviation or ideas adduced without argumentation and 3. 1- 4.25 proofs substantiated by detailed arguments. Since it is our

---

[160]. The most recent works on the subject are Sanders, Law; Hübner, Thought; Räisänen, Law; S. Westerholm, Israel's Law and the Churches Faith (Exeter and Grand Rapids, 1988). A sociological explanation of Paul's attitude to the Law is presented by Watson, Gentiles. For a consideration of Paul and the Law from the point of view of the philosophy of law see J. Hall, "Paul, the Lawyer, on Law", The Journal of Law and Religion 3 (1985), 1-49.

[161]. Betz, Galatians 114. J. Reumann, Righteousness in the New Testament (Philadelphia and New York, 1982), 54f, refers to Betz's approach favourably. However, comp. H.A.A. Kennedy, New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism (Chapel Hill, 1984), 144f. For a review of Betz's commentary see Davies, "Galatians, 172-188. See also J. Smit, "The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: A Deliberative Speech", NTS 35 (1989), 5-6, 9, who adopts a similar method to that of Betz yet is critical of his appeal to Quintilian.

view that this distinction can be sustained, we include a treatment of Gal. 2. 15ff in the present chapter.

> Several observations may be made about the contents of Gal.2. 15-16:
>
> "We who are Jews by nature and not Gentile sinners know that a man is not justified by the law except through faith in Christ Jesus. And we believed in Christ Jesus, in order that we might be justified by faith in Christ and not by works of law, because by works of law shall no flesh be justified."

First, the view put forward here is that of Jewish Christians: we who are Jews know. Paul is probably recounting what he said to Peter at Antioch[162] (or at least what he wished he had said). Moreover, what we are told is something that Jews know -- by nature, by virtue of their nationality, by being members of the covenant people of God: we are Jews by nature and not Gentile sinners. According to Dunn, Paul is offering "Jewish sensibilities or perhaps Jewish prejudices."[163] Second, we are informed that justification is not by works of the law but by faith. If this outlook is something Jews know by nature then the picture of Judaism offered by Sanders has some corroboration in Gal. 2.15f.[164] If so, then what can be deduced from this verse is that God's saving act accomplished by faith is not a distinctly Christian teaching. (What is Christian is that justification is in Christ Jesus). In this connection Dunn makes the point that "in this verse we are seeing the transition from a basically Jewish self-understanding of Christ's significance to a distinctly different

---

[162]. Dunn, "Perspectives", 104; Sanders, Law, 18ff; Bruce, Galatians, 136; C.K. Barrett, Freedom and Obligation (London, 1985), 18, 21; Schlier, Galater, 88; Lagrange, Galates, 45f. For the views of older commentators see Betz, Galatians, 113 n. 6; similarly Barclay, Obeying, 76.

[163]. Dunn, Ibid. 105 comp. Betz Ibid., 118.

[164]. This view is based on the assumption that vv. 15 and 16 belong together; so Schlier, Galater, 88; Barclay, Obeying, 78 n. 9; Bruce, "Autobiography", 158f.

understanding, the transition indeed from a form of Jewish Messianism to a faith which sooner or later must break away from Judaism to exist on its own terms."[165] What we may have is a Christian mutation set alongside a Jewish bias. It is the view that the faith in Christ Jesus is an extension of their Jewish belief, namely, that God initiated by his divine grace their entrance into a covenantal relationship. The verse still gives no support to the view that Paul is contrasting faith in Christ with the supposed Jewish tenet of earning God's acquittal by meritorious works.[166]

We have already seen that works in Judaism do not constitute an entry requirement for membership into God's people.[167] The verse makes this a common point shared by Jews and Christians. If entry is not by works, can we enquire further and determine what "works" Paul intends, works which will not enhance one's prospects of being saved? An answer to this question may emerge if we briefly sketch the situation of the Galatian letter. The debate in Galatians is over what was required for Gentiles to be recognized as full members of God's family -- the seed of Abraham (3. 29), as Paul calls them.[168] Three views have emerged.[169] First, Paul maintained that faith in Christ was all that was required. Second, the view of the so-called Judaizers was that in addition to faith in Christ Gentiles must observe the law of Moses, which included laws on clean and unclean foods, circumcision, the Sabbath, and special days. There was a third group who, consenting to

---

[165]. Dunn, Ibid. 115.

[166]. This view is assumed by Bruce, Galatians, 137; Betz, Galatians, 116; Schlier, Galater, 91; Reumann, Righteousness, 55.

[167]. Sanders, PPJ, passim.

[168]. So Dunn, "Perspectives", 107, also "The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2.11-18)", JSNT 18 (1983), 3-57; Räisänen, Law, 259-260; Sanders, Law, 18ff; Beker, Paul, 40; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 11ff. See also Gaston, Torah, 56; W.D. Davies "People", 127; and "Pitfalls", 77-82.

[169]. Issues surrounding this passage shall be treated more fully in chapter 5.

Paul's view, acted in a way that showed that fellowship depended on faith in Christ plus "works". Paul accused Peter and Barnabas of hypocrisy. "If you, a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how do you compel the Gentiles to judaize?" that is, to observe the food laws and table regulations practised by devout Jews of the time. It is in this connection that we find Paul's denial of justification by works. Specifically, the claim is that justification by works does not depend on circumcision, observance of food laws, and Sabbath. If taken in this context the works of the law referred to are the observances of the law like circumcision and the food laws. To this may be added the observance of special days and festivals (4. 10).

If we were to ask what significance these observances or works had for Jews, as indicated by literatures of the period, we find a consistent view. From the literature written by pagans on what they found peculiar about Jews (e.g. Petronius, Plutarch, Tacitus, Juvenal) these observances were what marked a person out as distinctly Jewish.[170] The Jewish material gives a similar picture.[171] The observances noted in Galatians are those which show that a Jew was living according to the requirements of covenant. By the fact that a Jew kept the food laws and was circumcised he showed himself faithful to the covenantal requirements, and was thus marked out as a faithful and obedient Jew.

From this it follows that justification by works of the law did not mean earning God's favour by meritorious activity or what is often called "works-righteousness".[172] Rather, the works referred to are indicators that one is living in accord with one's

---

[170]. Stern, Authors, Vol. 2 , passim; Sanders, Law, 117 n. 27.

[171]. This evidence is cited above, 64f.

[172]. An advocate of this view is D. P. Fuller, "Paul and 'the Works of the Law'", Westminster Theological Journal 38 (1975-6), 28-42. See the useful note in Barclay, Ibid., 82 n. 18.

covenantal status. It is thus clear why Peter and Barnabas could not resist separating themselves from Gentiles: by doing this they were showing themselves to be faithful Jews.[173] Such a scenario, it appears to us, sounds very much like what Sanders calls "covenantal nomism". Membership in the community of the faithful is not based on works, yet works formed an integral part as evidence of one's status in the community. If these reflections are applied to the situation in Galatia, and we ask what objection Paul had to the view of the Judaizers, the answer is that they believed that God's grace is extended only to Jews and to those Gentiles who practise the extras. This, however, undermines Paul's mission that Gentiles are to be included into the people of God on the same basis as Jews. It is thus evident that Paul's plea is that Gentiles are not to fulfil marks of Jewish self-definition in order to enter into the new people of God. If the above reflections have validity it is because they have history in their favour. What I have done is observe how Jews thought about themselves and show that this may help to illuminate the Galatian controversy. In so doing we have suggested that works are not defined in terms of personal achievement, meritorious behaviour or self-righteousness but according to norms of Jewish identity. Consequently, we maintain that Gal. 2. 15f confirms the Jewish view that entry into God's people is not by works. Furthermore, the verses suggest that maintaining one's covenantal status is integral to the Jewish pattern of religion.[174]

---

[173]. Whether the issue is also related to observance of purity laws; so Dunn, "Antioch", 31-32; 35-36; Barclay, Obeying, 82; Watson, Gentiles, 65 or fraternizing with Gentiles; so E.P. Sanders, "Jewish Association with Gentiles and Gal. 2. 11-14", in R. Fortna and B. Gaventa, (eds.), Studies in Honor of J.L. Martyn (Nashville, 1990), MS 22-24, will be considered in the following chapter.

[174]. In spite of the agreement suggested there is none the less a clear difference between Paul and the Judaism of the time regarding the consequences that follow from becoming a member of God's people "not by works". For Paul entry into God's family results in obtaining righteousness accomplished not by work but through faith. By contrast, in Judaism righteousness is not something one receives upon entry into a covenantal relationship. Rather, righteousness is a maintainence term which indicates that one is living in a way that is consonant with his relationship bestowed upon him by God. See on the point Sanders, "Jesus", 437 n. 144.

We have now considered a wide range of ideas that are present in Paul's letters which we maintain to be commonly held Jewish beliefs. We conclude with one further example: belief in a future hope. We want to analyse whether within the letters of Paul there is evidence to support the view that such a hope was a "fundamental postulate of Jewish theology".[175] In five of the seven undisputed letters of Paul the idea of a future hope occurs (1 Cor. 15; 2 Cor. 5; Phil. 3. 20; 1 Thess. 4. 13-5. 11; Rom. 13. 11-12).[176] What is significant for the present discussion is that in each of these examples the importance of the idea of a future hope is presupposed. One example is 1 Thess. 4-5, where two issues are raised regarding the parousia. First, when will those who have died before the parousia be raised? Or will their death exclude them from the future blessing? Second, what will happen to those who are still living when the parousia occurs? The implicit concern here is being caught unaware when the parousia happens. However, there is no question whether the parousia will take place. Rather, the only concern is with the time of the parousia and the effect it will have on those living and those who have already died.[177]

The locus classicus on the future hope is 1 Cor. 15. Here Paul makes no attempt to offer "proofs" for the existence of a future resurrection. Its inevitable coming he

---

[175]. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertamental Judaism (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), 9. The general accuracy of the formulation does not preclude that there existed diversity of opinion regarding details about the future hope. See esp. H. C. C. Cavallin, Life after Death (Lund, 1974), passim; also "Leben nach dem Tode im Spätjudentum und im frühen Christentum I. Spätjudentum" in W. Haase (ed.), Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin and New York, 1979), Vol. 19.1, 240-345; K. Schubert, "Die Entwicklung der Auferstehungslehre von der nachexilischen bis zur frührabbinischen Zeit", BZ NF 6 (1962), 177ff; A. J. M. Wedderburn, Baptism and Resurrection (Tübingen, 1987), 167-180.

[176]. The two exceptions, Galatians and Philemon, can be easily explained by the overall concern of these letters.

[177]. I. H. Marshall, 1 and 2 Thessalonians (Grand Rapids and London, 1983), 118ff; A. L. Moore, 1 and 2 Thessalonians (London, 1969), 68.

assumes. He does, however, give an exposition to illuminate matters relating to its character, nature, and form. The exposition is characterized by the "that" (vv. 1-34) and the "how" (vv. 35-58) of future resurrection.[178] This general point is illustrated by noting at vv. 13-19 and vv. 20-2 where Paul gives consequences, both negative and positive, for believing and failing to believe in the future resurrection. The assumption implicit in this type of argument is that, if Paul's focus is on "consequences" in distinction to "proofs", he must have considered the future resurrection to be commonly held opinion. This is supported by the logical progression from belief in the resurrection to its consequences.[179] Even if Paul's reply to the issues raised at 1 Cor. 15 was Christologically motivated this does not weaken the present point since for Paul a belief in a future hope and the resurrection of Christ are identical.

A presupposed belief in the future hope is also evident at 2 Cor. 4-5. In the 1987 Henton Davies Lecture, Professor Henry Chadwick argued for a distinct relationship between 1 Cor. 15 and 2 Cor. 4-5.[180] He maintains that 2 Cor. 4-5 is set in strong antithesis to 1 Cor. 15. While both passages affirm a belief in the future hope, the reality of 1 Cor. 15 is re-expressed in 2 Cor. 4-5 in language with metaphysical associations. Paul presents the same reality from two different points of reference---2 Cor. 4-5 from a Greek point of view (Platonic and Pythagorean) and 1 Cor. 15 from the Jewish point of view. Since the

---

[178]. M.J. Harris, Raised Immortal (London, 1983), esp. 114-115.

[179]. Among those who have considered the details of these pericopes see Harris, Ibid., 114ff; M. Rissi, Die Taufe für die Toten (Zürich, 1962); A. J. M. Wedderburn, "The Problem of the Resurrection in 1 Corinthians XV", NovT 23 (1981), 229-241; also Resurrection, 6-37; Beker, Paul, 163-181; Luz, Paulus, 332-358; J. Schniewind, "Die Leugner der Auferstehung in Korinth", in E.Kähler, Nachgelassene Reden und Aufsätze (Berlin, 1952), 110-139.

[180]. H. Chadwick, "2 Cor 4-5 and Christian Platonism", Henton Davies Lecture, Regent's Park College, Oxford, Feb. 1987, MS, 1-10, esp. 6. This view Chadwick credits to W.F. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles (Cambridge, 1939), 128-143, esp. 142. Comp. Barrett, Second Corinthians, 151-154;Bultmann, Korinther, 137-139.

Corinthians found the idea of a future hope in terms of resurrection in Paul's first letter unbelievable and unacceptable, in his second letter he restated with "great subtlety of shading in his language" the doctrine of the life to come in terms of the immortality of the soul. 2 Cor. 4-5 and 1 Cor. 15 illustrate how Paul tried different ways of presenting what form this hope would take. From these three examples we have shown that Paul believed in a future hope but that he tried different ways of expressing this reality. Thus, 1 Thess. 4 offers a general affirmation that the parousia will occur while 1 Cor. 15 presents future hope from the Jewish stance of resurrection of the dead and 2 Cor. 4-5 from the Greek view of immortality of the soul. We can affirm the certainty of a belief in a future hope and a diversity of forms in which this reality was expressed.

These features, certainty of hope and diversity of form and expression, are not unique to Paul. The sentiments are found in several Jewish witnesses. One example of this is m. Sanh. 10. 1 especially, if Finkelstein's translation is correct: "All Israel has a destiny in the future eternity". The translation leaves it open whether the future eternity is entered following the resurrection or by each soul at the time of death.[181] A second author who shows a lack of precision regarding what form the world to come will take is Josephus. In three separate works he refers to the future hope in different ways. In Ap. 2. 218 Josephus states that God will grant to a person at death a "renewed existence" and a "better life". However, in War 3. 374 reference is made to souls receiving a "new habitation". Finally, in Ant. 18. 14 Josephus records that Pharisaic belief includes the reward for good souls of a "new life". These expressions taken together reflect the same reality, i.e. a belief in the hope of a future life.[182] A third example that illustrates the ambiguity in language

---

[181]. L. Finkelstein, Mabo le-Massektot Abot ve-Abot d' Rabbi Natan (New York, 1950), xxxii-xxxvi, cited in Sanders, PPJ, 148.

[182]. Feldman, Josephus, Vol. 9, 13 n. c., maintains that these three passages refer to the resurrection. The point we are making is also supported by War 2. 154-5 and Ap. 2. 203 regarding the immortality of the soul. In War the soul is immortal and imperishable and

regarding the future hope is the DSS. For example, at 1QS 4. 7 and 1QH 6. 29-34 it is unclear whether the future hope is expressed in terms of resurrection or immortality.[183] From the above remarks we affirm that Paul shares a common Jewish view concerning the future hope, both its certainty as a general fact and diversity in the form of its affirmation.

Let us now draw this chapter to a close by offering an interpretation of the evidence as it relates to Contra Apionem. We have organized our material under nine categories relating to common opinion within the Jewish religion. Our aim has been to include those ideas which satisfy the criterion stated at the beginning of the chapter. We have argued from the undisputed letters of Paul that a list of common ideas ("denominators") would include the following. (1) Jews share a monotheistic view of God; their God is also just in his dealings towards mankind. (2) Jews have a privileged status by virtue of their nationality. (3) The election of Israel was a datum in the Jewish tradition. (4) Gentile entry into the people of God is an integral part of Jewish eschatological hope. (5) Holiness is a virtue to be emulated by the fulfilment of Torah. (6) Belief in a remnant is used as a means of explaining the hiatus between God's promise and reality. (7) God's saving activity arises out of his gracious nature. (8) A consequence of obedience to the will of God is reward while disobedience reaps punishment. (9) A future existence is an expected anticipation.

We note several common features between the evidence given in the present chapter and Contra Apionem (discussed in ch. 2). First, both share a common view of a future hope (Ap. 2. 218 and 1 Cor. 15. 12ff; 2 Cor. 5; 1 Thess. 4-5). Second, both authors maintain that sexual activity must be practised in an appropriate context (Ap. 2. 201 and

---

will be released from the bonds of the flesh. Similarly, in Ap. reference is made to the departure of the soul to another place.

[183]. Sanders, "Jesus", 392.

1 Cor. 5. 1ff). A third way in which common sentiment is shared between the letters of Paul and Contra Apionem is that both witnesses affirm that all behaviour has consequences either for good or ill. This is why Josephus can hold together the view that for the one who disobeys the law the penalty is death while the one who obeys it can look forward to a renewed existence and a better life (Ap. 2. 215-19). Paul considers the consequences of a person's behaviour in a similiar vein (2 Cor. 9. 6-15; 1 Cor. 3. 10-15; 5. 1-5. The fourth point that follows from this is that both authors affirm the centrality, uniqueness and justice of the Jewish God (Ap. 2. 190, 193; Rom. 3. 29-30, 3. 3-8, 9. 14-21; 1 Cor. 8. 4-6; Gal. 3. 20). The final point of commonality shared between our authors is that entry into the people of God is not limited to those who are Jews by nationality. For Paul the offer of salvation to the Gentiles is the incentive behind his missionary activity. For Josephus those "aliens" who are sincere are offered a gracious welcome to live in accord with the Jewish customs (Ap. 2.210).

There is one further point that was noted in our analysis of the letters of Paul that is fundamental to any study of common denominators in the Jewish religion: the assumption that the Jews are the elect people of God. This feature came out clearly in our treatment of Rom. 11. The same assumption, though not stated explicitly, lies behind Josephus' presentation of the Jewish religion in Ap. 2. 190-219. It is the reason the Jew must keep the Torah, worship and honour the one God, possess hope for the future, and live in accord with God's moral design for the universe -- or accept the consequences.

Let us conclude the present chapters by making explicit the thesis that has been hinted at in the first three chapter of our study. The method we have employed was first to analyse Contra Apionem to establish what may be commonly held Jewish opinion from a document dated in the post-70 period of the first century. Next we considered two types of evidence from the letters of Paul each clearly dated in the pre-70 period. We have

argued that common Jewish sentiment may equally be elicited from autobiographical material (ch. 2) and from the evidence we have classified as Jewish ideas presupposed but not argued for (ch. 3). From the autobiographical material we concluded that 4 common denominators can be documented. First, Jews boast of their pride of race. Second, they have a deep seated zeal for God and his Law. Third, correct behaviour is a matter of fundamental importance to the entire Jewish religious perspective. Fourth, Jews accepted that receiving severe treatment for their beliefs was part of their plight. We have given above the conclusions from our analysis of Jewish ideas presupposed but not argued for. If we bring together our analysis from Paul and Contra Apionem a thesis may be put forward which suggests that Jewish sentiment may be discovered that is both common and pre-70. This could be stated in the following way. Ideas may be deemed both common and pre-70 whenever they are found in Contra Apionem and attested by a wide spread of Jewish witnesses (thus common) and are also attested in the letters of Paul (so pre-70). In the two types of evidence from the Pauline letters considered we have given sufficient reason to suggest that the formulation offered is warranted. In what follows we shall take up other evidence to test our thesis further, beginning with material relating to Paul's argument with Judaizers.

CHAPTER 5

PAUL AND THE JUDAIZERS

In the last chapter I briefly dealt with Paul's opponents in connection with our discussion of the Jewish presupposition of salvation being not "by works". We now want to investigate more directly what Paul and his opponents shared in common. What was presupposed by Paul and the opponents and what were the points of agreement? We shall begin by sketching a suitable approach for determining the nature of the debate and the views of the opponents, as far as this is possible.

Any attempt to reconstruct the views of the opponents has one obvious difficulty. The Epistle to the Galatians presents us with what appears to be a one- sided conversation. Paul is giving his response to a problem that confronted the Church, but we must deduce what specific problem was from the correspondence. There is much room for differing views on the problem, in part because there are different approaches taken concerning how this task should be done.[1]

There are two main approaches. The first is "historical" in nature. This approach sees the Galatian controversy related to some historical phenomenon in the ancient world. William Ramsay, for example, understood Galatians in the light of religious movements in Asia Minor by appealing to literary and archaeological evidence about paganism and Judaism.[2] Others have understood the Galatian controversy and the opponents more

---

[1]. For a recent history of views see C.-N. Kim, Der Kampf des Paulus für das Evangelium in Galatien (diss. Mainz, 1984), 9-18.

[2]. William Ramsay, A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (London, 1900). See also for a more recent proponent of this method A. T. Kraabel, "Paganism and Judaism: The Sardis Evidence" in A. Benoit, M. Philoneko and C. Vogel (eds.), Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme. Influences et Affrontements dans le Monde Antique: (Mélanges offerts à M. Simon) (Paris, 1978), 13-33.

specifically in relation to a movement within early Christianity. This interpretation has taken several forms. (1) The opponents have been associated with Jewish Christians who demanded circumcision and Torah observance from all Christians at Antioch, similar to the views reflected at Acts 15. 5.[3] (2) It is claimed that the opponents are part of a widespread "apocalyptic" Jewish-Christian mission affecting the Christians at Galatia.[4] (3) The opponents are depicted as examples of Jewish-Christian Gnostics.[5]

An alternative to the approach which attempts to assess various "backgrounds" is to reconstruct the Galatian situation by considering the evidence of the letter itself. The technique inherent in this approach is to "mirror read" a text.[6] One attempt in the use of this technique is to take the "defensive statements" within Galatians and attempt to read off from these something of the nature and attitudes of the opponents.[7] Another use of this technique is to isolate text(s) and attempt to read off the Galatian situation from them. The danger of this is that one can be led to interpret the whole letter on the basis of several ambiguous texts. Schmithals, for example, leans heavily on 5. 3 and 6. 13 for his

---

[3]. See e.g. Jewett, "Agitators", 198-212; Dunn, "Antioch", 3-57, who both interpret this "judaizing" mission within the context of growing Jewish nationalism in Palestine. To what extent this phenomenon would have affected Galatia is difficult to determine, especially in the light of 2 Cor. 11. 22, where circumcision and Torah observance did not seem to be an issue. See, however Sanders, "Opponents", Vol. 1, 85-89.

[4]. e.g. J.J. Gunther, St. Paul's Opponents and Their Background (Leiden, 1973), 9.

[5]. W. Schmithals, "The Heretics in Galatia" in Paul and the Gnostics (Nashville,1972), 13-64 (revised ET from "Die Häretiker in Galatien" ZNW 47 (1956), 25-67. See the critique of Schmithals by R.McL. Wilson "Gnostics - in Galatia?" in Studia Evangelica IV (ed. F.L. Cross) (Berlin, 1968), 358-367.

[6]. On the difficulties inherent with the technique of "mirror-reading" see G. Lyons, Pauline Autobiography: Towards a New Understanding (Atlanta, 1985), 96-105.

[7]. e.g. Tyson, "Galatia", 241-254.

interpretation without any real consideration of Gal. 3-4.[8] Others infer from the language of "beginning" and "completing" at 3. 3 a theology of "perfection" for the opponents.[9] In this vein, Gal. 4. 3, 9, 10 have been used to suggest that the "heresy" of the opponents is characterized as Jewish Gnosis with Iranian influence.[10]

In view of the variety of methods employed criteria are required to decide matters of detail regarding Paul's opposition.[11] Several preliminary remarks relevant to our problem are in order. First, we must assume that Paul properly understood the views and interpretation of his opposition; second, that he did not intentionally misrepresent their views (otherwise his rebuttal would not have been very persuasive to the Galatians); third, that the opponents could not have agreed with all of Paul's judgements regarding their views, especially those describing their motives (e.g. 5. 7-12 and 6. 12ff).[12]

There are several clear criteria which could be employed so that a reconstruction deemed conceivable or possible may be promoted to the realm of probable or highly

---

[8]. Schmithals, Gnostics, passim. See also in this regard P. Borgen, Philo, John and Paul (Atlanta, 1987), 207-272, who does not considers ch. 3-4 to reconstruct the situation of Galatians but appeals to Gal. 5. 13ff, 5. 22ff, 6. 12f.

[9]. e.g. B. Brinsmead, Galatians-Dialogical Response to Opponents (Chico, 1982), 79, 191.

[10]. So K. Weganast, Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen (Neukirchen, 1962), 36-40. See also in this vein H. Koester, "Häretiker im Christentum" in RGG Vol. 3, 17-21 and " 'Gnomai Diaphoroi'. The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity", HTR 58 (1965), 279-318; Lührmann, Paulus, 69; Schlier, Galater, 202-207. Comp. however D. Lührmann's study "Tage, Monate, Jahreszeiten, Jahre (Gal 4.10)", in R. Albertz et al., Werken und Wirken des Alten Testament (Göttingen, 1980), 428-445, where he maintains that 4.10 is not a specifically "gnostic" reference but equally applies to various forms of Judaism.

[11]. This is one error of Brinsmead's study (see n. 9 above). Without giving any justification Brinsmead presumes (1) that Paul's statements often reflected that of his opposition (2) that his opponents sometimes had a different vocabulary (3) that Paul uses the terminology of his opponents but attributes to it a different meaning.

[12]. See on this point J. Eckert, Die urchristliche Verkündigung im Streit zwischen Paulus und seinen Gegern nach dem Galaterbrief (Regensburg, 1971), 22-26; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 27-28.

probable. J. Barclay has offered a useful list of criteria.[13] First, the criteria should be logical, consistent and suitably cautious. Second, they should take into consideration the whole of the letter to the Galatians and the major themes of this epistle. The reconstruction should not be built on "precarious structures" based on isolated texts. Third, if Paul's tone is emphatic we may presume the existence of some special problem. Conversely, a casual mention given to a matter may suggest peripheral importance. Fourth, the frequent re-occurrence of an issue may indicate a major problem whereas an occasional remark probably represents a side-issue. Fifth, an ambiguous statement capable of several interpretations is not the best basis for a hypothesis. Sixth, if Paul affirms something as true it is a reasonable deduction that his audience might have been in danger of overlooking or denying it. Conversely, if Paul denies something it may be because the Galatians are prone to regard it as true. And finally, if Paul issues a command it may be because the Galatians are in danger of neglecting the action. On the other hand, if Paul gives a prohibition there may be some risk that the action will be performed. In the course of our reconstruction of the Galatian controversy we shall attempt to keep these six criteria in mind.

We shall now begin to reconstruct a likely picture of the Galatian controversy. One of the undisputed facts is that the opponents were demanding that Gentile converts be circumcised (5. 2-6, 12; 6. 12-13; 2. 3-5).[14] This requirement is clearly recognized within the Jewish tradition for converts to Judaism.[15] Gen. 17 for example regards circumcision

---

[13]. J. Barclay, "Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case", JSNT 31 (1987), 73-93 also Obeying, 37-45

[14]. Eckert, Verkündigung, 31-71. For a discussion of critical opinion as to why the Galatians were "bewitched" by the opponents' demand to be circumcised see Barclay, Obeying, 47-52, and the literature cited.

[15]. There is also attested within Judaism a view that considers the uncircumcised not to be members of the covenant people, e.g. Jub. 15.26-8 (the uncircumcised "belongs not to the children of the Covenant which the Lord made with Abraham"). Comp. also m. Ab.

as the distinctive sign which demonstrates one's entry into the Abrahamic covenant.[16] With this sign of circumcision goes the obligation to keep clear commands of the Torah.

There was a second way in which circumcision was regarded as a distinctive sign within Judaism. It was circumcision that distinguished a "God-fearer" from a "proselyte".[17] Although certain Gentiles kept only some of the Law (e.g. Noachian laws) and circumcision may not have been an obligation within all groups of Judaism,[18] it was none the less generally regarded both in Palestine and the Diaspora as necessary for obtaining the rights and status of an Israelite.

It is within this context that many commentators find the most probable focus of the Galatian controversy.[19] In addition to satisfying several of the criteria sketched above, the view that the theology of the opponents is focused on circumcision as a seal of God's

---

3.11; b. Sanh. 99a; b. Yoma 85b.

[16]. On the importance of the covenant within Judaism see Sanders, PPJ; A. Jaubert, La Notion d'alliance dans le judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne (Paris, 1963); K. Baltzer, The Covenant Formulary in Old Testament, Jewish and Early Christian Writings (Oxford, 1971).

[17]. On proselytism see B.J. Bamberger, Proselytism in the Talmudic Period (New York, 1968); W.G. Braude, Jewish Proselytizing in the First Five Centuries of the Common Era (Providence, R. I., 1940); D.Daube, Ancient Jewish Law. Three Inaugural Lectures (Leiden, 1981); L.H. Schiffman, "At the Crossroads: Tannaitic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christians Schism", in E.P. Sanders (ed.), Jewish and Christian Self Definition (London, 1981) Vol. 2, 115-156; S. Zeitlin, "Proselytes and Proselytism During the Second Commonwealth and the Early Tannaitic Period", in Studies in the Early History of Judaism (New York, 1974), Vol. 2, 407-417; M. Simon, Verus Israel (Oxford, 1986), 271-305. See also J. J. Collins, "A Symbol of Otherness: Circumcision and Salvation in the First Century", in J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs (eds.), "To See Ourselves As Others See Us" : Christians, Jews "Others" in Late Antiquity (Chico, 1985), esp. 163-185.

[18]. McEleney, "Conversion", 310-341, argues from a variety of Jewish evidence that proselyte circumcision is not always required. This view, however is challenged by Nolland, "Uncircumcised, 173-194, and Schürer, Jewish People, Vol. 3.1, 165ff. See also Collins, "Otherness", 164-179.

[19]. Mussner, Galaterbrief 216-217; Burton, Galatians, 153-159; J. Bligh, Galatians. A Discussion of St. Paul's Epistle (London, 1969), 239-240; Barclay, Obeying, 45ff.; Jewett, "Agitators", 200-201; Sanders, Law, 18; Hübner, Law, 16; Davies, "People", 127-129.

covenant with Abraham is firmly rooted within Scripture.[20] This is set over against the strikingly unfamiliar use Paul makes of Scripture in his treatment of the Abraham theme. In this connection it is also relevant that the arguments of Galatians require an audience that includes, in addition to Jews, former proselytes and God-fearers who have knowledge and experience of the synagogue.[21] This would ensure that the scriptural exegesis of Gal. 3-4 and the paraenesis of 5. 1-6. 10 are intelligible.[22] This audience is consistent with those who understand the meaning and significance of a requirement for circumcision. Finally, the close association between privilege and responsibility which characterized most forms of first-century Judaism is reflected in the demand of the opponents for would-be proselytes to observe the law and be circumcised.

If circumcision then formed an integral part of the debate and the opponents could justifiably appeal to OT Scripture in support of their view, what formed the basis of the intense dispute between Paul and the opponents? There were several factors implicit within the outlook of the opponents that may help answer this question. First is that the view of the opponents assumes that there was a recognized halakah within Judaism regarding entry of Gentiles into the people of God and that the "legal" requirement for this entrance was circumcision. Second, the tenacity with which the opponents approach the Gentile question

---

[20]. So C. K. Barrett, "The Allegory of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar in the Argument of Galatians", in Essays on Paul (London, 1982), 158: "Paul's words can best be explained if we may suppose that he is taking up passages that had been used by his opponents, correcting their exegesis, and showing that their Old Testament prooftexts were on his side rather than on theirs." See also Barrett, Freedom, 18ff esp. 22 and J.L. Martyn, "A Law-Observant Mission to the Gentiles: The Background to Galatians", Michigan Quarterly Review 22 (1983), 230-235.

[21]. This is assuming that the discussion of Galatians is intended both for the opponents and in some sense for the implied Galatian reader. Notwithstanding this point, some sections (e.g. chs. 3-4) may be more comprehensible by the opponents and other sections (e.g. 3. 1-5; 5. 1ff.) directed at the Galatians.

[22]. Davies, "Galatians", 176-177, 180.

indicates that other perhaps equally legitimate approaches could have existed within early Christianity. Finally, the view of the opponents assumes that entrance of Gentile converts into the "seed of Abraham" and Gentiles becoming proselytes are identical realities that require the same obligation: circumcision. A proper consideration of these factors may enable us to appreciate how the dispute arose and perhaps to see reasons behind the intensity of the Galatians controversy.

Let us take these in order. It is a widely held view within the Jewish tradition that in the last days Gentiles would enter the people of God.[23] This was a point that Paul and his opponents agreed upon: indeed this formed the focus of the debate. However, what was left ambiguous was on what basis Gentiles could enter. Were Gentiles to become full proselytes before they could become converts to the Christian movement? The opponents' answer was yes. The problem that confronted Jewish Christianity was that there was "no accepted halakah" within the Jewish tradition regarding conditions for entry of Gentiles into the people of God.[24] One text that could have been appealed to by Paul's opponents was Is. 56. 6-8, where "foreigners" who enter the people of God are expected to embrace the covenant (circumcision) and keep the Sabbath.[25] However, these verses from Isaiah, as far as it is possible to tell, did not play a part in the opponents' argument. This leads us to a second factor relevant to our discussion -- that the opponents gave the impression that there was little debate within early Christianity on the question of conditions for Gentile

---

[23]. Jeremias, Promise, 61; Sanders, Jesus, 213-214; T. L. Donaldson, "The Curse of the Law and the Inclusion of Gentiles: Gal. 3. 13-14", NTS 32 (1986), 94ff. The exception to this view is 1 QM and Jub. 22. 20f. I En. 91.9; Bar. 4.25, 31, 35; Sir. 36.7,9, where the destruction of the Gentiles is attested. See the discussion in ch. 4 above.

[24]. Sanders, Law, 18-19, 50 n. 9.

[25]. The text was noted in connection to halakah prescribed for Gentile converts to Judaism by P. Fredriksen in a paper entitled "Jewish Restoration Eschatology" read at the NT Seminar, Oxford on 15 June 1989, MS 1-7.

entry into the people of God.[26] However, J. Meier and R. Brown have argued that there were various approaches during the early decades of the Christian movement to the Gentile mission. They suggest three approaches relevant to our discussion.[27] The first is the view of those Jewish Christians who claimed that full observance of the Mosaic law was required -- including circumcision. This view is reflective of the opponents who influenced the Christians at Galatia and whom Paul refers to as the "false brethren" who were secretly brought in to spy out freedom of Paul and Titus (2. 4). At Acts 15. 5 a group with similar tendencies is depicted as members of the sect of the Pharisees.

The second approach consists of Jewish Christians who did not insist on circumcision for Gentile converts but required them to keep some Jewish observances. According to Acts 15 and Gal. 2 James and Peter agreed with Paul that circumcision was not to be imposed on Gentile converts. Acts 15. 20 indicates that James insisted that they accept the following elements; (1) to abstain from food polluted by idols; (2) to abstain from sexual immorality; (3) to abstain from meat from the strangled[28] and from blood. The view that some Jewish observances were required is evident at Gal. 2. 12, where "men from James" created embarassment at Antioch over the question of Jewish Christians eating with Gentiles, presumably because they did not keep the food laws. What is significant is that Acts omits the point about not eating with Gentiles. Yet the fact that "men from James" came to Antioch with demands about certain food laws, that a letter embodying James's

---

[26]. This could equally be levelled at Paul in his rebuttal of the opponents' view.

[27]. Meier and Brown, Antioch and Rome. Meier and Brown, also consider John, the Hellenists, and Hebrews and place the view of these witnesses in the category that goes beyond Paul's outlook.

[28]. A recent defence of the Western text of Acts 15. 20 was marshalled by P. Borgen, "No Apostolic Decree", NT Seminar, Oxford, Feb. 1989. Other advocates of this view are given by B. M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (London and New York, 1971), 433-434.

position (Acts 15. 23) was sent to Gentiles in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, and that Paul had to debate the issue of food offered to idols at Corinth (1 Cor. 8) suggests that we are dealing with a missionary thrust that produced another style of Jewish Christians less rigid than the first approach.

The third approach on the Gentile question insisted neither on circumcision nor observance of the Jewish food laws. The most celebrated representative of this view is Paul. Despite the evidence of Acts 15, implying his acceptance of the position advocated by James, 1 Cor. 8 suggests Paul resisted the view of James regarding the observance of food laws. Specifically, Paul does not require Christians to abstain from food dedicated to idols (1 Cor. 8, 10) -- a requirement clearly imposed by James according to Acts 15. 20, 29. Notwithstanding that Paul clearly does not make circumcision a condition for Gentiles to become members of the people of God, there are ambiguities in his approach. For example, Paul objects to circumcision and food laws, yet he admonishes his converts to keep the commandments. At Rom. 13. 8-10 he quotes from the Decalogue and then adds the comment that if you love your neighbour as yourself you have fulfilled the Law (in this context the referent is the ten commandments).

If Brown and Meier are correct that in the early decades of the Church there was some variety regarding what was required for Gentiles to enter into the people of God, then we are given a larger context within which to interpret the debate between Paul and his opponents. What we find in the Galatian controversy are two approaches to the Gentile question in debate with each other. Furthermore, if there were several different approaches taken on the Gentile question it is inappropriate to speak of the opponents in Galatians as

representing the establishment view and Paul and Gentile Christians as proponents of a sectarian attitude.[29]

A final factor that will assist in properly understanding the background of the Galatian controversy is to observe a correlation made by the opponents. Specifically, they argued that the requirements for proselytes should be the same as for Gentile converts to the Christian movement. The rationale for this may have been that since the "final days" had begun and Gentiles would be made part of the people of God during this end time, a decision was required regarding their conditions for entry. Since the normal requirements for entry into the people of God was full proselytization, Paul's Jewish opponents made the deduction that this should likewise be the case for Gentile converts. Paul is made to reflect a view contrary to Jewish opinion. Consequently, his rebuttal to the opponents is seen by some scholars as indicative of his separation from Judaism, especially the synagogue.[30] However, since there was no accepted halakot that dictated specific conditions for Gentile entry, and since there appeared to be several different approaches to the Gentile question in early Christianity, we suggest that a plausible context with which to understand the Galatian controversy is that of an intramural or "family dispute" between two opposing views within Jewish Christianity.[31] Each group was confronted with the fact that salvation history had progressed such that Gentile entry was present history. In this vein, the pressing issue became "What is a legitimate basis for entry of Gentile converts into the new covenant community"? In order to legitimate their respective views, Paul and his opponents appealed

---

[29]. So Watson, Gentile, 49ff, 72. See, however, in this connection, Davies, "Pitfalls" 96-100.

[30]. So Räisänen, Law, passim also " Galatians 2. 16 and Paul's Break with Judaism", NTS 31 (1985), 544; Watson, Gentiles, eg. 19, 22, 61ff; Betz, Galatians, passim. Comp. Dunn, "Perspective", 112.

[31]. Davies, "People", 135-137 and "Galatians", 181.

to OT Scripture, variously interpreting the common Jewish tradition. This scenario accords with a pre-70 context for the Galatian debate, where one must speak in terms of several different interpretations of Judaism in competition with one another. Therefore it is "arguable that even in Galatians the Christian movement was not for Paul an antithesis to the religion of his fathers but a particular interpretation of it in the light of Christ crucified".[32]

If the context of the Galatian controversy is one of intramural activity between Jewish Christians and not one that reflects separation or a break from Judaism per se,[33] we must determine what was held in common between Paul, his opponents, and the rest of Judaism and where the central areas of dispute lay. To this end we shall consider the evidence under the categories of explicit and implicit data. Let us begin with the explicit material and consider Gal. 2. 11-14.[34]

The importance of this pericope for our enquiry is evident by virtue of its focus on correct behaviour. The issues raised by the incident at Antioch may have been threefold. First, since the opponents considered the Gentiles "sinners" (Gal. 2. 15), must Jewish Christians remain separate from their Gentile brethren and not participate in fellowship meals together? Second, if eating together is permissible, under what circumstances ought Jewish Christians to have table fellowship with their Gentile brethren? Third, do laws

---

[32]. Davies, "Galatians", 181.

[33]. This point must be stressed in view of the fact that scholars persist in seeing the Galatian controversy not as a debate over conditions for Gentile entry but as Paul's confrontation with Judaism e.g. F. Hahn, "Das Gesetzverständnis im Römer und Galaterbrief", ZNW 67 (1976-77), 51f; Luz, Paulus, 219; Hübner, Law, and "Identitätsverlust und paulinische Theologie", KD 24 (1978), 183; Betz, Galatians, 116. For the view we are taking see e.g. Sanders, Law, 18-20, 48-52; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 11-29 and "Theologische 'Wiedergutmachung.' Am Beispiel der Auslegung des Galaterbriefes", Freiburger Rundbrief 26 (1974), 7-11; Davies, "Galatians" esp. 180-181.

[34]. See R. Kieffer, Foi et Justification à Antioche (Paris, 1982), 81-134, for a history of criticism on this passage.

relating to unclean food, as stipulated in the OT (e.g. Lev. 11. 1-23 and Deut. 14. 3-21), also apply to Jewish Christians in their relations with Gentile Christians?[35]

There were three general views of these issues. First was that of Peter and Barnabas, who had, like Paul, affirmed a belief of equality in Christ for both Jews and Gentiles extending to the sharing of meals together. This view is based on the assertion that all people have become "one" in Christ in accordance with Gal. 3. 28[36] and that circumcision is not the distinctive symbol of community membership for those in Christ who are and heirs of Abraham (6. 15; 5. 6). Therefore, what we find in Antioch is the situation of a mixed community having fellowship, and sharing meals and perhaps the Lord's table together.[37] This behaviour had become a way of life[38] for Jewish Christians at Antioch if Peter, Barnabas, and the "rest of the Jews" mentioned at 2. 12-13 represent the entire community. However, this only lasted until a group of Jewish Christians from Jerusalem depicted as envoys of James put pressure on Peter to change his behaviour. Their charge is stated at 2. 14 -- if you, though a Jew, live like a Gentile, how can you compel the Gentiles to judaize? Interpreted, this means "if you have already made it your practice not to observe social separation from Gentiles, do you now by the arrival of the

---

[35]. These are agreed to be the issues of our pericope, notwithstanding differences over detail: so Bruce, Galatians, 137; Betz, Galatians, 106f; Hübner, Law, 25; Bonnard, Galates, 48; Sieffert, Galater, 127; D. Lührmann, Der Brief an die Galater (Zürich, 1978), 42; H. Lietzmann, An die Galater (Tübingen, 1932), 14; Schlier, Galater, 86; Lightfoot, Galatians, 114; Kieffer, Antioche, 17-25; Dunn, "Antioch", esp. 25ff.; T. Holtz, "Der Antiochenische Zwischenfall (Galater 2. 11-14)", NTS 32 (1986), 344-361.

[36]. It is also the case that Peter's behaviour is consistent with the Lukan portrayal of him in the Cornelius story (Acts 10. 1-11. 18), where those of the circumcision (οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς) charge Peter with eating with the uncircumcised. Cf. Sieffert, Galater, 125; Betz Galatians, 107 n. 448; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 138.

[37]. We are in agreement with Bonnard, Galates, 45, that it is difficult to determine whether eating included partaking of the Lord's Supper. For a sketch of the various views on this point see Mussner, Ibid.

[38]. The imperfect form συνήσθιεν suggests this is so Betz, Galatians, 107; Lagrange, Galates, 43; Mussner, Ibid.; Sieffert, Galater, 128; Bonnard, Galater, 49.

Jerusalem envoy expect the Gentiles to judaize, i.e. to assimilate Jewish customs up to but not necessarily including circumcision?"[39] The result of Peter's separation is to ensure that further association with the Gentiles does not lead to eating their food.[40] The predicament in which Peter finds himself is trying to reconcile two irreconcilable principles. The first is the view that Gentiles by virtue of their nature are "sinners". Second, salvation in Christ is for "all" on the same basis, irrespective of racial classification.[41] Peter's attempt results in what Paul calls "hypocrisy" because he was not direct about the truth of the Gospel but relied on what he had learnt through being brought up a Jew.[42]

---

[39]. This understanding of ἰουδαϊζειν is supported by two examples. In the LXX of Esther 8. 17 we read "Many of the Gentiles were circumcised and judaized (ἰουδαϊζον) for fear of the Jews." The second example is found in War, 2. 454, where we are told of a certain Metilius, the commander of the Roman garrison in Jerusalem, who "saved his life by entreaties and promises to judaize and even be circumcised" (καὶ μέχρι περιτομῆς ἰουδαΐσειν). From both of these examples it is evident that "judaizing" and circumcision are not the same thing---the latter only being a more complete expression of the former. Compare also here War 2. 462-3 where we are told of a considerable number of Gentiles in Syria who have attached themselves in varing degrees to Judaism. Cf. Dunn, "Antioch", 26-27; Kieffer, Antioche, 33; Barclay, Obeying, 77. However, G. Howard, Paul: Crisis in Galatia (Cambridge, 1979), 23-28, assumes uncritically that ἰουδαϊζειν refers solely to circumcision. See also in this regard, P. F. Esler, Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts (Cambridge, 1987), 88. For the view that both dietary stipulation and circumcision are intended see Schlier, Galater, 87; Kieffer, Ibid. 34.

[40]. The uncleanliness of Gentile food is well documented e.g. Dan. 1. 8-16; Tob. 1. 10-13; 1 Macc. 1. 62-3; 2 Macc. 6. 18, 7. 2; 3 Macc. 3. 4; Jub. 22. 16; Jos. and As. 7. 1; Ant. 14. 223-230; Acts 10. 14, 11. 2-3. On dietary practices in general see H. Rabinowicz, "Dietary Laws", Enc. Jud. Vol. 6, 26-45; A. Wiener, Die jüdischen Speisegesetze nach ihren verschiedenen Gesichtspunkten (Breslau, 1895); J.N. Sevenster, The Roots of Pagan Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World (Leiden, 1975), 139.

[41]. Barrett, Freedom, 18-19; similarly Betz, Galatians, 112.

[42]. Sieffert, Galater, 128 suggests the possibility that eating with Gentile Christians occurred because no prior instruction was given against it. In effect Peter was following the logic implicit in a belief that the gospel is for all on the same basis.

The second view of the issue that emerges from our pericope is that of the "opponents", whose attitude towards Gentiles may be summarized[43] at 2. 15 "we are Jewish by nature[44] and not Gentile sinners". This is a dominant Jewish attitude towards Gentiles, as is indicated by words "sinner" and "Gentile" being synonymous. This view is found already in Ps. 9. 17, but occurs also in 1 Macc. 2. 48; Pss. Sol. 1. 1; 2. 1-2. It is further to be noted that the depiction "sinner" is determined in relation to the Law. Specifically, a sinner is one who either broke the law or did not know it. Therefore, in the LXX the link is made between sinner and lawlessness (e.g. Ps. 27. 3; 54. 3; 91. 7; 100. 8; 124. 3; 128. 3). This link continues in a later period, where "sinner" and "lawless men" are parallel terms (1 Macc. 1. 34; 2. 44).[45] When one turns to Gal. 2. 11ff and asks in what sense Gentiles are sinners, it seems reasonable to suggest that it is in some sense directly related to eating meals together. Dunn has raised the issue by asking what the men from James expected from Peter. He suggests three possibilities.[46] First, the Jerusalem envoy expected a greater observances of the Torah. This was because the Jewish believers at Antioch were no longer observing the laws of unclean foods, did not insist that animals were to be killed in

---

[43]. So Bruce, Galatians, 137; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 67; H. Feld, "Christus Diener der Sünde", ThQ 153 (1973), 123. On this formulation see also H. Neitzel, "Zur Interpretation von Gal 2. 11-21", ThQ 163 (1983), 16-30.

[44]. φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι is best understood as a reference to privileges of race comp. Rom. 9. 4; 2. 17; 3. 2; Phil. 3. 5; so Schlier, Galater, 88; Lagrange, Galates, 46; Sieffert, Galater, 141; Bonnard, Galates, 52; Kieffer, Antioche, 39-41. The inclusion of ἡμεῖς suggests this was a point Paul and the opponents shared. Thus we have here an example of Paul's Jewish bias coming through.

[45]. See also on the Jewish attitude toward Gentiles, Schürer, Jewish People, Vol. 2, 81-84; Alon, Classical World, 165-167; Dunn, "Antioch", 17-19. For a broader presentation of the Jewish view on Gentiles compare Sanders, Jesus, 212-218.

[46]. However, Esler, Community, 78-84, has argued that there was little diversity regarding the question of Jews dining with Gentiles. He maintains that Jews refrained from eating with Gentiles and this was a distinctive feature from the 4th cent. BC of the classical period. The evidence discussed by Esler has been recently considered by Sanders, "Jewish Association", 9ff. MS, and the conclusions derived, contrary to Esler, were that Gentiles did eat with Jews provided that certain conditions were met.

accordance with the law or that foods offered to idols were prohibited. The second possibility is that Peter and the other Jewish Christians were asking Gentile God-fearers to act as proselytes and be circumcised. On this reading the men from James were not insisting on the observances of dietary laws because to a considerable degree they were already observing even laws of tithes and ritual purity.[47]

The third alternative is an intermediate position between the two already given. It is that the Jewish Christians were expected to be more scrupulous in their observance of dietary laws, especially relating to tithing and ritual purity. Dunn favours this third suggestion on the grounds that the practice of table-fellowship had "not totally disregarded the law but probably had paid due heed to the basic dietary laws of the Torah".[48] What the men from James were shocked by was the minimalist attitude towards the observance of Torah and that it was being carried out in a far too casual manner.[49] While they assumed with Paul, Barnabas, and the "rest of the Jews" at Antioch that the Gospel would be offered to the Gentiles, what the men from James had not envisaged was that Jews and Gentiles would partake in fellowship meals together. To do so would violate the stipulations on dietary laws and the practice of social separation towards Gentile "sinners".

The issue at Antioch has recently been considered by Sanders.[50] He suggests that men from James did not press a general case, that Jewish members of the Christian movement should not eat with Gentile members, but a specific case, that Peter, apostle to the circumcised, should not associate too much with the uncircumcised. If there was a specific legal problem, it was probably in connection with idolatry via pagan meat or wine.

---

47. See Dunn, "Antioch", 29-31 for his own critique and reasons for rejecting these two possibilities.

48. Dunn, Ibid., 35.

49. See Dunn Ibid. 31-2; 36, for other arguments to support this position.

50. Sanders, "Jewish Association" esp. 22-24 MS.

But more likely James was worried that he fraternized too much with Gentiles and thus was generally suspect. In this connection the point is made that the issue is not over the violation of biblical law. On this point Dunn and Sanders agree.

Considering these points together, what the men from James required of Peter was less association with Gentile Christians, since this could have the effect of discrediting Peter's reputation. In addition, it was a worry that Peter was not cautious enough regarding eating Gentile food since it might appear as though he was "flirting" with idolatry and food which the Bible calls "abomination".

We have noted above the views of Peter and Barnabas and the opponents. We can now state a third view taken of the controversy raised at Antioch. This is solely reflected by Paul, who claimed that the Jewish view of separation from Gentiles had been overturned in Christ to the extent that Jews and Gentiles are to practise regular fellowship at mealtime. Furthermore, the Jewish judgement of Gentiles as "sinners" has been cancelled by virtue of their being "baptized" in Christ, because he became sin on behalf of Gentile "sinners". Therefore, Galatians can be seen in one sense as a legitimation of the "truth" that one aspect of Judaism that Christ has overturned in the cross is the social separation of Gentiles from Jews.

In this context we can now suggest areas of common ground shared among these three views. First, each of the three groups shared a belief in Gentile entry into the people of God and held that initiation for this entry was baptism. Second, by conviction Paul maintained that mixed communities of Jews and Gentiles eating together were a significant consequence of the fact that all categories of people are "one" in Christ. The "opponents", on the other hand, it is argued, believed that for Jews and Gentiles to eat together violated the purity laws regarding diet (Dunn) or opened the possibility of discrediting Peter's reputation because he was not more cautious regarding Gentile food (Sanders). Peter,

Barnabas and the other Jewish Christians at Antioch found sympathy with the opponents' view(s) (regardless of whether one adopts the view of Dunn or Sanders) even if their practice suggests that they did not subscribe to the opponents' view with conviction. If they had held to a view of separation from Gentiles out of conviction they would perhaps not have changed their minds so easily when the envoy arrived. However, conviction and practice do not always coincide with one another. Indeed, the fact that Peter made it his practice to eat with Gentile Christians, yet when the envoy from Jerusalem arrived changed his stance, illustrates this point. By noting this change on Peter's part we shall be able to observe several important features regarding the common ground shared between the opponents and Peter and Barnabas.

It is first to be noted that Peter's change in behaviour at the arrival of the Jerusalem opponents indicates that he is in agreement with the view of the opponents that Gentiles are considered sinners. When pressure is on from the Jewish brethren Peter responds in a way that shows him to be a Jew with a view similar to that of the Jerusalem group. Indeed, Peter acts in a way that suggests that he is less influenced by a theology of oneness in Christ and justification for all on the same basis than by the view that Gentiles are "sinners". This adds force to the point that his behaviour is consistent with a common Jewish sentiment.

This point is affirmed by a second observation, that not just Peter but other Jews as well respond in a similiar way, showing their sympathy with the Jerusalem group, i.e. Barnabas and the rest of the Jews at Antioch. Even if one may concede that Barnabas and these other Jews were acting in accord with Peter due to their allegiance to him or the influence of his position in the early Church, this does not lessen the fact that their response was one consistent with Peter as well as with the Jerusalem opponents.

The third point that emerges from the the incident at Antioch is that we find three separate examples of Jews (Peter, Barnabas, and the "rest") behaving in a way similar to the Jerusalem opponents. However, there is one difference—the opponents did so out of conviction while Peter, Barnabas, and the other Jews were not sincere. But this judgement of insincerity is Paul's interpretation of the the response of Peter, Barnabas, and the other Jews. From the Jewish point of view their response is consistent with being Jews "by nature". We therefore suggest from these observations that the behaviour and attitude of the Jerusalem opponents, Peter, Barnabas and "the rest of the Jews" reflect a common Jewish sentiment concerning the issue of eating with Gentiles.

We must now consider material that reflects implicit data relating to possible common ideas shared by Paul, his opponents and their contemporary Judaism. The pericopes we shall assess for this purpose are Gal. 3. 6-29 and 4. 21-30. We shall begin with the assumption of many scholars, that within the text of chapters 3 and 4 one hears echoes of what Paul's opponents were saying.[51]

Indeed, it is also thought that it is only by beginning with this assumption that one can make sense of Paul's argument.[52] Therefore, our discussion will aim to determine from the arguments of Paul how the opponents may have presented their case, where the areas

---

[51]. Barrett, "Allegory", 158ff and Freedom, 22ff.; Hübner, Law, 16, 42 n. 2; Burton, Galatians, 156ff; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 221 n. 46; Beker, Paul, 30; Brinsmead, Opponents, 108; Zeller, Mission, 94; R. Bring, Commentary on Galatians (Philadelphia, 1961), 111; Eckert, Verkündigung, 75f; Watson, Gentiles, 65; Oepke, Galater, 69. B. Byrne, "Sons of God" - "Seed of Abraham" (Rome, 1979), 148f, and L. Gaston, "Paul and the Law in Galatians 2 - 3",in P. Richardson, Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity (Waterloo: Ontario, 1986), Vol. 1, 48-49, contest this view. Comp. K. Berger, "Abraham in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen", Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift 17 (1966), 47-63, who does not treat Gal. 3 as Paul countering views of his opponents but as a general theological treatise.

[52]. Watson, Gentiles, 70.

of disagreement were, where the opponents and Paul agreed, and how the respective parties in the debate regarded their views in relation to the Judaism of the time.

Let us begin by sketching a preliminary list of common points shared by Paul and the opponents as portrayed in Gal 3. First, the all-important question that generated the debate was how membership into the seed of Abraham was to be obtained.[53] Second, the centrality of the figure of Abraham within the debate is assumed. This is evident in the repetition of his name in the chapter (vv. 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 16, 18).[54] What is debated is the correct interpretation of the tradition associated with Abraham, not his importance. Third, the debate presumes that the admission of Gentiles as members of the people of God was likewise a point not contested. The issue was on what terms. Fourth, the OT was the legitimating authority of appeal for both parties of the debate. Integral to this appeal to the OT were the different ways the OT was used by the respective parties of the debate. Fifth, there is a strong sense for Paul and the opponents to show that their views correspond to the salvific purposes of God, especially as this relates to the place of faith and law.[55] Finally, symbols of Jewish ethnicity loom over the entire discussion: obligation to covenant, circumcision, and obedience to the Torah.

---

[53]. So Hübner, Law, 15f; Watson, Gentiles, 70; Barrett, Freedom, 25; Sanders, Law, 19; Beker, Paul, 48; Byrne, Sons, 148; Lagrange, Galates, 62; J. D. G.Dunn, "Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3. 10-14)", NTS 31 (1985), 529; Bligh, Galatians, 239; Schlier, Galater, 128f; G. Ebling, The Truth of the Gospel: An Exposition of Galatians (Philadelphia, 1985), 165; Burton, Galatians, 156-159. See also C. Dietzfelbinger, Paulus und das Alte Testament (Münich, 1961) 19-23, for the importance given to the "seed of Abraham" in these verses.

[54]. Mussner, Galaterbrief, 213 refers to the name of Abramham in vv.6-18 as the "Stichwort". Similarly Barclay, Obeying, 86ff.

[55]. Sanders, Law, 26. This emphasis is also brought out by Howard, Crisis, 54, 64; Zeller, Juden, 97.

The best point of departure in considering the passage for our purpose is to note that to a large extent the debate is one concerning scriptural exegesis.[56] The debate is focused around the Abraham story, and the story is used to assist in answering the question of how membership into the family of Abraham can be obtained. Paul begins with Gen. 15. 6 at v. 6 and proceeds to include five other texts in the chapter to present his own viewpoint. The texts, except one, are from the Torah (Gen.18. 18 (v. 8); Dt. 27. 26 (v. 10b); Hab. 2. 4 (v. 11b); Lev.18. 5 (v. 12b); Dt.21. 23 (v. 12b)). A second way to use the passage for our purpose is to follow the conclusions Paul draws from his appeal to the OT texts (eg. vv. 7 ,9). Thirdly, one can observe the terminological associations that are made between the OT texts and the correlations which Paul draws from his appeal to the OT.[57] As we have already indicated, the issue Paul is discussing is on what basis membership in Abraham's family is attained. There are several answers that Jews could have given. The first is by physical descent -- one is a member by virtue of birth. However, this method is irrelevant for non-Jews. A second way that is relevant to non-Jews is through proselytization. Implicit in this method is that Gentiles must observe the Torah as well as become circumcised. It was the latter of these approaches that Paul's opponents adopted in treating the Gentile Christians at Galatia. To support this view the Abraham story can be used, especially Gen. 17. 10-13.[58] However, Paul appealed to another part of the Abraham story for his view. This text was Gen 15. 6, which he quotes at Gal 3. 6: Abraham

---

[56]. Barrett, Freedom, 22; Hübner, Law, 15-17; Howard, Crisis, 54; Ebling, Truth, 165; Beker, Paul, 47; Bligh, Galatians, 214; Sanders, Law, 21ff; Betz, Galatians, 138; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 213; Luz, Paulus, 279-281.

[57]. The methodological approach taken here is similar to that of Sanders, Law, 21ff; comp. also Betz, Galatians, 138. While in our view there is reason to contest Hübner's treatment of Gal 3. 10-12, we are sympathetic to his analysis of vv. 6-9, Law, 16-17. See also the useful analysis of the structure of vv. 6-14 offered by Lührmann, Galater, 53.

[58]. Bruce, Galatians, 155; Hübner, Law, 16; Bligh, Galatians, 242f; Sanders, Law, 18; Barrett, Freedom, 24.

believed God and it was reckoned to him as righteousness. The conclusion (ἄρα) he draws from this occurs at v. 7. Those who are "sons of Abraham" are so because of their faith. Therefore, entry is not related to the requirements of Torah or circumcision, but to faith. The point to be noted is that both Paul's and the opponents' interpretation of the Abraham story occur within Gen. 15-18, though taken from different parts of the story. While Paul bases his view of Gen. 15, the opponents appeal to Gen. 17 for their point of view. Yet both parties have done this with a clear purpose in mind.

Thus far Paul has incorporated in his argument one OT text, from which he has brought together two key concepts for his argument -- faith and sonship in Abraham. The third concept that is essential for his view comes in v. 8. To make his point he cites another OT text and and draws out its consequence in v. 9. He must bring together Abraham, the Gentiles, and and faith as the means of entry. Paul does this by quoting from Gen. 18. 18: "In thee shall all the Gentiles (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) be blessed".[59] From this text the conclusion (ὥστε) made is that those who are of faith are blessed with the faith of Abraham (v.9).[60] The ἔθνη intended here are the Gentile Christians (if there is any doubt

---

[59]. It is thought by many scholars and commentators that the controlling OT text alluded to here is Gen. 12. 3. But the Greek word used there is πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαί, whereas the Greek of Gen. 18. 18 is πάντα τὰ ἔθνη . Since Paul's argument requires the inclusion of the Gentiles it is the latter text that best suits Paul's purpose. Consequently, it is reasonable to find this aspect of the Gen. 18. 18 text used by Paul at Gal. 3. 8. It is improbable to suggest (as Watson, Gentiles, 70) that the Judaizers may have made use of Gen. 12. 3. Strictly speaking, Paul cites from the LXX of Gen 18. 18b, except for ἐν σοί which is from Gen. 12. 3, c.f. Mussner, Galaterbrief, 220 and n. 42; similarly Sanders, Law, 21, 53 n. 24. The appeal to Gen. 18. 18 in connection with Gen. 15. 6 (Gal. 3. 6) is noted by F. Hahn, "Gen. 15.6 im Neuen Testament" in H. W. Wolff (ed.), Probleme biblischer Theologie, für Gerhard von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag (Münich, 1971), 100.

[60]. What Paul has done is to bind together elements of vv. 7 and 8 i.e. faith, Abraham, Gentiles, and drawn a consequence in v. 9: so Mussner, Galaterbrief, 222. This is based on terminological association and the citation of an OT text. Hübner, Law, 17, has summarized Paul's argument as a syllogism. The first premise is: Abraham was justified because of his faith. This is followed by a second premise: In Abraham all the people are blessed. The conclusion drawn from these is that if the peoples are blessed, i.e. justified, this is because of their faith, as it was with Abraham.

of this v. 8a dispel the suspicion). We can see that Paul brings together OT citations and terminological associations, and draws his own conclusions from these OT texts to present a case against his opponents. Like Paul, their view began with Abraham and they sought to legitimate their view from the OT. However, in choosing another OT text Paul argued for different conclusions, those which did not include in the necessity for Gentile entry the requirements of the Torah or circumcision.

Consequently, Paul has shown that for him Abraham-Christ-faith/blessing function together as a unit. This is set in contrast to his opponents, who associate together Abraham-Christ-Torah/circumcision. In this present formulation Paul has drawn a wedge between Abraham and the Torah and Torah and Christ, and in so doing has offered a radical antithesis between faith and the Torah.[61]

The second stage of the argument begins at vv. 10ff.[62] In these verses we find Paul carrying forward his scriptural argument, by appealing to four further OT texts. In addition to this method of argument it is significant that in the case of three of the OT texts Paul offers an introductory comment to indicate how he intends the OT to be understood. Paul gives his conclusion first and then cites the OT.[63]

There is reason to think that this stage of the argument continues Paul's debate with his opponents.[64] This is so because on the face of it Dt. 27. 26 says just the opposite

---

[61]. Beker, Paul, 51.

[62]. Sanders, Law, 22, correctly states that these verses have a "subsidiary" role to the over-all argument of vv. 6-14.

[63]. Betz, Galatians, 144; Sanders, Ibid., 22.

[64]. Sieffert, Galater, 178; Barrett, Freedom, 25f; "Allegory", 159; U. Wilckens, "Zur Entwicklung des paulinischen Gesetzesverständnisses", NTS 28 (1981-2), 165; Watson, Gentiles, 71, maintains "whether or not Paul's opponents used this text it perfectly sums up what must have been their position". Consequently the "works of the law" intended are Torah and circumcision; see e.g. Lagrange, Galates, 68. Dunn, "Curse", 531, Barclay, Obeying, 82f; R. Heiligenthal, "Soziologische Implikationen der paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre im Galaterbrief am Beispiel der 'Werke des Gesetzes'", Kairos 26 (1984), 49f; and W. Meeks, "Towards a Social Description of Pauline Christianity", in W.

of what Paul claims.[65] The point he intends to make is that reliance on the Law is a curse. Yet Dt. 27. 26 (LXX) states that everyone is cursed who does not do all the things prescribed in the written Torah. A curse is not pronounced on those under the Law but on those who reject or disobey the Law. It is difficult to know how those who desire to be under the Law (i.e. the opponents) can be said to reject or disobey it. Paul, none the less, quotes the OT text with the hope of confronting his opponents' view. What Paul's argument requires is a text which brings together "law" and "cursed", and Dt. 27. 26 fulfills this purpose. In fact, Paul cites the only text in the LXX which brings together νόμος and ἐπικατάρατος.[66] We note that in addition to this repetition of language between preface and OT text (law and curse) we find the "blessing" bestowed upon those who have gone the way of Abraham (3. 9) functioning as a counterpart to the "cursing" (3. 10) incurred by those who do not insist on circumcision and the fulfilment of Torah.[67] Paul arrives at this

---

S. Green (ed.), Approaches to Ancient Judaism (Missoula, MT, 1980), Vol. 2, 33 each draw attention to the social dimension of "works" language. There are still those who persist in seeing the discussion of these verses as formed around "works-righteousness", legalism so Burton, Galatians, 165; Bring, Galatians, 120ff; Fuller, "Works of the Law", 28-42; H. Ridderbos, St. Paul's Epistle to the Churches of Galatia (Grand Rapids, 1981), 125; or as a contrast between living by faith vs. living by law so H. C. C. Cavallin, "'The Righteous Shall Live by Faith.' A Decisive Argument for the Traditional Interpretation", ST 32 (1978), 33-43.

[65]. Watson, Gentiles, Ibid.; Barrett, Freedom, 25f; Bligh, Galatians, 258; Lührmann, Galater, 55; Luz, Paulus, 149; Betz, Galatians, 145; Barclay, Obeying, 66-7.

[66]. So Sanders, Law, 21. Paul cites a text close to the LXX. He makes one alteration to the LXX which is also evident in the MT. What is more specific in these versions is made more general by Paul; the law that is referred to in the MT and LXX is the curses denounced at Mount Ebal, whereas for Paul the law intended is that of the written Torah. Consequently, the laws that must be observed in order not to incur the curse include being circumcised. Therefore, it is a reasonable deduction that the version of Dt. which Paul cites reflect the theology of his opponents and may even have been the version used by them in debate.

[67]. So Sanders, Ibid., 22; Barrett, Freedom, 25. The terminological emphasis we have given to Dt. 27. 26 assumes that the approach taken by some critics---to place the emphasis on the word "all" and to enquire why everyone who does not abide by the law is cursed---in its context asks the wrong question of the verse. The conclusion that is given to this question is that a person is cursed because it is not possible for anyone to perfectly keep the law. However, this thrust does not take duly into consideration that Dt. 27. 26 is part

conclusion by means of logical deduction and terminological association located within Scripture.[68]

The argument proceeds (v. 11f) by appealing to two additional texts[69] to reiterate the point of view begun at v. 10.[70] The thrust of the present argument is to show first that righteousness is not from the Torah. This point is enhanced by a second OT text -- faith and Torah are opposed to each other. We can know with some certainty that these are the points Paul intends to derive from the OT texts at vv. 11-12 because he first gives his conclusions and then quotes from the OT. The first text used is Hab. 2. 4 (v. 11),

---

of a scriptural argument initiated by Paul's opponents. Since Paul and those who subscribed to his view by virtue of not adopting circumcision as an entry requirement for Gentiles, fell within the category of those considered accursed. This understanding best accounts for the context and situation of the use of Dt. 27. 26 in light of the Galatian controversy. A second factor against the view that the use Paul makes of Dt. 27. 26 at Gal. 3. 8 reflects the unfulfillability of the law is that within Judaism forgiveness for transgression of sin was an integral part of the pattern of the religion. To be cursed for not doing all of the law perfectly is antithetical to the essential nature of the Jewish religion. The view we are contesting is adopted by the following scholars: Hübner, Law, 18-20; "Gal 3, 10 und die Herkunft des Paulus," KD 19 (1973) 215-231; "Pauli Theologiae Proprium", NTS 26 (1980), 445-473; Burton, Galatians, 164; Eckert, Verkündigung, 77; Schlier, Galater, 132ff; Schoeps, Paul, 176f; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 226; Luz, Paulus, 149f; Byrne, "Sons", 151 and n. 56; Räisänen, Law, 94-96; Watson, Gentiles, 71. For a critique of this view see Sanders, Law, 20ff; 52ff; Howard, Crisis, 50-53; F.F. Bruce, "The Curse of the Law", in M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson (eds.), Paul and Paulinism: Essays in honour of C. K. Barrett (London, 1982), 27-36; R. B. Hays, The Faith of Jesus Christ, (Chico, 1982), 206; comp. Bonnard, Galates, 67.

[68]. Mussner, Galaterbrief, 223, maintains that Paul argues by means of Scripture only and denies any appeal to logic. However, the logic implicit in Paul's statement is that the exclusion from "blessing" equals "curse" (3. 9-10): so Betz, Galatians, 144. Comp. also Sieffert, Galater, 178; Schlier, Galater, 133; P. Jung, "Das paulinische Vokabular in Gal 3, 6-14", Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 74 (1952), 446.

[69]. Whether the OT texts that occur at vv. 11-12 are those used first by the opponents which Paul takes up and re-interprets is difficult to know. However, Bligh, Galatians, 262f., assumes this is the case. It seems to us more likely that the texts are those which Paul draws upon to argue his case.

[70]. Luz, Paulus, 150, maintains that vv. 11f mark the same standpoint as v. 10, only presented "empirically". The argument, however, does appear not be be a strict parallel, as the inclusion of the δέ (v. 11) suggests so Betz, Galatians, 146, against Schlier, Galater, 133.

introduced by Paul's own words: no man is justified before God by the law. This is so because "the righteous shall live by faith" (Hab. 2. 4).[71] The second text likewise introduced by Paul's own words, "the law does not rest on faith", is Lev 18. 5, "He who does them shall live by them." These two texts set over against each other serve to dissociate Torah from faith.[72] In addition, they function to assert that righteousness is by faith and that law and faith are not common entities.[73] However, it is incorrect to conclude from Paul's use of faith and works in the present context that he means "abstract theological principles" incompatible with each other.[74] Paul is arguing a case centred around various scriptural

---

[71]. The point is made by Howard, Crisis, 62f, that the contrast between Hab. 2. 4 and Lev. 18. 5 is not between two antithetical ways of righteousness but man's works and God's faithfulness. Comp. also Bring, Galatians, 125ff. However, Hays, Faith, 205ff, esp. 205, 7 maintains that the use made of Hab. 2. 4 is best understood as an allusion to ἐκ πίστεως at vv. 7, 9. In this vein ὁ δίκαιος is a reference to Messiah. Consequently, the point of the Hab. text is that as Messiah is vindicated not by works but through faith so are Messiah's people. The views of both Howard and Hays, however, can be contested by what Paul says himself: 11a, 12a. See the recent discussion by M.D. Hooker, "ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ", NTS 35 (1989), 321-342

[72]. This understanding of these verses is consistent with a terminological thrust to the passage. Nonetheless others seek to interpret the relationship between the OT text on other grounds. Dahl, Paul, 164ff, and Schoeps, Paul, 177f, both maintain that Paul the rabbinic exegete is clearly evident at vv. 11-12. Paul is applying the 13 middoth of Rabbi Ishmael: if two texts contradict each other one should find a third to resolve the conflict. Dahl suggests that this third text is Gen. 22, whereas Schoeps favours Gen. 15. 6. Hübner, on the other hand, suggests a different approach to these OT citations. He indicates that Lev. 18. 5 is to be understood in relation to Dt. 27.26. In this vein, Lev. 18. 5 affirms that it is theoretically possible to gain life by obeying the law yet in reality this is not the case as Dt. 27. 26 testifies (Law, 19f; also "Pauli", 461f). This interpretation does not give due regard for what Paul maintains that Lev. 18 attests: law does not rest on faith (so Sanders, Law, 54 n. 30).

[73]. Lürhmann, Galater, 53; Sieffert, Galater, 183; Sanders, Law, 22, 54; Beker, Paul, 56; Bonnard, Galates, 68; J. Tyson, " 'Works of Law' in Galatians", JBL 92 (1973), 428; Bruce, Galatians, 162.

[74]. Watson, Gentiles, 68. The further comment by Watson: "[Paul] has simply read back his own conviction that Christianity is incompatible with the practice of Judaism into the Old Testament" seems to us to require some special pleading. Neither does this judgement naturally follow from the earlier remarks on Gal. 3. 12. The argument given at Gal. 3. 10-12 is more specific than Watson permits.

texts and he has used Hab. 2. 4 and Lev. 18. 5 in the particular form he has in order to serve his scriptural and theological aims.[75]

Thus far in this paragraph Paul has made three assertions. First, the blessing of Abraham is offered on the basis of faith. Those who do not come on this basis but by means of the law are under a curse. The second point made is that no one is justified by the law. Third, faith and law are not common entities. Paul has one final stage left in this part of his argument (v. 13).[76] He must find a way to remove the curse of the law (v. 10) incurred by those who sought to receive the blessings of Abraham by means other than faith.[77] Paul does this by asserting that Christ has become the means by which the curse of the law is removed. The final OT text appealed to is Dt. 21. 23 : " Cursed be everyone who hangs on a tree."[78] Before citing this OT text he makes the point he intends to derive from the OT: Christ redeemed[79] us from the curse which the law had become for us.[80]

---

[75]. The form of the Hab. 2. 4 text is neither that of the LXX nor the MT but that which reflects Paul's own emphasis. The form of Lev. 18. 5 is that of the LXX except for the word ἄνθρωπος .

[76]. Whether it is correct that Gal. 3. 13 came to Paul ready-made as a reply to the problem of a crucified Messiah, (as Sanders, Law, 25, suggests), does not seem to us a question the opponents would have been troubled with given the line of defense Paul has sketched in Gal. 3.

[77]. It is at this place in vv. 10-13 that the theme of righteousness not being by law concludes and Paul's concern turns to how the curse of the law can be removed so Sanders, Law, 26. The repetition of the word "curse" in vv. 10 and 13 suggests that Paul continues to structure his argument with key terms in mind.

[78]. The form of the quotation is close to that of the LXX. The one significant omission is the words . The result of this is to make clear that Christ in his death was not cursed by God. Rather the curse was made effective by virtue of Christ hanging on a tree so Betz, Galatians, 152.

[79]. On the use of the word ἐξαγοράζω and the context of the verse see Schlier, Galater, 137-40; Bruce, Galatians, 163-7; J. S. Pobee, Persecution and Martyrdom in the Theology of Paul (Sheffield, 1985), 55f.

[80]. is best understood in reference to Jewish Christians: so Lagrange, Galates, 71; Sieffert, Galater, 183; Betz, Galatians, 148: Donaldson, "Curse", 97. Those who favour the view of Gentile Christians are Luz, Paulus, 152; Schlier, Galater, 136f. Howard, Crisis, 59; Sanders, Law, 82, 88 n. 20; Mussner, "Auslegung", 11, considers that the reference is to Jews

The result of Christ's death on the cross was that access to Abraham's family was possible by faith apart from any works of the law. By a method of assertion, appeal to OT texts, and emphasis given to key words, Paul has posited an argument that leads him (in v. 14a) to conclude that in Christ Jesus the blessings of Abraham will come to the Gentiles. While these verses may appear to contain proof-texting and the "bending" of the OT for theological aims, for Paul it achieved the result of separating Abraham, faith, and Messiah from Torah so that Gentiles could be made members of Abraham's family on terms which excluded the requirements of circumcision and fulfillment of Torah. This concludes the first part of Paul's scriptural argument.

The second part of the appeal to Scripture occurs at 3. 15-18. One of the assumptions made in vv. 6-14 that has not yet been stated is that Paul considers that he has (in distiction from the opponents) correctly interpreted God's historical plan and purpose for mankind.[81] An analysis of this point is taken up in vv. 15-18, where the relationship between law and promise is discussed.[82] Several points are given to confirm the assertion that Paul considers himself to have correctly interpreted God's salvific plan. However, his principal argument is that God's working in history concurs with his view because the promise came prior to the time of the giving of the Torah.[83] He argues the case first by

---

and Gentiles alike. Kim, Kampf, 248 n. 8, however, maintains that it is not important which view is adopted. None the less, he favours the view of Jewish Christians.

[81]. This emphasis in the argument in noted by Sanders, Law, 26f, 54; also Howard, Crisis, 54; Zeller, Juden, 96; Blank, Paulus und Jesus, 273; Luz, Paulus, 184f; Byrne, "Sons", 158; Beker, Paul, 54; Bonnard, Galates, 70f.

[82]. In spite of the fact that law and promise are of central importance in the paragraph, other ideas are interrelated. In this vein it seems difficult to determine which is the "Stichwort" of the paragraph -- inheritance v. 14 (so Schlier, Galater, 142; comp. Betz, Galatians, 157); seed v.16 (so Zeller, Juden, 97), or promise, vv. 16, 18 (so Luz, Paulus, 186).

[83]. That the opponents continue to form an integral part of the discussion of this pericope is a view adopted by eg. Barrett, Freedom, 27; Watson, Gentiles, 70f; Bligh, Galatians, 278ff, Betz, Galatians, 158.

stating a fact known in the making of a will or testament (v. 15)[84] -- that a person cannot alter a will by adding to it or annulling it once the will has been set. Although the appropriate background of this premise has been much debated,[85] its main point in the present context is clear: "once a testament has been ratified, nobody has the right to cancel it or add a codicil to it".[86]

The second point Paul adds in support of his case is to apply the datum of v. 15 to the covenant made with Abraham (v. 17).[87] However, before stating how he intends to apply the datum he clarifies that aspect of the promise that is of interest to him. Specifically, the covenant implied is that of Gen. 18. 18; 22. 18, where Abraham is promised that he will become a father of many nations (= Gentiles).[88] In this vein, it should be

---

[84]. The relationship between v.15 and v. 17 is that of major and minor premise. The former is given in the words κεκυρωμένην διαθήκην (v.15) and the latter by the words ὁ μετὰ ..... νόμος (v.17) thus creating a minori ad majus effect so Burton, Galatians, 183 also Schlier, Galater, 147.

[85]. The backgrounds that critics have pursued regarding this premiss are Roman: so A. Hamel, Über römisches Recht im Galaterbrief (Essen, 1895); D. Walker, "The Legal Terminology in the Epistle to the Galatians", The Gift of Tongues and Other Essays (Edinburgh, 1906), 81-175; J. M. Taylor, "The Function of ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ in Galatians", JBL 85 (1966), 58-76; Greek: so Ramsay, Galatians, 349-375; and Jewish: so E. Bammel, "Gottes Diatheke (Gal. III. 15-17) und das jüdische Rechtsdenken," NTS 6 (1959/60), 313-319 followed by Mussner, Galaterbrief, 237. See, however, the remarks by Räisänen, Law, 129f.

[86]. So Betz, Galatians, 156.

[87]. διαθήκη is used in this paragraph in two different senses -- v. 15 as will or testament in the legal sense and v. 17 as "covenant" so Burton, Galatians, 182f; Bruce, Galatians, 169; Leitzmann, Galater, 20f, Lagrange, Galates, 75; Ebling, Truth, 186f. However; Betz, Galatians, 157 n. 42, following Schlier, Galater, 146 n. 4, maintains that the use of διαθήκη must be understood in the same way in both verses, and therefore suggests that the word in both instances means "covenant". Yet if v. 15 states the premiss and v. 17 its application, then context and function of the word must determine the content of διαθήκη . Comp. Betz, Ibid. 158, where he seems to come very close to this: "It is obviously Paul's method to apply the language of the legal example v. 15 to the issue he wants to argue, the promise to Abraham."

[88]. Contra Betz, Galatians, 156; Schlier, Galater, 144f; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 237f, who consider Gen. 17. 1ff to be the text in mind. However, Mussner maintains that Gen. 22. 17f also has an important role. Comp. Gen. 12. 7, 13. 15, 17, 26. 4, 28. 13, where in part the promises to Abraham's seed refer to the land they will inherit. This, however, is not a

noted that the distinction between the many and the one descendant is an example of the collective singular well known in the Bible and Jewish exegesis.[89] By this exegetical manoeuvre Paul concentrates the eschatological intent of the promise in Christ. In so doing he breaks down the old solidarity of race in order to establish a new collectivity which is coming into being in Christ.[90] By this means he "forges" a direct link across the centuries between Abraham and Christ. This link, channelled by the promise could not be attributed to the law because it came between the time of Abraham and Christ.[91]

What is perhaps implicit in the present remark becomes explicit when the illustration of v. 15 is applied. This is stated at v. 17 and is introduced by the words "this is what I mean", i.e. not to cancel a will once ratified (v.15). What is being referred to at v. 17 is two acts of God set chronologically in relation to each other. These two acts are the giving of the Torah at Sinai and the promise God made with Abraham. What Paul intends by contrasting these acts of God in history is to show that what came first cannot be cancelled by what comes later. Consequently, since the law was given 430 years after the promise made with Abraham Paul maintains that his interpretation of the Abraham story in vv. 6-14 is legitimate.[92] It is by this means that Paul can associate Abraham, faith, promise, and blessing together and attempt to separate Abraham, law, blessing, and promise from each

---

concern to Paul in the present context but has to do with universal blessing. Yet in Rom 4. 13 the promise to Abraham and his offspring is that they will will "inherit the world".

[89]. Bruce, Galatians, 172f; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 240; and esp. D. Daube, "The Interpretation of a Generic Singular", The NT and Rabbinic Judaism (London, 1956), 438-444.

[90]. Barrett, Freedom, 38.

[91]. So Byrne, "Sons", 159.

[92]. The 430 years named here are determined from the time the Israelites remained in Egypt according to the LXX of Exod. 12. 40. In Gen. 15. 13 the time in Egypt was 400 years. These differences are of little concern to Paul. His primary aim is "to render impossible the assumption that the revelation of the Torah at Sinai could imply a cancellation of the promise made to Abraham"; so Betz, Galatians, 158.

other. Since the promise came historically before the giving of the law Paul is led to set inheritance and promise in continuity with Abraham and to make the law discontinuous with him (v. 18). From Paul's point of view, to follow the way of his opponents and adopt the law and circumcision as necessary requirements for Gentile entry to Abraham's seed is antithetical to the way God has acted in history. There was one final argument (vv. 19ff) which the opponents could raise against Paul.[93] It is not entirely accurate that a will cannot be altered. It can be altered by the testator himself who in this case is God. Furthermore, it is arguable that God has altered a will by giving the law after he had already made a covenant with Abraham. Paul replies that the law came by means of angelic intermediaries, whereas the covenant of promise came directly from God.[94]

This is Paul's interpretation of the Abraham story in Gal. 3. 6-18. In this chapter he has offered his own definition of the seed of Abraham. They are those who are people of faith (v. 7) and those who consider their inheritance coming not by law but by faith (v. 18). It follows from this for Paul to conclude in v. 29 that those who belong to Christ are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise. We have seen throughout Gal. 3 that those who are included as Abraham's offspring are the Gentiles (vv. 8, 14; cf. v.16). This point is reiterated at v. 28, where Paul includes both Jews and Gentiles baptized in Christ as recipients of Abraham's promises. This, then, is Paul's defence against the position that sonship includes for Gentile converts circumcision and the keeping of the Torah as well as faith in Christ.

There is another passage in Galatians where Abraham has a principal role. It is found at 4. 21-31, and has a similar sentiment to Gal. 3, though the argument is not solely

---

[93]. That the opponents have formed an integral part to the discussion of vv. 15-18, 19ff, is a view adopted by Barrett, Freedon, 27; Watson, Gentiles, 70f; Bligh, Galatians, 278ff; Betz, Galatians, 158; Sieffert, Galater, 199; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 241.

[94]. Barrett, Freedom, 27. See ch. 4 for a fuller treatment of this passage.

one from scripture or an appeal to the way in which God acts in history.[95] Indeed, Paul refers to the content of the paragraph as an "allegory". This has been interpreted as imposing "on a story hidden meanings which the original author never intended nor envisaged".[96] However, it may be more precise to say that what Paul calls allegory has to a considerable degree crossed over into typology.[97] This is especially so if typology means in this context to see in certain OT persons, institutions or events the prefiguring of other persons, institutions, or events in light of a new historical-time frame.[98]

---

[95]. The view is maintained that 4. 21-31 is an afterthought to Paul's overall argument in Galatians: so Burton, Galatians, 251; M. Luther, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (London, 1953); J. Calvin, The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians (Edinburgh, 1965); U. Luz, "Der alte und der neue Bund bei Paulus und im Hebräerbrief", EvTh 27 (1967), 319; Schlier, Galater, 216. Alternatively see esp. Barrett, "Allegory", 154ff; Bligh, Galatians, 390ff (with Barrett's criticism); Bonnard, Galates, 95; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 316.

[96]. G. B. Caird, Language and Imagery of the Bible (London, 1980), 165 similarly R. Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period (Grand Rapids, 1977), 127; A. T. Hanson, Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology (London, 1974), 94.

[97]. Comp. L. Goppelt, Theology of the New Testament (Grand Rapids, 1982), Vol. 2, 58 n. 25. who maintains that the Ishmael and Isaac story at Gal. 4. 21ff is a typology that to a considerable degree crossed over to allegory.

[98]. So E. E. Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (London, 1957), 126; J. Bonsirven, Exégese rabbinique et Exégèse paulinienne (Paris, 1939), 269; Longenecker, Apostolic, 127; Lagrange, Galates, 123. For our purpose it is not so critical whether we call what Paul is doing typology or allegory; rather, the use made of the Abraham story as it relates to Hagar and Sarah is most important. The acknowledgement of interplay between the two literary forms is common: O. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel (Gütersloh, 1929), 110; Longenecker, Ibid.; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 320; Bruce, Galatians, 217; Luz, Paulus, 57, 64, 185 also "Bund", 320; St. John Chrysostom, Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians and Homilies on the Epistle to the Ephesians (Oxford, 1890), 69; Betz, Galatians, 239; Bonnard, Galates, 97. However, some do favour Gal. 4. 21ff strictly as allegory (e.g. R. M. Grant, Letter and Spirit, (London, 1957), 122; C. H. Cosgrove, "The Law has Given Sarah no Children Gal. (4. 21-30)", NovT 29 (1987), 222, 226, 231; Caird, Language, 170f, who classifies the material as "polemical allegorism") while others as typology (e.g. Ellis, Ibid. 53, 130; Hanson, Technique, 97; L. Goppelt, Typos (Gütersloh, 1939), passim; R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event (London, 1959), 80-3; Comp. Schlier, Galater, 219).

The structure and composition of Paul's "allegory" are a scriptural reply against opponents. There are several reasons which suggest that Paul is taking up material from his opponents.[99] Following the rhetorical question of v. 21 Paul begins v. 22 with the familiar γέγραπται, which is usually used to introduce an OT quotation (e.g. Rom. 1. 17, 2. 24, 3. 4; Gal. 3. 10, 13). Here we do not find an OT quotation but rather a summary of OT material from Genesis relating to the birth of two of Abraham's sons --Ishmael and Isaac (chs. 16 and 21). The inclusion of the word γέγραπται is thought to demonstrate "the genuine Old Testament foundation to the Judaizers' argument".[100] The sons referred to are those which come from Hagar, the slave woman, and from Sarah, Abraham's wife. When Sarah was old and was unlikely to give birth to a child through natural means she decided in accordance with a practice that appears to have been socially acceptable to have a child by proxy (Gen. 30. 3-13). So Sarah permitted her Egyptian slave Hagar to have relations with Abraham and she bore him a son. However, some years later Abraham and Sarah were told that through divine intervention they were to have a child, and this came to fruition in fulfilment of God's promise. In due course animosity grew between the two women and Abraham sent away Hagar and Ishmael. One consequence of this was that there arose a race of people from Ishmael whose descendants were known as Ishmaelites. As time went on they ranked among the Gentiles, excluded from the covenant God had made with Abraham and his descendants through Isaac. This incident and especially the way it is alluded to at v. 23, presupposes several facts about the debate. First, we learn who was intended by the "slave woman" and the "free woman". This is enforced by the fact that Sarah is not referred to as the free woman in the Genesis record. Furthermore, it is

---

[99]. For the following argument see esp. Barrett, "Allegory", 161-165. Comp. Gosgrove, Ibid., 222-223.

[100]. Barrett, Ibid., 161.

presupposed by the form of statement at v. 23 that Hagar was the slave woman and her descendants outside of the promises and Sarah the free woman whose descendants were the elect people of God. The implication of this is that a correlation is assumed between Hagar-slave-natural birth-outside the covenant and Sarah-free woman-birth by promise-covenant membership.

There is a second indicator which suggests that Paul is taking up material from his opponents. It is that they adopt a plain, literal reading of the Abraham story--- what was later called the peshat interpretation. This literal reading of the Genesis story supports the view of the opponents, i.e. that those who observe the law of Moses are heirs to the Abrahamic promises. In addition, there is no indication that Paul contests the point that Hagar's child was born by human arrangement (κατὰ σάρκα) or that Sarah's was conceived through a specific divine word (δι' ἐπαγγελίας). Consequently, we may conclude that Paul assumes that these are accurate statements of the content of the OT text. These points suggest that Paul's argument begins from the assumption that there was a straightforward, literal meaning of the Genesis story before his audience. The point Paul queries is whether this peshat interpretation is the correct reading of the Genesis story. He sets this reading over against an "allegorical" interpretation of the material (vv. 24ff).[101] The remainder of the pericope gives this re-interpertation of the story in relation to the Galatians controversy. Paul presents an allegory focused on two women. From the assertion that the two women equal two covenants Paul proceeds to re-interpret the Genesis story.

---

[101]. The fact that this "allegory" appeals to a part of the OT that Paul does not otherwise make use of and that his method of interpretation is unusual enforces the general point that he is making use of material cited by his opponent.

While there is no doubt a measure of truth in the view that what follows is more like a series of free associations than logical argument,[102] there may be a discernible method to what appears at first sight as an arid, academic exercise. It is arguable that Paul has structured his "allegory" along lines known to Jewish exegetes as kemin homer.[103] What is implied by this method of exegesis is the re-interpretation of a significant word followed by the use of an explanatory text. (See Mek Ex 21.6). It is these two features that are present in Paul's explication at vv. 24b-27. He takes the word Hagar and re-interprets the name so that it gains associations that exceed a purely literal meaning of it. Paul proceeds by association to connect Hagar in connection with Mt. Sinai and slavery (v. 24b). In v. 25 the association continues with a second reference to Mt. Sinai, which we are told corresponds to the present Jerusalem.

Two points emerge from these correlations. The first is that we find Paul associating Hagar with the place where the law was given. This understanding of v. 25 is based on the longer reading of the text, which in the context of the controversy of Galatians makes

---

[102]. Caird, Language, 171.

[103]. Barrett, "Allegory", 163; J. Bonsirven, Exégèse, 230.

reasonable sense.[104] By this means Paul has Hagar stand for the covenant at Sinai, the covenant focused on Torah (in distinction from the covenant of promise). Second, the correlation is made between Mt. Sinai and the "present Jerusalem" by the verb συστοιχεῖ, which is thought to mean "to stand in the same line".[105] In this context what is intended is a correspondence between similar concepts. Paul sets together Hagar-Sinai (Law)-present Jerusalem above-slavery (v. 25) in contrast to Jerusalem-freedom-Sarah ("our mother"). Both groups of ideas correspond to one of the covenants stated at v. 24, where the "allegory" began.

We can now add a third point and in so doing observe one way in which the "allegory" may apply specifically to the situation of the Galatians. We have noted above that a contrast is made between the present Jerusalem and the Jerusalem above. To whom do these refer? The prevalent view is that a contrast is being made here between Judaism and Christianity.[106] Therefore, the present Jerusalem implies "the political-religious

---

[104]. It is none the less a disputed point whether Ἁγάρ was included in the orginal text. The MS evidence in favour of the shorter reading includes $\mathfrak{p}^{46}$ ℵ C G latt Orig, while the longer reading has the following witnesses B A D K Ψ 33 Chrys . While the witnesses are divided, one must reckon with the fact that the omission of Ἁγάρ leaves one with a piece of geographical information ('Mt. Sinai is a mountain in Arabia') of little apparent significance to Paul's discussion. See regarding this, textual problem e.g. F. Mussner, "Hagar, Sinai, Jerusalem", ThQ 135 (1955), 56-60; Galaterbrief, 322-324; L. Gaston, "Israel's Enemies in Pauline Theology", NTS 28 (1982), 410; Eckert, Verkündigung, 96; Lightfoot, Galatians, 192f; Metzger, Commentary, 596; Barrett, "Allegory", 163f (in addition to other commentaries). In this connection there is little substance to the view of H. Gese, Τὸ δὲ Ἁγὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ Vom Sinai zum Zion, (Münich, 1974), 49-62 that there is evidence of a pun on the Arabic word hagar to convince the Galatians that Hagar is associated with Sinai (hagar being a location near Sinai). Since the Galatians did not speak Arabic, one wonders to whom the "pun" was intended.

[105]. The word συστοιχία in Pythagorean philosophy meant "a pair of coordinates" or "parallel columns" of ideas. In addition συστοιχία was a military term which denotes a file. The word is also used by grammarians (e.g. Aristotle, Rhetoric, 1.7). See H.D. Liddell and R. Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, rev. by H.S. Jones (Oxford, 1940), s.v., for examples; also Lightfoot, Galatians, 181; Burton, Galatians, 262; Lietzmann, Galater, 31.

[106]. So Burton, Galatians, 261-263; Lightfoot, Galatians, 181-182; Betz, Galatians, 246-247; G. S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians (London, 1934), 146; 125; Lietzmann, Galater, 33; Bruce, Galatians, 220. Comp. however Gaston, "Enemies", 401ff,

institution of Judaism for which the Holy City stands as a symbol".[107] In this vein, the Jerusalem above refers to the Christian Church, those of the community of the new covenant who have already begun to live out their citizenship in heaven (Phil. 3. 20).[108] This understanding of the two Jerusalems seems to us to require some qualification mainly because the debate of Galatians (as we have been arguing throughtout this chapter) is a much more specific debate than one between Judaism and Christianity. There is internal evidence which supports this view. At v. 26 the correlation is made between Jerusalem above and Sarah as the mother of those who have their lineage from her. Earlier in the paragraph (v. 23) it is stated that one of Abraham's sons gave birth by the free woman through the promise. This idea of promise in connection with Abraham occurred at 3. 29 as the conclusion to the discussion begun at 3. 6 regarding requirements for Gentiles to obtain sonship with Abraham. The answer is summarized at 3. 18: if the inheritance is by law, i.e. Torah, it is not by promise. If these correlations are taken in the light of the fact that the descendants of Ishmael are considered Gentiles and of the point already noted regarding the link between Hagar and Sinai, it seems plausible that the reference to the present Jerusalem has a more specific meaning. That is, it does not refer to Judaism as such but to those Jewish Christian opponents who were seeking to have Gentiles

---

who argues against the view that Gal. 4. 21ff is a confrontation with Judaism.

[107]. Betz, Ibid., 246 similarly Zeller, Juden, 229.

[108]. It is maintained by some critics that the Jerusalem above refers to the Church without indicating that the present Jerusalem implies Judaism: so Schlier, Galater, 224; Lagrange, Galates, 128; Sieffert, Galater, 290; Eckert, Verkündigung, 97. Mussner, Galaterbrief, 326, suggests the present Jerusalem refers to Christian conviction.

circumcised in order to secure sonship with Abraham.[109] This concludes Paul's re-interpretation of the word "Hagar".

We must now consider the appeal made to an explanatory text to further Paul's interpretation. The OT text used at Gal. 4. 27 is Is. 54. 1 (LXX). This text Paul appeals to not because of its prior association with Abraham, Sarah, or Hagar but by means of gezerah shawah.[110] In this vein the word link required in Paul's argument provided by Is. 54. 1 is the word "barren". In the Genesis story Sarah's barrenness is well known (11. 30; 21. 6f). It is equally the case that it was in these terms that the prophet spoke of Israel when she was in captivity in Babylon ("Sing, O barren one"). It was as though she was like a lonely woman without a husband or family. The prophet, however, also echoes a triumphant note of a time when the barren woman will have more children than her rival. In the Targum of Is. on 54. 1 we find a similar sentiment: "Sing praises, O' Jerusalem, who wast as a barren woman that bare not; break forth into a song of praises and rejoice, thou who wast a woman that conceived not; for more shall be the children of desolate Jerusalem than the children of inhabited Rome, saith the Lord."[111] The citation is employed by Paul to support the point of v. 26b that Sarah is our mother ie. those who are successors of the Jerusalem above. If then the barren one represents Sarah and she is to have more children than her rival, what is intended by the citation in the context of Galatians? Betz has stated the matter as follows "the quotation refers to Sarah, who was at first incapable of bearing children and then became the mother of so many. Paul has applied this prophecy to the

---

[109]. Comp. Mussner, Ibid., 325, who maintains that Jewish Christianity is indicated by the phrase "the present Jerusalem". However, Davies, "People", 128, favours the view that it is splitting hairs to attempt a decision between Jews or Jewish Christians since the latter assumes the former.

[110]. Barrett, "Allegory", 164 and Freedom, 28.

[111]. J. F. Stenning (ed.& trans.), The Targum of Isaiah (Oxford, 1949), 182.

(Gentile) Christians whose mother is the 'heavenly Jerusalem' (4.26)".[112] This accurately states the relationship between Paul's appeal to Is. 54. 1 in the context of the Galatian controversy. The consequence that Paul draws from this allegorical reading is that Gentile Christians follow the line of Isaac and are children of promise. This concludes Paul's appeal to the kemin homer method of exegesis in support of his re-interpretation of the Sarah and Hagar stories.

Before the paragraph concludes (v. 31), two further appeals are made to confirm Paul's view -- one from Jewish tradition and another from OT scripture (vv. 29-30). The appeal from Jewish tradition occurs at v. 29. The aim of this appeal is to show a parallel between the time of Ishmael and Isaac and the present situation of the Galatians. The parallel that is drawn is between Isaac being persecuted by Ishmael and the present Galatian controversy.[113] The difficulty of understanding the nature of this parallel is in part that there is no evidence in the OT (either in the MT or LXX) that Ishmael persecuted Isaac. But it is thought that the foundation of this statement is Gen. 21. 9.[114] The principal problem is over the disputed meaning of the Hebrew word מְצַחֵק , which is translated in the LXX by παίζοντα. The Hebrew word has been rendered by "playing" or "laughing"; yet it is not obvious, if this is correct, why the request was made by Sarah to have Hagar and Ishmael sent away (Gen. 21. 10ff).[115] Jub. 17. 4 offers one explanation: Sarah saw

---

[112]. Betz, Galatians, 249; similarly Bruce, Galatians, 222; Lührmann, Galater, 78; Eckert, Verkündigung, 97; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 328. Comp. Lightfoot, Galatians, 183, who states that the image of barrenness is derived from the entrance of Gentiles into the Church. However, he also seems to maintain the "barren one" does not refer to Gentile Christianity as opposed to Jewish Christianity, but a contrast between the old and new dispositions. This appears to be a case of wanting it both ways.

[113]. Eckert, Verkündigung, 98.

[114]. e.g. Barrett, "Allegory", 164; Lührmann, Galater, 78; Eckert, Verkündigung, Ibid.; Bonnard, Galates, 99; Bruce, Galatians, 223; Lietzmann, Galater, 33.

[115]. TDNT Vol. 5, 628.

Ishmael playing and dancing, and Abraham rejoicing, and she became jealous and demanded Ishmael's expulsion. According to the rabbis there was rivalry between Ishmael and Isaac over their inheritance. A tradition recorded both in the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen 22. 1 and Gen. Rabb. 55. 4 on Gen 22. 1 suggests that the rivalry arose because Ishmael was the first-born son.[116] The Targum of Jonathan states: "Ishmael said : "It is for me to inherit from my father, for I am his first-born son", but Isaac said: "It is for me to inherit from my father, for I am the son of Sarah his wife, whereas you are the son of Agar, my mother's servant". Consequently, the view put forward is this: because Isaac was the second born he had less claim to be Abraham's heir. In light of the above midrash it is plausible that the "playing", "laughing" of Gen. 21. 9 is understood in the sense of mocking, teasing or jeering. This may explain why Paul says at v. 29 that Ishmael "persecuted" Isaac. What is implied is that Ishmael tried to talk down to Isaac regarding his right of inheritance. Furthermore, it may explain why Sarah was provoked to say "Cast out this slave woman with her son; for the son of this slave woman shall not share the inheritance with my son Isaac" (Gen. 21. 10).[117] If this midrash was known by Paul it could have formed the background for his statement that Ishmael "persecuted" Isaac.[118]

What is of concern to us is that a parallel is being drawn between this persecution and the Galatian community ("as at that time...so it is now"). Several suggestions as to its nature seem plausible. First, it is thought to refer to the persecution that Christians

---

[116]. Other interpretations given for מְצַחֵק in Gen. Rabb. include immorality, idolatry, bloodshed, shooting arrows. Comp. Tosf. Sotah 6. 6, where מְצַחֵק also means bloodshed. The tradition about this brotherly hostility is also recorded in Ant. 1. 215. See R. Le Deaut, "Traditions targumiques dans le Corpus Paulinien?", Bib 42 (1961), 37-43; Schlier, Galater, 226.

[117]. Bligh, Galatians, 398.

[118]. It also shows that the tradition may be more ancient than is ordinarly thought: so Bonnard, Galates, 99.

incurred at the hands of Jews.[119] As a Pharisee, Paul was an active participant in some form of persecution. On this point both Paul in his letters and Luke agree (Gal. 1. 13f; Acts 8. 3). Second, the persecution implied is that which Christian missionaries and teachers received from false brothers as is reflected in 2 Cor. 11. 26.[120] Third, what is intended by the reference to persecution is that the opponents of Galatia persecute Paul by causing a threat to his Gospel, which allows the entry of Gentiles without circumcision into the family of Abraham.[121] If, as we have been suggesting throughout, the argument of Galatians is very particular in nature -- ie. a debate within Jewish Christianity over Gentile entry -- this third option is cogent.

This leads us to Paul's final appeal to his "allegory". This occurs at v. 30 in the form of a citation from Gen. 21. 10. If Paul is using a text provided to him by his opponents, it is quite a useful one to support his view by simply inverting its original sense.[122] In its original context we find Sarah asking Abraham to send away Hagar and Ishmael for fear that Ishmael will share the inheritance of Isaac. In this context Ishmael represents those who are outside the covenant as well as the Gentiles. The inversion that Paul performs is to associate theologically the Ishmaelites not with the Gentiles but with the Jewish Christian opponents and the descendants of Isaac with the Gentile Christians.[123] Consequently, those whose expulsion Paul demands are the law-observant Jewish

---

[119]. Betz, Galatians, 250; Luz, Paulus, 284; Lightfoot, Galatians, 184; Bruce, Galatians, 224; Schlier, Galater, 227; Eckert, Verkündigung, 98; Bonnard, Galates, 99; Lührmann, Galater, 78.

[120]. Betz, Ibid., 250; Jewett, "Agitators", 205.

[121]. Barrett,"Allegory", 165; Freedom, 28; Lightfoot, Galatians, 184; Burton, Galatians, 266; Duncan, Galatians, 150; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 331; Gaston, "Enemies", 409; Bring, Galatians, 398; Lagrange, Galates, 131; Sieffert, Galater, 294f; Ridderbos, Galatians, 181.

[122]. Bruce, Galatians, 225; K. J. Thomas, "Covenant in Relation to Hagar and Ishmael in Galatians", Bib. Trans. 37 (1986), 446

[123]. So Barrett, "Allegory", 165.

opponents,[124] not Gentiles who have become children of promise without circumcision and legal observance. This is the most consistent reading of Paul's appeal to Gen. 21. 10 in the light of the situation of Galatians.

In addition to this inverting of Gen. 21. 10, Paul also alters the LXX of Gen. 21. 10 to support his view. In his appeal to this text Paul follows the LXX closely except for one important alteration. He changes the language at the end of the quotation from τοῦ υἱοῦ μου Ἰσαακ to τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρας. What is being emphasized by this is that an inheritance from the son of the slave woman cannot coexist with one from the son of the free woman. This has formed the burden of Paul's plea throughout his allegory -- spiritual ancestry does not depend only on who one's father is but also on one's mother. Because the Gentiles were not the first born they cannot claim spiritual descendancy from Sarah, the free woman, but from Hagar, the slave who gave birth to Abraham's first son. This brings Paul's allegory to its conclusion (v. 31).[125]

Let us now draw some conclusions from our analysis of Gal. 3. 6-18 and 4. 21-31. We stated at the beginning of our analysis of Gal. 3 the presence of six common points agreed upon by Paul and the opponents that emerge from that passage. These can briefly

---

[124]. Mussner, Galaterbrief, 332; Lagrange, Galater, 132: Gaston "Enemies", 409. Comp. Bring, Galatians, 407. By virtue of our previous discussion it is the opponents and not "Jews" qua "Jews" or "Judaism" that are the objects of expulsion. That view, nonetheless has its proponents, e.g. Luz, Paulus, 285; Lightfoot, Galatians, 184; Oepke, Galater, 115; Betz, Galatians, 251. Bonnard, Galates, 99, maintains that ἔκβαλε implies the rejection of Jews as well as legalists.

[125]. There is some discussion whether v. 31 forms a conclusion only to vv. 29-30. In support of this view is the fact that because at v. 28 we have a conclusion drawn for the preceding verses v. 31 serves as a summary, strictly speaking, of the allegory since that conclusion. Others want to see vv. 28-31 as a repetition of vv. 21-7, e.g. Bonnard, Galates, 99. There is no reason why v. 31 could not function both as a summary of vv. 29-30 and at the same time of the entire allegory see e.g. Schlier, Galater, 228. However, the view of Betz, Galatians, 251, that v. 31 sumarizes both 4. 21-31 and the section from 3. 1-4. 30 is unnecessary in view of the various conclusions given throughout the section (e.g. 3. 9, 14, 24, 29; 4. 7).

be restated. (1) The central issue of the debate is the requirements for entry into Abraham's family. (2) The centrality of Abraham is presupposed in the debate. (3) It is expected that Gentiles will become part of the new people of God. (4) The OT is the legitimating authority of appeal. (5) A sense of accountability to the historical plan and purpose of God is assumed within the material. (6) Symbols of Jewish ethnicity loom over the discussion: circumcision, covenant, and legal observance. Our analysis has confirmed that these points clearly emerge from within the passage as well as forming the basis of the debate. It is indeed these particular elements which give coherence to the discussion. It follows from this that if these elements do provide a coherence to the passage, it was in all probability because they were points which were agreed by both Paul and the opponents. There are several points of detail in this context worth mentioning. In addition to a series of agreements between Paul and the opponents, there is also an agreement of some importance between the opponents and contemporary Judaism. As we have suggested from our discussion, one text that formed a central place in reflecting the view of the opponents was Gen. 17. Circumcision formed an integral part of membership into Abraham's family. This view is consistent with a Judaism whereby membership within the community must be accompanied by certain forms of praxis as a means of confirming a person's community identity. It is because the opponents thought within this frame of reference that they expected new members of God's family, such as the Gentiles, to be circumcised. The opponents expected of new Gentile converts that they observe the requirements of covenant and thus show themselves to be within this Jewish frame of reference.

Notwithstanding this fundamental point of agreement between the opponents and contemporary Judaism, there is one significant departure. In our treatment of Gal. 3. 10 we suggested that the citation from Dt. 27. 26 reflects the view of the opponents: "Cursed be everyone who does not abide by all things written in the book of the law, and do them."

The quotation as it occurs is a generalized form of Deut. 27. 26 (LXX), and therefore allows for its application to the Galatian controversy. This view of obedience to the Torah, however, does not allow for a common feature within virtually all witnesses of Judaism, the provision of forgiveness when disobedience to Torah does occur. Therefore, it may be the case that at this point there is evidence for ultra- conservative if not perfectionist tendencies on the part of Paul's opponents. If so, this would reflect a tendency uncommon in Judaism.

When turning to Paul we equally find a significant departure that was common to Judaism. At vv. 11-12 we noted that Paul separates Torah from faith. The point was used in Paul's scriptural argument against the view that one is cursed if one does not observe the law, i.e. become circumcised. The situational context in which this argument occurs must be considered carefully, especially in assessing from these verses Paul's "separation" from what was common to Judaism. This is because elsewhere in Galatians (e.g. 5. 14, 19f) (as well as other letters) Paul affirms the notion of fulfilment of Torah in a way that is consistent with Judaism of the time (e.g. the disavowing of fornication, idolatry, and impurity -- Gal. 5.19f). Therefore, we suggest that within the scope of the six common agreements shared between Paul and his opponents (also common to Judaism) there is additional evidence for a departure from the common Jewish view on the part of the opponents as well as by Paul. This departure on the part of the opponents may have resulted from conservative/perfectionist tendencies. As for Paul, the departure, which took the form of separating Torah from faith, was dictated by the situation in which he was writing and his Christological outlook.

From our analysis of Gal 4. 21-31 we suggest a picture similar to that of Gal. 3. 6-18. The six common features are in evidence at 4. 21ff. However, there is one significant difference between the two accounts. This is largely dictated by the fact that the material at Gal. 4. 21ff is presented in allegorical/typological form. What at 3. 6ff is stated explicitly

is presented at 4.21ff implicitly. Because the common points of 3. 6ff are implicit within the material of 4. 21ff we suggest that the evidence of common themes strengthens the claim for the presence of shared common ideas between Paul and his opponents. First, it is presupposed from 4. 21ff both that Abraham plays a central role in the account and that membership into his family is the continued focus of this discussion (vv. 21-3). Second, the fact that the "we" of v. 28 and the reference at v. 29 to the persecution of those born according to the Spirit denote in all probability Gentile Christians adds to the point that the issue in this paragraph continues to be the Gentile problem. If, in addition, the "Jerusalem above" includes the Gentile Christians, this enforces the point. Third, we noted evidence of a scriptural debate. To this end Paul reinterprets the Abraham story of Gen. 16 as well as appealing to Is 54. 1 and Gen 21. 10 to support his view. In addition, he makes use of a tradition unknown in the the OT but found within the Jewish tradition about Ishmael persecuting Isaac at v. 29. Fourth, there is some indication that symbols of Jewish ethnicity occur. This takes the form of allegorizing Hagar and Sarah as two covenants. Hagar is represented as the one whose covenant is associated with the Law and the historic city of Jerusalem. By contrast, Sarah is associated with the covenant of promise.

There is, however, one omission in the scheme found in 3. 6ff, that is, a sense of historical asccountability for a given interpretation such as we observed at 3. 15-18. The nearest we come to this sort of feature is the theme of eschatological fulfilment. It has been suggested that this is implicit within the notion of a "Jerusalem above" (v. 26). [126] This concludes our discussion of the opponents in the Epistle to the Galatians.

Before concluding this chapter we treat the material in Phil. 3 and 2 Cor. 10-13 related to Paul's opponents. Phil. 3 is a logical point of departure from Gal. 2-4, since it

---

[126]. Luz, "Bund", 321; Mussner, Galaterbrief, 327; Sieffert, Galater, 288.

is arguable that Phil. 3 presents a portrayal of Paul's opponents that is similar to that already suggested in Gal. 2-4. This is especially so if circumcision formed a central debating point of the opponents in Philippi, as it did in Galatia. There are several indicators to support this view. Paul depicts the opponents as dogs, evil-workers, and those who multilate the flesh (3. 2). The first word "dogs" is a pejorative way in which Jews referred to Gentiles who are outside of the covenant (cf. Mt. 15. 26f; Rev. 22. 15). If we simply had this term it would not be very clear what sense this word is intended. Given that the opponents are contrasted with v. 3, where the "we" refers to Christians, the suggestion is made that the epithet "dog" refers to Jews.[127] This ambiguity is clarified by a second term ἐργάτης, which is a technical term for a Christian missionary (cf. 2 Cor 11. 13). From this it appears that Paul has Christian opponents in mind. Third, the fact that there is a word-play between κατατομή and περιτομή suggests that the opponents here maintain circumcision as the rite of entry into the people of God.[128] This makes reasonable sense in view of the statement at v. 3, where Paul and the Philippian converts are referred to as the (true) circumcision. In addition to circumcision, the list of Jewish boasts which

---

[127]. Those who subscribe to the view of the opponents as Jews include Beare, Philippians, 101; Klijn, "Opponents ", 278-284; Caird, Prison, 133; Lohmeyer, Philipper, 124; D. W. Michaelis, Der Brief des Paulus an die Philipper (Leipzig, 1935), 53; G. Hawthorne, Philippians (Waco (TX), 1983), xlvi-xlvii, 125; M. Dibelius, An die Thessalonicher I.II an die Philipper (Tübingen, 1937), 86. For the view that the "dogs" refer to the Gentiles see P. Richardson, Israel in the Apostolic Church (Cambridge, 1969), 84-97; K. Grayston, "The Opponents in Philippians 3", ExpT 97 (1986), 171.

[128]. This word-play has been noted by Collange, Philippians, 124; Watson, Gentiles, 74; Michaelis, Ibid.; C. Mearns, "The Identity of Paul's Opponents At Philippi", NTS 31 (1987), 197; Martin, Philippians, 126; G. Baumbach, "Die Frage nach den Irrlehrern in Philippi", Kairos 13 (1971), 258; Sanders, "Opponents", 80; W. Schmithals, "The False Teachers of the Epistle to the Philippians", in Paul and the Gnostics, (Nashville, 1972), 85; J. Reumann, "St. Paul's Use of Irony", Lutheran Quarterly 7 (1955), 140-5; C.E. DeVries, "Paul's Cutting Remarks about a Race: Gal. 5: 1-12" in G. Hawthorne (ed.) Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation (Grand Rapids, 1975), 115-120; Bonnard, Philippiens, 60; Gnilka "Antipaulinische", 260 n.10 D.F. Watson, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians and its Implications for the Unity Question", NovT 30 (1988), 73-74.

Paul makes of himself further suggests that the opponents were Jewish. This is so especially if it is reasonable to assume the opponents could have provided a list of boasts similar to Paul's. Therefore, we maintain that the opponents at v. 2 are Jewish Christian missionaries who made circumcision a requirement of becoming a members of God's family.[129]

These features are reminscent of the Galatian opponents. Several details are noteworthy. First, the play on the word "circumcision" (κατατομή) is reminiscent of Gal. 5. 12, where physical circumcision is referred to as "mutilation" (RSV). In spite of there being no verbal parallel (Gal.:ἀποκόπτω ; Phil.:κατατομή), the word-play accomplishes the same end. Second, Phil. 3. 3 states that "we" boast in Christ Jesus and put no confidence in the flesh. The implication here is that Paul's opponents do put confidence in the flesh. The word σάρξ at v. 3b would seem to be best understood as a reference to the rite of circumcision,[130] though at vv. 4ff it may imply trusting in an ordinance outside of Christ (e.g. ancestry: Phil 3. 5-6 or law observance: Phil 3. 9).[131] This language is strikingly similar to Gal. 6. 13-14, where the opponents are depicted as those who want to make a good showing in the flesh by having the Galatians circumcised, while Paul boasts in the cross of Christ. Finally, the opponents at Philippi and Galatia are both trying to get Gentile Christians to be circumcised. This we have already shown for Galatia. The fact

---

[129]. Koester, "Purpose, 320-321; Gnilka, Ibid.; Tyson, "Philippi", 82ff; Sanders, Ibid.,83-84; Lightfoot, Philippians, 143; Bonnard, Ibid.; Mearns, Ibid., 202; G. Friedrich, Der Brief an die Philipper (Tübingen and Göttingen, 1962), 159; Watson, Gentiles, 74; P. Ewald (G. Wohlenberg), Der Brief des Paulus an die Philipper (Leizig, 1923), 165; Watson, "Rhetorical", 58-59; B. Mengel, Studien zum Philipperbrief (Tübingen, 1982), esp. 260f; 278f.

[137]. W.D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit", in Christian Origins (London, 1962), 145-177.

[131]. Martin, Philippians, 127; H.R. Moehring, "Some remarks on σαρξ (sarx) in Philippians 3:3ff", in F.L. Cross (ed.), Studia Evangelica (Oxford, 1968), vol. 4, 432-436. Collange, Philippians, maintains that while the use here is primarily to fleshly circumcision and membership into the people of God, it does include justification by the Law and a person's own spirituality. Similarly Caird, Prison, 134; H.A.A. Kennedy, The Epistle to the Philippians (Grand Rapids, 1974), 450; Gnilka, Philipperbrief, 187.

that at Philippi there were not enough Jews to have a synagogue suggests that the Christian congregation was predominantly Gentile.[132] Therefore, a portrayal of the Philippian opponents as Jewish Christian missionaries whose aim it was to have Gentile converts circumcised seems cogent.

We must now proceed to a second pericope (3. 17ff) and consider its content. There are several clues to the views of the opponents from this material. First, they are "enemies of the cross" (3. 18). This charge is precisely what we find in Gal. (2. 21, 3. 1, 5. 11, 6. 12-14) -- the cross is set over against circumcision and Torah observance. If the reference to the cross at Phil 3. 18 is understood in connection with Phil. 3. 2 and the phrase to have minds "set on earthly things" is seen as the same claim of v. 3f, "to put confidence in the flesh", then the controversies of Gal. and Phil. appear to have the same focus of debate.

Second, they are described in allusive language: "their God is the belly and they glory in their shame". In view of the ambiguity of this expression various possible meanings have been suggested. If we take the phrase "their God is the belly", the important word to define is κοιλία. The range of meaning includes the following: (1) greed or sensuality;[133] (2) self-regard;[134] (3) a reference to Jewish dietary restrictions;[135] (4) the term supports

---

[132]. R. Jewett, "Conflicting Movements in the Early Church", NovT 12 (1970), 372; Caird, Prison, 97. This view seems to have been held since the study of W. H. Schinz, Die christliche Gemeinde zu Philippi (Zürich, 1833).

[133]. Beare, Philippians, 136.

[134]. Caird, Prison, 147; Collange, Philippians, 138; Martin, Philippians, 145; Kennedy, Philippians, 462; comp. Gnilka, "Antipaulinische", 276; Baumbach "Irrlehrern", 262.

[135]. Koester, "Purpose", 328; Ewald, Philipper, 165; Watson, "Rhetorical", 58.

the view for a gnostic libertinism.[136] If we begin by noting the parallel nature of the language and attempt to isolate the common idea in each part of the sentence, it is arguable that αἰσχύνη ("shame") and κοιλία ("belly") both refer to the same entity. In this vein, it has been suggested that both terms are used as euphemisms for the male sex organ.[137] κοιλία has this euphemistic sense in the LXX of Ps. 132. 11; 2 Sam. 7. 12, 16. 11; Sir. 32. 6. The evidence for this meaning of αἰσχύνη is attested in Ex. 20. 26; Rev. 3. 8, 16. 15; 1 Cor. 12. 23. Therefore, what Paul is drawing attention to is the opponents' emphasis on circumcision. If this interpretation is cogent it becomes unnecessary to postulate two distinct theses of the opponents at Phil 3. 2 and 3. 17ff. This understanding would also account for the fact that opposition to the cross and circumcision occur in the same context. Therefore, it appears cogent that the opponents in Philippi are similar in kind to those of the Galatian controversy.

There is a third pericope (3. 12-16) that is thought to reflect another element of the opponents' views.[138] There are several details adduced to advance this case. It is claimed that the opponents held to a predominantly realized eschatology and therefore denied the future hope of the parousia. This view, sometimes termed perfectionist, is reflected in Paul's use of τελειόω/τέλειος at 3. 12, 15. The assumption that some held was that since they had been blessed with a new life in Christ and now share in his

---

[137]. Schmithals, "Teachers", 109; Jewett, "Movements", 381-2. The libertine element is also advocted by H.D. Betz, Nachfolge und Nachahmung Jesu Christi im Neuen Testament (Tübingen, 1967), 145-153, though he maintains that the gnostic influence is reflected only at 3. 2-16 (not in 3. 17ff).

[137]. Mearns, "Opponents", 198-9; Watson, Gentiles, 76; TDNT Vol. 1, 189-91, Vol. 3, 786-9.

[138]. This view is quite widespread, e.g. Collange, Philippians, 13; Mearns, "Opponents", 196; Schmithals, "Teachers", 95ff; Gnilka, Philipperbrief, 201; Martin, Philippians, 140ff; Koester, "Purpose", 322ff; Michaelis, Philipper, 59.

immortality, they can forget about a future eschatolgical hope. In this context Paul's disclaimer that he has not already obtained the resurrection of the dead in v. 11, and that he is not perfect, makes reasonable sense. This is also consistent with the corrective statement at v. 15: (let those of us who are τέλειοι be thus minded) as well as with the affirmation of a future coming of Christ at 3. 20-21.

However, what is not clear is whether the portrayal given is that of the opponents from outside or whether it is Paul's instruction regarding an internal community matter. The latter of these seems the more plausible.[139] First, in view of the emphasis in first century Judaism on apocalyptic it seems peculiar for Judaizing Christians to adopt a mainly realized eschatology divorced from the future return of Christ. Second, the reference to "us" and "you" at v. 15 suggests that we are dealing with an internal matter within the Philippian community. Finally, 3. 12-16 seems better understood as a transition (from his charge and rebuttal against the opponents in vv. 3ff) before taking up in 3. 17ff his second attack. If these reasons are cogent then 3. 12-16, we suggest, may not be used as evidence in determining the views of the opponents in Philippi.

Let us now conclude with some remarks on the opponents in 2 Cor. 10-13. Our aim will not be to offer a full treatment of the vexing problem of the opponents in 2 Corinthians.[140] Rather, we shall consider whether the portrayal of the opponents here reflects an emphasis similar to those of Galatians and Philippians. One difficulty in determining this question is that the references to the opponents are largely allusive in

---

[139]. Watson, Gentiles, 75.

[140]. See e.g. Georgi, Gegner, also the ET The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians (Edinburgh, 1987); E. Käsemann, "Die Legitimität des Paulus. Eine Untersuchung zu II Korinther 10-13", ZNW 41 (1942), 33-71; Schmithals, Gnosticism; C.K.Barrett, "Christianity at Corinth", Essays on Paul (London, 1982) 14-22, and "Paul's Opponents in 2 Corinthians", 60-107; Friedrich, "Korintherbrief", 181-215. For a recent survey of views Furnish, II Corinthians, 48-54 may be consulted.

nature. Nonetheless, the following points of similarity have been suggested.[141] (1) The opponents are Jewish Christians whose origin (or that of their family) was Palestine, and their Jewish heritage was a matter of great pride (11. 22; Phil. 3. 4-6).[142] (2) The use made of ἄμετρος and μερίζω (10. 13) to remind his readers not to go beyond the sphere God has apportioned recalls the division of apostolic labour at Gal. 2. 7-9.[143] (3) The reference to the ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων (11. 5) and the ψευδαπόστολοι (11. 13) echoes the discussion at Gal. 2. 4-6.[144] The use of irony directed toward the ἀπόστολοι (11.5) and οἱ δοκοῦντες(Gal.2.6) is also apparent. (4) The debate found both in Gal. and 2 Cor. is focused around this "other gospel" (11. 4; Gal. 1.6). Whether the phrase means the same thing in Gal. and 2 Cor. is a disputed point. (5) The opponents in 2 Cor. 11.13 and Phil. 3. 2 are both described by the word δόκιος/κακός ἐργάτης. However, what is omitted from 2 Cor. 10-13 is mention of circumcision and Torah observance (unless the transient nature of the law mentioned in 2 Cor. 3 may be appealed to). [145] Since both circumcision and the observance of the law for Gentile converts characterized the opponents in Gal. and Phil., there is reason to question the premiss that the opponents of 2 Cor. were the Judaizers who were active in the churches of Galatia and Philippi. The above evidence shows that the opponents were certainly Jewish Christians. The other points of similarity

---

[141]. Barrett, "Opponents", passim appeals to the following data to reconstruct the view of the opponents: 10. 6, 12-18; 11. 3, 4, 13, 14; 12. 12, 13, 18; 12. 19-13. 2; 13. 3-9. It is our view that each of these texts cannot be used with equal reliability for our question. We shall use them selectively.

[142]. For a discussion of the epithets in 2 Cor. 11. 22. see the ch. 3.

[143]. D. W. Oosterdorf, Another Jesus (Kampen, 1967), 1-30.

[144]. This depends on whether one sees one or two groups being referred to. See Furnish, II Corinthians, 502-509 and Barrett, Corinthians, 30-32; Käsemann, "Legitimitat", 41ff; Bultmann, Korinther, 205.

[145]. Bultmann, Korinther, 216; Furnish, II Corinthians, 534; F. Young and D. F. Ford, Meaning and Truth in 2 Corinthians (London, 1987), 49; R.P. Martin, 2 Corinthians (Waco (TX), 1986), 350. Comp. Sanders, "Opponents", 85.

noted above lack sufficient detail to allow a confident judgement that the opponents were also Judaizers.

What is striking about the material in 2 Cor. 10-13 is the central place given to the contrast between Paul and his opponents. In this vein, the suggestion has been made that the rhetorical device of συγκρίσις, ("comparison") is evident throughout the material as a technique used both by Paul's opponents as well as himself.[146] The point is also made that a rival apostolate is to be placed within the "mainstream of Greco-Roman cultural convention".[147] This understanding of the context of 2 Cor. 10-13 seems to clarify several elements in Paul's defence. First, even though Paul is quite willing to concede that he is unskilled in speech (ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ), he does have some competence in γνώσει(11. 6). Second, it fits with Paul boasting in his capacity as a visionary (12. 1-6) as well as being one who performed miracles, wonders, and mighty works (12. 12). Third, it shows that Paul defends himself by appeal to what is essentially a hellenistic rhetorical convention.

The following definition of Paul's opponents in substance is correct: the intruders were Jews, Jerusalem Jews, Judaizing Jews, and as such constituted a rival apostolate to Paul's, backed by all the prestige of the mother church; the Corinthians, confronted by these rival apostolates, proceeded to compare and to judge between them on essentially hellenistic grounds.[148] There are two statements which ought to be qualified with "possibly". The first is that the intruders were "Judaizing Jews", and the second that they

---

[146]. The thesis has been argued in detail by P. Marshall, Enmity in Corinth (Tübingen, 1987). The point has also been suggested by C. Forbes, "Comparison, Self Praise and Irony: Hellenistic Rhetoric and the Boasting of Paul", NTS 32 (1986), 1-30 and H.D. Betz, Paul's Apology: II Corinthians 10-13 and the Socratic Tradition (Berkeley, 1970), 14. See also E. A. Judge, "Paul's Boasting in Relation to Contemporary Professional Practice", ABR 16 (1968), 37-50.

[147]. Marshall, Ibid. 336-337.

[148]. Barrett, "Opponents", 80.

were backed by the Jerusalem Church. Both of these points are based on the assumption that the similarities noted above between Gal. and Phil. and 2 Cor. are precise enough to conclude that the opponents of 2 Cor. are the Galatian Judaizers who were active in the Philippian church. We have argued that there is insufficient evidence to make these conclusions with certainty.

Let us now formulate several overall conclusions regarding the views shared between Paul and his opponents in the three bodies of evidence considered. First, Gal. presents us with the widest brief concerning the ideals of Paul's opponents. Second, the opponents found in Phil. are similar in outlook to those in Gal. They were Jewish Christians who held circumcision and Torah observance as distinguishing marks for converts to Christianity. Unlike the portrayal of Gal., we found no indication of an appeal to the figure of Abraham, the OT, or God's action in history. Third, while the opponents in 2 Cor. may have had traits similar to those of the Galatian Judaizers, we maintain that there is insufficient evidence to claim that Paul's opponents in Corinth were the same group that are found in Galatia and Philippi. None the less, it may be affirmed that they were Jewish Christians who used hellenistic rhetorical conventions to oppose the work of Paul.

CHAPTER 6

JEWISH ETHICS AND GENTILE CONVERTS

We have thus far considered material which informs us about Jewish ideals in connection with Jews qua Jews and Jewish Christians. We shall now discuss the relationship between Gentile converts and Jewish ethical ideals. Specifically, the issue that requires attention is what occurs when Paul's Jewish presuppositions clash with the behaviour of Gentile converts. While Paul's converts from paganism in one sense are a "new creation", their behaviour did not always reflect this. In order to correct this behaviour Paul instructed his converts to embrace certain Jewish ethical ideals. Gentile converts were to emulate Jewish ideals in two areas (1) sexual ethics, (2) the rejection of idolatrous practices. Let us take these in order.

1 Thess. 4. 3-8 is an appropriate text to investigate in connection with Paul's attitude to sexual ethics because it is both ethical in nature and is thought by some to be thoroughly Jewish in character.[1] First, I shall argue that a common Jewish ideal on sexuality is reflected within this pericope.[2] This will be supported by an analysis of 1 Thess. 4 and other evidence from Paul's letters (e.g. list of vices in 1 Cor. 5, 6; Rom. 1) in conjunction with that of the Jewish sources. Second, I shall suggest that the Jewish ethics present within 1 Thess. 4 are assumed by Paul to be behaviour expected of Gentile converts. I shall

---

[1]. R. F. Collins, Christian Morality: Biblical Foundations (Notre Dame, 1986), 212-214 = "The Unity of Paul's Paranesis in 1 Thess. 4. 3-8" in NTS 29 (1983), 421-422; H. Koester, "Thessalonians: Experiment in Christian Writing", in Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History: Essays Presented to George Hunston Williams on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday (Leiden, 1979), 42.

[2]. The case for a common Jewish ethic within the diaspora Jewish literature has been recently argued by Collins, Athens and Jerusalem, 137-174.

conclude with several remarks on the social importance for the church at Thessalonica that Gentile converts should observe Jewish ethics.

We have already noted the Jewish character of 1 Thess. 4. R.F. Collins gives several indications of this.[3] First, Paul uses the verb παραλαμβάνω (vv. 1-2). This usage reflects the Hebrew קִבֵּל , which was a term used technically in the rabbinic schools in relation to the transmission of tradition. Second, the Greek word περιπατέω is used on two occasions in the introductory section of this pericope to describe the manner of life which the Thessalonian Christians are to emulate. The choice of words reflects the rabbinic use of הֲלָךְ which denotes how a person ought to live his/her life. Third, the desired conduct of the people of God is set in contrast to the "Gentiles who do not know God" at 4. 4. This motif of the people of God in relation to ignorant pagans is also found in Rom. 1, and has as its Jewish precedent Wisdom 13-14. Finally, it is to be noted that at v. 3 occurs the notion of God's will (θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ). This idea formed a major religious motif within late Judaism, and it was also deemed a fundamental source of motivation and guidance. Within this general context we must now consider in more detail vv. 3-6a, to determine how this general Jewish flavour accords with the content of the ethics expected of the Thessalonians. In the structure of the material which has been customarily

---

[3]. Collins, Morality, 212-214 also Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians (Leuven, 1984), 314-15.

recognized, 3a forms a general statement followed by the ethical instruction in vv. 3b-6a. In this connection 6b-8 gives three motivations for obeying the instruction given.[4]

The central theme of Paul's exhortation is sanctification. This idea occurs for the first time in the introductory statement at v. 3 "this is the will of God, your sanctification". The idea recurs in the problematic phrase at v. 4 "that each of you know how to take a wife for himself in holiness" (RSV) or "that each one of you know how to handle his own body in holiness" (NEB).[5] Holiness is rendered in Greek by the word ἁγιασμός .[6] There is further evidence of the sanctification motif in the second motivational element in our pericope at v. 7: "For God has not called us to uncleanness, but in holiness." From this third example we are told that a Christian's call includes the ethical domain. In the first two examples cited we are given indicators that the sanctifying process is taking place.[7] It is indeed this latter thrust that forms the core of vv. 3b-6a. Paul brings together in list form what constitutes the will of God as it relates to sanctification, and in this present context sanctification equals correct sexual behaviour.

---

[4]. Collins, Studies, 36-50; E. Best, The First and Second Epistle to the Thessalonians (London, 1977), 159-170 ; T. Holtz. Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher (Zürich, Koln, 1986), esp. 163. M. Adinolfi, "La santità del matrimonio in 1 Tess. 4, 1-8", in RivB 24 (1976), 165-166; F. Laub, Eschatologische Verkündigung und Lebensgestaltung nach Paulus. Eine Untersuchung zum Wirken des Apostels beim der Gemeinde in Thessalonike (Regensburg, 1973), 52-53; J. E. Frame, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St Paul to the Thessalonians (Edinburgh, 1946), 127; W. Marxsen, Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher (Zürich, 1979), 59. Comp. C. Roetzel, "The Judgement Form in Paul's Letters", in JBL 88 (1969), 306-307.

[5]. See R. R. Richards, "1 Thessalonians 4.4-6" in BT 29 (1978), 245-247, for an overview of how the various translators have treated these verses.

[6]. The centrality of ἁγιασμός to the pericope is noted by Adinolfi, "1 Tess. 4, 1-8", 165-166, also Collins, Studies, 308-309, and O. L. Yarbrough, Not Like The Gentiles (Atlanta, 1985), 79.

[7]. Cf. Collins, Morality, 214.

The first indicator given is that the Christian convert is to abstain from immorality. This is thought by many to refer to all types of wanton sexual behaviour, i.e. all forms of sexual misconduct that takes place outside the marriage relationship.[8]

The second indication that the sanctifying process is evident occurs at v. 4. The problematic Greek phrase ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος has a varied history among the interpreters, from the time of early commentators to the present. In 1956 one eminent commentator concluded that there was insufficent information to "resolve the crosses".[9]

There have been two main interpretations of this verse.[10] The debate is focused on how to understand several key words of the sentence. The Greek word σκεῦος for example, has been translated metaphorically either as "wife" or as "body". Those who have adopted the former have appealed to the following points to support their view.[11] First, reference is made to 1 Peter 3. 7 as a possible parallel where the woman is referred to as the "weaker vessel". In a similar vein 1 Cor 7. 2 is adduced to underscore the importance of sexual relations within marriage. Second, the ingressive sense of κτᾶσθαι, meaning "to acquire" or "get" a person or thing, is appealed to. Third, the use of the reflexive pronoun ἑαυτοῦ makes better sense in a context where correct sexual behaviour in relation to the wife is discussed. It would be difficult to know what it would mean for a person to acquire

---

[8]. Marshall, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 107; F. F. Bruce, 1 and 2 Thessalonians (Waco, (TX), 1982), 82; Laub, Eschatologische, 53; D. E. H. Whiteley, Thessalonians (Oxford, 1969), 60; B. Rigaux, Les Épîtres aux Thessaloniciens, Études bibliques (Paris, 1956), 502; H. Schlier, "Auslegung des 1. Thessalonicherbriefes (4: 1-12)", in Bib Leb 3, (1962) 243; J. Jensen, "Does Porneia Mean Fornication? A Critique of Bruce Malina", NovT 20 (1978), 161-184.

[9]. This phrase is from Collins, Studies, 299. The intended scholar is Rigaux, Thessaloniciens, 503.

[10]. The advocates of these two main views are listed by Collins, Studies, 311-312.

[11]. For a recent defence of this view see Yarbrough, Gentiles, 68-76.

or get his own body. Fourth, appeal is made to extra-biblical parallels, particularly among the rabbis. One text that is often referred to is from the Babylonian Talmud, Megill. 12b, where a midrash on Esther 1. 10 is given. This view is supported by both ancient and modern commentators.

Objections have been raised against each of these points. First, the parallel with 1 Peter 3. 7 cannot be defended since both men and women are referred to in this passage as σκεῦος. The woman is called the weaker vessel of the two and the reference here is to the woman's body, without the connotation that she is a possession of the husband. This view is also questioned because there is no NT passage in which a man's wife is called his σκεῦος. The possible parallel with 1 Cor 7. 2 also cannot be sustained since the injunction to avoid πορνεία will be obeyed by the man having his own wife and the wife her own husband. Therefore the relationship between the man and woman is mutual, unlike 1 Thess. 4, where the man takes the active role. It can also be noted that neither the man nor the woman is the σκεῦος of the other at 1 Cor. 7. Second, the point that ἑαυτοῦ is best understood emphatically in relation to his wife needs to be set alongside the fact that in Hellenistic Greek the pronoun has lost much of its emphatic force.[12] Third, the present infinitive κτᾶσθαι can have a durative meaning, and if so is equal to the Greek perfect and used in the sense of "master" or "to keep under control". Support for this

---

[12]. J. H. Moulton, A Grammar of the New Testament: Prolegomena (Edinburgh, 1978), Vol. 1, 87-88; Rigaux, Thessaloniciens, 506; C. Masson, Les deux Épîtres de Saint Paul aux Thessaloniciens (Neuchâtel and Paris, 1957), 47, renders it as "son vase à lui". Frame, Thessalonians, 150, cites this as a possible interpretation.

may be adduced from papyri dated from the 1st century A.D.[13] We can also point to Lk. 18. 12 as a NT example where the present takes on a meaning of the perfect.[14]

The fourth objection raised is regarding the Jewish evidence. The example used to illuminate 1 Thess. 4 is from the Talmud (b.Megill. 12b) and therefore it is not within our reach to know whether this material formed a background to the language Paul chose. However, even if the material could be deemed early the evidence is still ambiguous. Those who appeal to this evidence do so on the grounds that קְלָה is equivalent to σκεῦος and refers to a woman. It is also claimed that קְלָה is found in contexts where sexual overtones are evident. The tradition recalled and attributed to Rabat (d. 352) states "Some say that Medes are more beautiful, while others say that Persians are more beautiful. Then Assuerus said: The קְלָה which I use is neither a Mede nor a Persian but a Chaldaean woman. Do you want to see her? Yes, they answered, provided that she's naked." What can be noted here is that the Hebrew word does not refer to a woman but to various women. Therefore even if its tradition was early b. Megill. 12b would not serve as a very effective text to illuminate 1 Thess. 4, where sanctity of the sexual relations within marriage is assumed on an understanding of σκεῦος as wife. Neither does the b. Megill. text present a constructive view of women. If we were to ascribe this understanding of women to Paul, she would be little more than a vessel for gratifying the sexual desire of her

---

[13]. J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (London, 1914-29), 362 cite the following papyrus from AD 23 : P. Oxy. II. 259 (6), where κτάομαι means "have". This point is noted by M. Dibelius, An die Thessalonicher I.II an die Philipper (Tübingen, 1925), 19; Rigaux, Thessaloniciens, 505-506; W. Neil, The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians (London, 1950), 79-80; L. Morris, The First and Second Epistle to the Thessalonians (London and Edinburgh, 1959), 123 n. 14.

[14]. H. G. Liddel and R. Scott, A Greek - English Lexicon, rev. by H. S. Jones (Oxford, 1968), 1001; Plummer, St. Luke, 418; M.-J. Lagrange, Évangile selon Saint Luc (Paris, 1921), 477.

husband.[15] There is one final objection to the view that σκεῦος refers to wife. The fact that one can cite commentators both ancient and modern loses its force when it is recalled that the alternative view (vessel= body) can claim from earliest time an interpretative history that is equally impressive.[16]

We have already indicated the direction of our sympathies. Let us state these more explicitly. There seem to be several positive arguments in favour of σκεῦος referring to "body". First there is support for a metaphorical sense within Paul and elsewhere in the NT. One text that is often pointed to in this regard is 2 Cor 4. 7 where the physical body is considered an earthen vessel: "we have this treasure in earthen vessels". Another text relevant here is 1 Peter 3. 7, where "body" seems appropriate, given that both man and woman are seen as vessels of the Holy Spirit. A second argument in favour of the interpretation "body" is to understand σκεῦος in a somewhat qualified sense, i.e. not as the container of the soul but as a euphemism for the male sex organ.[17] While σκεῦος has been understood from Patristic times as "body", the specifically sexual connotation of the equivalent Hebrew term כְּלִי to σκεύη in 1 Sam 21. 5 has received little attention.[18] On this reading the sense of σκεῦος at 1 Thess. 4. 4 is that of sexual self control or the mastering of one's body. This understanding of σκεῦος is attested in Greek, and also has

---

[15]. Bruce, Thessalonians, 83; Morris, Thessalonians, 124; Marshall, Thessalonians, 108; Rigaux, Thessaloniciens, 506; J. B. Lightfoot, Notes on Epistles of St. Paul (London, 1904), 55.

[16]. Whether one is to follow Theodore of Mopsuestia, Augustine, St. Thomas (=wife) or Tertullian, Chrysostom, John Damascene, Calvin (=body) is a moot point.

[17]. J. Whitton, "A Neglected Meaning for SKEUOS in 1 Thessalonians 4: 4", in NTS 28 (1982), 142; Marshall, Thessalonians, 108.

[18]. Whitton, Ibid.

the advantage that one does not have to suppose that Greek readers appreciated an uncertain rabbinic usage.[19]

However, there is perhaps a more persuasive reason to support the interpretation "body" as we have formulated it. It is that this view offers a greater coherence and logical thrust to the passage. In v. 3 Paul states that the converts are to abstain from immorality and in v. 5 they are not to behave like the Gentiles who act in the passion of lust. If in v. 4 what is being requested is sexual self-control -- mastery of the body---there is an exact coherence within vv. 3-5. Converts are to reflect in their behaviour that the sanctifying process is taking place. They are to do this first by abstaining from immorality. Positively, they are to do this by mastering the sexual control of their own bodies. Negatively, they are not to behave as do the non-Jewish nations who are characterized by lustful passion because of their ignorance of God. Paul's definition of the will of God begun at v. 3 is concluded at v. 6a with the injunction not to transgress against his brother (probably understood here in a wider sense of fellow man; comp. Rom 13. 9) by defrauding, i.e. taking advantage, of him. The matter[20] at hand is that which has been discussed throughout these verses -- correct sexual behaviour. Therefore, Paul's plea is to avoid any form of sexual promiscuity. In the context of a pagan environment like Thessalonica, [21] this general

---

[19]. Marshall, Thessalonians, 109.

[20]. It does not seem likely in our view that Paul is taking up a new subject at v. 6a. Therefore πράγμα is best understood in relation to the sexual matters of vv. 3-5. This view is supported by Best, Thessalonians, 164; Rigaux, Thessaloniciens, 510; G. Friedrich, "Die erste Briefe an die Thessalonicher", in Die Brief an die Galater, Epheser, Philipper, Kolosser, Thessalonicher und Philemon (Göttingen, 1976), 239; Laub, Eschatologische, 52; P. Richardson, "Judgement in Sexual Matters in 1 Corinthians 6: 1-11", in NovT 25 (1983), 49; K. P. Donfried, "The Cults of Thessalonica and the Thessalonian Correspondence", in NTS 31 (1985), 342; comp. Holtz, Thessalonicher, 161-2; Masson, Thessaloniciens, 48; H. Baltensweiler, "Erwägungen zu 1. Thess. 4, 3-8", in TZ 19 (1963), 1-13.

[21]. On this theme see the recent discussion by Donfried, Ibid., 336-356; also H. Ulonska, "Christen und Heiden. Die paulinische Paranese in 1 Thess 4, 3-8", in TZ 43 (1987), 210-218.

instruction would seem to have greater positive value than the more specific exhortation on sexual behaviour within marriage especially since we lack any firm evidence that sexual problems within marriage, were an issue for the new converts, as was the case in 1 Cor.[22]

The significance of the above interpretation for our over-all thesis will be seen by noting that this view of sexual ethics is not unique to 1 Thess. 4. Indeed, abhorrence of immorality forms a central place in Paul's reflections on ethical behaviour in several other letters. If one considers the use of πορνεία or similar words one finds that this word-group held a prominent place within the list of vices.[23] πόρνος or πορνεία occurs first in the list of vices in Gal. 5. 19-21; 1 Cor 5. 9; 1 Cor 5. 11; 1 Cor 6. 9-10. In Rom 1. 20-3 idolatry is followed by the dishonouring of bodies of which homosexuality is specified (Rom 1.26-7). In Rom 1. 29-31 πονηρία comes second.[24]

There are four general points that emerge from these lists of vices. First, they are Jewish.[25] They emphasize the two cardinal Gentile sins as seen by Jews: sexual transgression and idolatry. We shall restrict our discussion for the moment to the first of

---

[22]. See however, Collins, Studies, 314-15 for a suggested Sitz-im-Leben for the pericope under discussion.

[23]. Several points in the following discussion were brought to my attention in an unpublished paper by E. P. Sanders, "Paul and Sex", delivered to the NT Seminar, Oxford, 19 June 1986. While Sanders argues a point similar to our over-all thesis, he does so by interpreting the σκεῦος at v. 4 as wife. Consequently, Sanders argues that what is common between Paul and the Jewish tradition is that a man is not to "desire" his wife. Sanders thus translates ἐπιθυμία as "with the passion or feeling of desire", and suggests that Paul intends to "limit desire to a subordinate place". For this view among Jews see Philo, On Joseph 43, and Josephus, Ap. 2. 199.

[24]. The numerical position of the πορν- word group is as follows: first of fifteen (Gal. 5. 19-21), first of four (1 Cor. 5. 9), first of six (1 Cor. 5. 11), first of ten (1 Cor. 6. 9-10), second of twenty-one (Rom. 1. 29-31).

[25]. B. S. Easton, "New Testament Ethical Lists", in JBL 51 (1932), 1-12; Betz, Galatians, 281-286; S. Wibbing, Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament und ihre Traditionsgeschichte (Berlin, 1959); Conzelmann, Corinthians, 100-107; A. Vögtle, Die Tugend und Lasterkatolge im Neuen Testament (Munich, 1936). However E. Kamlah, Die Form der katalogischen Paranese im Neuen Testament (Tübingen, 1964), maintains that the form of the vice lists are Iranian.

these. Second, several lists (e.g. 1 Cor 6. 9-10; Gal 5. 19) suggest the outlook is pre-Pauline.[26] One possible source of the lists could be what was remembered from synagogue sermons. Third, in the case of two lists the contexts are little regarded (1 Cor. 6. 9-10; Gal. 5.19). Fourth, the list in Rom. 1 has several features that are common with Wis. 13-14. Sexual perversion, adultery, and fornication are a consequence of idolatry; sexual sins and idolatry reflect sins of Gentiles, and the vice list at Rom. 1. 29-31 and Wis. 14. 25 both include murder and deceit. Finally, the list-like form of the vices suggests that their importance and significance were self-evident and, for at least some of Paul's audience, did not require explanation. These observations lead us to conclude that the emphasis on sexual immorality indicates that the lists of vices reflect a common Jewish attitude toward Gentiles.

We must now give several examples to support the emphasis of the list of vices at 1 Thess. 4 and Rom. 1 -- that sexual transgression characterized the Gentiles. We have already noted Wis. 13-14. This view of Wisdom is consistent with a wide variety of Jewish sources of the diaspora. This is evident both in general terms as well as when specific Gentile sins are considered in Paul's letters and Jewish sources.

The specific forms of sexual sins immorality given by Paul are incest, homosexuality, prostitution and adultery. The first of these -- incest -- occurs at 1 Cor. 5. 1ff. The prohibition, derived from Lev 18. 8 and 18. 7, forbids uncovering the nakedness of one's own near of kin--father, mother, father's wife etc. Philo in Spec. Laws 3. 22-25, discusses the question of incest with one's sister and echoes a sentiment similar to that of the Bible.

---

[26]. Betz, Galatians, 285; Easton, "Ethics", 4-5; Lietzmann, Korinther, 26; R. Scroggs, New Testament and Homosexuality (Philadelphia, 1983), 101-109. The fact that the vices are traditional does not necessarily suggest that they are "haphazard collections of random vices" unconnected to the epistolary situation of the letter. In this connection see the recent study by P. S. Zaas, "Catalogues and Context: 1 Corinthians 5 and 6", NTS 34 (1988), 622-629.

This may equally be said of the Letter to Arist. (151), which adds to Philo's list the defilement of mother and daughter. It is significant that both Aristeas and Philo agree that Jews keep clear of any such sins.

A second sin is that of homosexuality. This is referred to in 1 Cor. 6. 9-10, where πόρνος is more fully defined as adultery and homosexuality, passive and active homosexuality. The sin also occurs in Rom 1, where both male and female homosexuality is denounced. Paul's view here is entirely consistent with a variety of Jewish witnesses. In addition to the Bible (Lev. 18. 22; 20. 13), Arist. 152; Sib. Or., 2. 73; Hypoth. 7. 1, Spec. Laws 3. 372; Ap. 2. 199; Ps. Phoc. 3, 190 all condemn homosexuality.[27] Several details are noteworthy. First, Arist. and the Sib. Or. indicate specifically that homosexuality is an act of non-Jews (Arist. 152: whole countries and cities take part; Sib. Or. 3. 596 includes Egyptians, Latins, Romans and Greeks as those who hold unholy intercourse with boys). Second, in the Hypoth. and Contra Apionem homosexuality occurs in a discussion where Judaism is being defined to the Gentile world. Thus, Josephus and Philo present Judaism in its best light and to facilitate this give a selective summary of the Jewish religion. Yet they do not omit their abhorrence of homosexuality. Third, Philo (Spec. Laws 3. 37-42), in a lengthy discussion of sexual sins, includes pederasty and complains that men now boast of not only active but passive participation. The importance of this observation is two fold: (1) Graeco-Roman culture considered it disgraceful for adult free males to be sexually passive.[28] It was expected of men, unlike women and slaves, to be sexually active. Philo's abhorrence of the active and passive role of homosexuality shows Jewish ethics to be distinctive from those

---

[27]. See on this theme Scroggs, Homosexuality, 66-98; also the discussion in Yarbrough, Gentiles, 7-29.

[28]. See on this theme during the time of Plato and Aristotle, K. Dover, Greek Popular Morality (Oxford, 1974), 213-216; also his Greek Homosexuality (London, 1978); A. Richlin, Garden of Priapas (Yale, 1983), passim, e.g. 32ff., 136ff., 220-226.

of Graeco-Roman culture. (2) Paul in 1 Cor. 6. 9 makes this distinction between the effeminate-passive partner μαλακός -- the "soft one" and the active one -- ἀρσενοκοίτης.[29] Paul is against both forms of homosexual activity and therefore shows himself in agreement with Philo on this point of detail.

The third sin of immorality referred to is the use of a prostitute. 1 Cor. 6. 13b-20 condemns such a practice. This example may appear to be in conflict with the Bible (Jud. 11.1; Josh. 2) and Rabbinic Judaism (e.g. R. Judah-ha-Nasi: Tosef., Tem. 4.8) where prostitution is known and practised. Josephus also in his summary of Judaism in the Ant. (4. 206), notes the practise, though he states that payment received by a prostitute for her hire may not be used to purchase a sacrifice. Philo, on the other hand, states in Spec. Laws (3. 51) states that a harlot (πόρνη) is to be stoned. This view also occurs in On Joseph (43), where a harlot from among the commonwealth of Israel is not permitted to live. This view is given in a context where visiting prostitutes is attributed to nations other than Jews. If it is correct that Philo's view is based on the LXX Dt. 23. 18, where a daughter of Israel is prohibited from from being a prostitute, we may detect a different emphasis within the diaspora. This may have been in part because "some Jews attempted to forbid prostitution entirely within their communities--a step which was not required in Palestine, where the problem of Gentile ethics did not press so heavily and make Jews take the step to be distinctive".[30] This suggestion also adds a plausible context for understanding Paul's strong statements in 1 Cor. 6. 13b-20.

The final sin mentioned above -- adultery -- requires little comment. All voices within Judaism were against it (e.g. Hypoth. 7. 1; Spec. Laws 3. 8; Ap. 2. 199; Ps. Phoc. 3; Wis. 14.

---

[29]. Barrett, Corinthians, 140; Lietzmann, Korinther, 27; Bruce, Corinthians, 61; G. Fee, The First Epistle to the Corinthians (London, 1987), 243-244; Scroggs, Homosexuality, 62-65, 108.

[30]. Sanders, "Sex", 11, MS.

26; Arist. 152 also Ex. 20. 13 cf. 5. 17), and some witnesses specify that this sin characterized non-Jews. It must be added that this is a Jewish point of view, since Gentiles were also against adultery. [31]

What may be deduced from this brief sketch is that the sexual transgressions Paul defines or associates with πόρνος/πορνεία are the same sins that Jews of the diaspora condemned and considered to be characteristic of Gentiles. Consequently, the sexual transgressions denounced in Paul's list of vices, Rom. 1 and 1 Thess. 4 are those one would expect of a person writing from a Jewish point of view influenced and informed by the diaspora synagogue around the first century.

We conclude that if Paul's definition of πόρνος/πορνεία reflects common diaspora Jewish sentiment two consequences follow. First, we can see from 1 Thess. 4 that Paul imposes on his Gentiles converts a Jewish ethical ideal. Although we have little direct information on ethical teaching of the diaspora synagogue (apart from the sort of examples noted in the preceding discussion) we do know that the synagogue played an important part in diaspora life.[32] Therefore, the morality that the Thessalonian converts were to emulate was what one would expect from a person such as Paul, well acquainted with the diaspora synagogue. In addition, it can be noted that Paul appeals to this ideal with little deviation from the Jewish tradition or creative reflection of his own. The view we have suggested also makes good sense if the synagogue was not just a place of instruction for Jews but attracted Gentiles.[33] If so, the ethics we have observed may have been familiar to at least some of Paul's new converts.

---

[31]. So Dover, Morality, 209-210, 218; Richlin, Priapas, 128, 176, esp. 215.

[32]. Collins, Athens and Jerusalem, 162-163; Georgi, Gegner, 83-100.

[33]. Collins, Ibid., 163.

Second, the application of Jewish ethics to Gentile converts served a social function. It helped to distinguish these converts from the morals of their non-Christian contemporaries in a way similar to that in which Jewish ethics marked out Jews from pagans. This view is equally consistent with a community of largely Gentile converts at Thessalonica who needed to be reminded that turning to serve the living and true God (1. 9) had ethical consequences. This would show their distinctiveness from other Gentiles.[34]

Three concluding remarks are warranted. (1) The case for understanding σκεῦος as body is given added force. (2) Our discussion strengthens the view for the presence of a common denominator Judaism that may be documented before AD 70 i.e. in the late forties and fifties. (3) Our argument helps us appreciate better that Paul in his Christian theology showed continued sympathy with the moral traditions of Judaism.

We now want to enquire whether the outlook we have suggested regarding sexuality is equally reflected when Paul discusses how Gentile converts should perceive the worship of pagan idols. 1 Cor. 8-10 provides useful data for consideration. We have already noted from our remarks on the vice lists of 1 Cor. 5 and 6; Gal. 5 and Rom. 1 the central place held by sexual immorality. To this vice may be added a second sin: idolatry. We shall not repeat again the arguments given to suggest that the vice lists reflect a common Jewish attitude towards Gentiles. Since idolatry is included in the list of vices in 1 Cor. 5 and 6; Gal. 5 and Rom. 1, we shall simply assume the reason given (that the vice lists are common and Jewish in outlook) regarding immorality also applies to idolatry.

If then idolatry was another sin which Jews considered typical of Gentiles, we must determine (1) what Paul's view was regarding the worship of idols by Gentile converts, (2) to whom and in what circumstance his view applied, and (3) whether his view is consonant with Jewish ideals.

---

[34]. In this vein see Yarbrough, Gentiles, 81-87.

Paul's view is not as clear-cut as may be implied from the statement at 10. 14: "my beloved, shun the worship of idols". One reason for this is that there appears to be a contradiction between 10. 23-11. 1 and 8. 7-13. In the former, eating food offered to idols is a matter of indifference. Therefore, whatever is sold in the market-place can be eaten without raising a question of conscience. This applies if an unbeliever invites a believer for a meal. Without being disturbed by matters of conscience, one can eat whatever is put before one. The only proviso given is that the good of another is to be placed before the good of oneself. This view, however, is in contradiction with 8. 7-13, where the injunction is given to abstain from food offered to idols for the sake of the weaker brother. This is so that the conscience of the weaker brother may not be defiled. Various attempts have been made to resolve this tension.[35] The most plausible way forward, in our view is to

---

[35]. The following solutions have been proposed: (1) The issue throughout 1 Cor 8-10 is the problem of eating food bought at the market-place, e.g. C. K. Barrett, "Things Sacrificed to Idols", in Essays on Paul (London, 1982), 40-59; J. Murphy-O'Connor, "Freedom or the Ghetto (1 Cor., VIII, 1-13; X, 23-XI, I)," RB (1978), 543-574; J. Blunt, "Rejected, Ignored, or Misunderstood? The Fate of Paul's Approach to the Problem of Idol Food in Early Christianity", NTS 31 (1985), 113-124; G. Theissen, The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity (Edinburgh, 1982), 121-143, as well as many commentaries; (2) 1 Cor. is a compilation of two or more letters e.g. Schmithals, Corinth, 87-96, 224-229; J. Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief (Göttingen, 1910), xl-xliii; J. Hering, The First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians (London, 1962), xii-xv also those listed in J. C. Hurd, The Origin of I Corinthians (London, 1965), 43-47, 131-142; (3) the attendance at the temple feasts and the problems of the "weak" and "strong" are merely hypothetical in nature. In actual fact Paul is in general agreement with the "strong" but only disagrees with them over why eating food sold in the marketplace is a matter of indifference so Hurd, Ibid., 115-149. In this vein, comp. H. F. von Soden, "Sacrament and Ethics in Paul," in W. Meeks (ed.) The Writings of St. Paul (New York, 1972), 257-268 who sees the tension between the eating of idol meat at home or at the temple as a false one; (4) the circumstances surrounding 1 Cor. 8. 7-13 and 10. 23 - 11. 1 are different in kind. The former refers to eating meat sacrificed to idols at the temple while the latter eating meat bought at the market-place, at home or in the company of friends: so G. F. Fee, "Εἰδωλόθυτα Once Again: An Interpretation of I Corinthians 8-10", Bib 61 (1980), 172-197; "II Corinthians and Food Offered to Idols", NTS 23 (1977), 148-54, and Corinthians, 357-489. See also R. St. John Parry, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (Cambridge, 1926), 125-155, and Lietzmann, Korinth, 37-52, though neither argues the case. Problems relating to 1 Cor. 8-10 have been discussed in the essays edited by L. de Lorenzi entitled Freedom and Love: The Guide for Christian Life (1 Cor. 8-10; Rom. 14-15) (Rome, 1981).

determine what is intended by the word εἰδωλόθυτα in ch. 8 and 10.[36] This is essential, since the contradiction between 8. 7-13 and 10. 23-11. 1 is based on the assumption that in both contexts εἰδωλόθυτα is referring to food offered to idols and later sold in the market-place. This view maintains that Paul is replying to a situation in the Corinthian church whereby differing views were held by the "strong" and "weak" over the question of eating meat sold in the market-place. The "strong" were advocating eating market-place food (8. 7-13), as well as attending cultic meals at pagan temples (8. 10; 10. 14-22).[37] The hope was that the "strong" would build up the "weak" so that they would experience more of their Christian freedom. However, the "weak" resist eating meat offered to idols as a matter of conscience. Paul enjoins the "strong" to consider that their knowledge may cause one of the "weak" to be destroyed (8. 11). He encourages the "weak" to take a broader view. They are to buy and eat, accept invitations as dinner-guests with unbelievers, and they need not enquire whether the food has been sacrificed to an idol (10. 23-29). This interpretation is based on the assumption that in 8. 1-13; 10. 1-11. 1 food offered to idols and sold at the market-place is the issue that Paul is addressing. There are several reasons which suggest that the case may be otherwise.

First, the most specific reference to eating in 8. 7-13 occurs at v. 10 where there is no mention of market-place food but of attendance at the temple. This is in clear contrast to 10. 23-11. 1, where there is no mention of the temple but food bought at the macellum, to

---

[36]. In what follows the debt to Fee will be evident.

[37]. The view that the emphasis of the "strong" may be determined from phrases which Paul includes in his reply at 8. 1, 4, 8 is now commonly held, e.g. Hurd, Origin, 66-98, 105, 110-111; J. Jeremias, "Zur Gedankenführung in den paulinischen Briefen" in J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik (eds.) Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan septuagenarii (Haarlem, 1953), 151-154; W.L. Willis, Idol Meat in Corinth (Chico, 1985), 65.

be eaten at home or at a friend's house.[38] Second, the nature of the material in 8. 1-13 is "argumentative and combative".[39] The repetition of argumentative language supports this: If anyone thinks he knows anything...the weak brother, for whom Christ died, is destroyed by your knowledge..; if anyone sees you, the one who has knowledge...". This form of argument, which we find in 8. 7-13, is consistent with 8. 1-3; 10. 1-22, whose aim is to show the Corinthians that they are wrong and that Paul is right. However this confrontive style is virtually absent from 10. 23-11. 1 (except possibly 10. 29b-30). Rather, the focus of the material is giving advice and showing concern for "the other person". Third, the view we are opposing fails to take into account that 8. 4-6 is related to 10. 14-22 and not 10. 23-29. In both 8. 4f and 10. 19f the issue discussed is whether idols have reality and, if so, in what sense. What these particulars suggest is that food offered to idols and sold in the market-place is not the central issue of 8. 1-13; 10. 1-11. 1, yet it does form the main point of discussion at 10. 23-11. 1.

If so, what is the question under debate at 8. 1-10. 22? The answer to this will emerge by considering the use of the εἰδωλ-word group. Εἰδωλόθυτα occurs four times in ch. 8 (vv. 1, 4, 7, 10) and at 10. 19. The last of these examples is the clearest use of εἰδω λό-θυτα. The reference is to sacrificial food in connection with a pagan temple. This is supported by the general context (vv. 18ff) as well as the rhetorical questions of v. 19. In a context where food is being offered to the deity Paul asks whether the idol or the food has reality in itself. His reply is that a person who eats food sacrificed to idols becomes one with the demon. This statement would make very little sense in a context other than

---

[38]. On the background to the word macellum see H. J. Cadbury, "The Macellum of Corinth", JBL 53 (1934), 134-41, especially the Latin inscription on the macellum found at Corinth.

[39]. Fee, "I Corinthians 8-10", 176, 9.

offering sacrifice to the deity. Therefore, 10. 19 almost certainly refers to the sacrifice of food at a pagan temple.[40]

This view is consistent with 8. 10, where the stronger brother does not become a stumbling-block to the weaker brother by eating food bought in the market-place but by the weaker one "seeing" the stonger one attending the temple meals. The consequence of this is that the weaker one is encouraged to imitate the stronger one.

Within this context 8. 7 is best understood. Several points may be deduced from the text. First, the offended person is a convert from paganism: he is one accustomed to idols. Second, the anxiety over idolatry does not come from an outside source, nor is it related to food contamination which may have been the case if converts had adopted Jewish thinking about market-place food.[41] Rather, the anxiety comes from the fact that the convert is living between two worlds. The one world is that of being accustomed to idols and thinking that they do possess some reality. The other world is that of new converts, where idols no longer retain the associations they once did. Yet to return to the place of worship and partake in meat offered to idols would bring back the memories of eating meat and its association with the deity, as though it had a reality.[42] Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that 10. 19, 8. 7 and 8. 10 support the thesis that the issue at 8. 1-3; 10. 1-22 is meat for sacrifices at a pagan temple, not meat offered to idols subsequently purchased in the market-place.

There are several additional points that strengthen the above argument. The first is Paul's appeal to the OT in 10. 6-10. Both at 10. 7 and 10. 11 reference is made to OT events which serve to warn the Corinthians. 10. 7 adds that the warning is so that the

---

[40]. Fee, "Again", 181-7.

[41]. Fee, Ibid., 183.

[42]. Fee, Corinthians, 379.

Corinthians would not desire evil. The OT examples used are (1) Ex.32, (2) Num. 25. 1-3, (3) Num. 21. 4-7, and (4) Num. 14. 1-38/16. 41. Whether these texts serve only to illustrate Israel's fall (10. 5) or also reflect the Corinthian situation can be determined by noting several details. At 10. 1-5 the central concern is to warn the Corinthians against a kind of false security in Christian baptism and the eucharist. If the Corinthians think that these sacraments would automatically protect them against sin and an unfavourable judgement by God they only need to recall Israel, who had her own form of spirtual baptism and the eucharist, yet did not withstand the judgement of God.

To illustrate the point and to indicate more precisely the evil desire which the Corinthians are to avoid Paul first appeals to Ex. 32. 6b: "And the people sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play." This text is used to support the point that the Corinthians are not to be idolaters (as some of the Israelites were). While there are perhaps several other texts within Ex. 32 that would make the general point about idolatry better, e.g. 32. 6a or 32. 31b, the text Paul uses is made specific to the Corinthian situation. He chooses that part of Exodus 32 which stressed the Israelites' eating in the presence of the golden calf: The meal had cultic associations.

The second example is from Num. 25. 1-3 and is linked to the Ex. 32. 6b. This text ends with the phrase "they rose up to play" (ἀνέστησαν παίζειν). In the Exodus narrative παίζειν occurs in connection with "shouting" (v. 17), "singing" (v. 18) and "dancing" (v. 19) and is thought to have sexual overtones.[43] This is suggested by the description of the people in v. 25 "breaking loose" and by the use of צָחַק which can be understood in a clearly erotic sense (eg. Gen. 26.8). From a later period this view is supported by the rabbi Eliezer b. R. Yose (y. Sotah. 6.6).

---

[43]. Willis, Idol, 148; Conzelmann, Corinthians, 167; W. F. Orr and J. A. Walther, I Corinthians (New York, 1976), 246; Fee, Corinthians, 454-5.

What is implied regarding the sexual overtones of παίζειν at Ex. 32.6b is made explicit at Num. 25. 1-2: "the people began to play the harlot with the daughters of Moab. These invited the people to the sacrifices of their gods, and the people ate, and bowed down to their gods." The significance of this OT example is that sexual immorality occurs in connection with meals offered in the presence of the pagan idol of Baal. This connection between sexual immorality and sacred meals is equally thought to be part of the temple cult in the first century (e.g. Ant. 18. 65-80).[44] If, then, both of the OT texts to which Paul appeals (Ex. 32. 6b; Num. 25. 1-3) have the common element of a sacred meal offered to a deity one must ask why these specific associations of cultic meals in the presence of idols are given if the eating of idol food purchased in the market-place is the main issue of 10. 1-22.[45]

The third OT example contributes to this general point of view. The text that forms the background to Paul's statement "we must not put Christ to the test" is thought to be Num. 21. 4-7, where the Israelites complain to Moses because they have to eat manna rather than ordinary food. While it may appear initially that this OT allusion has little to do with the situation of the Corinthians, several details may suggest the contrary. First there is no mention in the OT passage of a "test". An explanation of this omission may be seen if we note at 10. 21-2 the allusion to Dt. 32. 17, "Are we trying to arouse the Lord's jealousy?" Paul's use of this Deut. text comes in the concluding section of his prohibition

---

[44]. In this passage the lady Paulina "after supper" had night-long sex with Mundas because she thought him to be the god Anubis.

[45]. Willis, Idol, 150, is more cautious about the theory that the correlation between fornication and idolatry reflects the actual situation of the Corinthian Church. However, the problem of immorality has been addressed already several times in earlier chapters (e.g. 1 Cor. 5, 6). The point, is not contested, however, that the relationship between idolatry and immorality in our verses is thoroughly Jewish. See. eg. Rom. 1. 23ff; Wis. 14. 12; Philo, Life of Moses, 1. 302-303 (297-299), where a causal relationship is attested between idol-worship and immoral practices. Comp. Test. Reub. 4. 6 for a converse causal relationship whereby fornication results in idol-worship.

against temple attendance. Therefore, it seems plausible that the use of the "test" (ἐκπειράζω) at 10. 9 has to have a similar meaning. What the Corinthians are not to do is challenge Paul's previous prohibition against cultic meals and thus put Christ to the test.[46] Second, the one who is being put to the test is "Christ" and not the "Lord" (Numb. 21. 6). There is substantial support for this reading of the original text.[47] Thus Paul is binding together the situation of the Israelites and the Corinthians in a Christological way.

The final OT example is the most general of those Paul appeals to. The idea that prompted a final text was probably the motif of grumbling, a recurrent theme in the record of the wilderness wanderings (e.g. Num. 14. 2ff; 16. 11; 17. 10). Regardless of the precise text that is being alluded to, the context would suggest that the grumbling in the wilderness wanderings against Moses has now passed on to Paul due to his prohibition against idolatry and sexual immorality (5. 9-11).[48] These observations regarding the use Paul makes of the OT in 10. 6ff help confirm the claim that the issue of 10. 1-22 is the same as that of 8. 1-13: the prohibition against idolatrous acts associated with eating meals at the temple.

There is a second line of support that further enforces the linguistic arguments given above in connection with εἰδωλόθυτα. It is that cultic meals were a regular part of worship in antiquity.[49] From Serapeum in Alexandria there exist two papyri in which it is stated that guests are invited to dine at a sacred meal with lord Sarapis. An invitation would take the following form: "Chaeremon requests your company at the table of the lord

---

[46]. This text, however, has been understood as a general hortatory admonition: so Willis, Idol, 152.

[47]. On this point see C.D. Osburn, "The Text of I Corinthians 10. 9", in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee (eds.), New Testament Textual Criticism, Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honour of Bruce Metzger (Oxford, 1981), 201-212; Metzger, Commentary, 560.

[48]. Fee, Corinthians, 457.

[49]. See esp. Willis, Idol, 8-64; also Lietzmann, Korinther, 49-51.

Sarapis at the Sarapeum tomorrow, the 15th, at 9 o'clock." [50] There is also a description of a meal in the cult of Asclepius known from Aristides, Or. Sac. 2. 27. The fact that this cult had a prominent temple in Corinth is noteworthy. In Pausanias' description of Corinth, in addition to temples of Apollo and Aphrodite he counts at least another twenty-two temples or shrines (1. 255-72).[51] He also mentions two "sacred precincts" in Corinth that were dedicated to Isis and Sarapis.[52] At these "sacred precincts" the meat offered at the meals was apparently divided three ways: (1) that burned before the deity (in honour of their presence); (2) that given to the worshippers; (3) that dedicated to the deity and placed upon his special table -τραπέζομετα "table of the god".[53] Against this background Paul's reference to "many gods and many lords" (8. 4) and to the "table of demons" (10. 21) would make reasonable sense. This is especially so if Porphyry's description of Sarapis as the chief of the malevolent demons (De Phil. ex orac. haur.) is more than a comment of his own day. In any case, it is this world which was familiar to Paul's Gentile converts, for whom the temple served a social and religious function all their life.[54]

There is a final reason for affirming that the issue throughout 8.1-13; 10. 1-22 is meat offered to idols as part of the Temple cult. It is that this best fits the overall context and

---

[50]. P. Oxy. 1. (2) (2nd AD). There is also another papyrus: P. Oxy. 111. 523 (also 2nd cent.) which states "Antonius, son of Ptolemy, requests your company at the table of the lord Sarapis in the house of Claudius Serapion on the 16th at 9 o'clock."

[51]. While this evidence does come a century after Paul, it may have some relevance. See W. H. S. Jones, Pausanias' Description of Greece (London, 1918).

[52]. On this evidence see C.-H. Kim, "The Papyrus Invitation", JBL (1975), 391-402; G. H. R. Horsley, New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity (North, Ryde, NSW, Australia, 1981), 5-9.

[53]. See the description in D. H. Gill, "TRAPEZOMETA: A Neglected Aspect of Greek Sacrifice", HTR 67 (1974), 117-137, and on the general theme W. Burkert, Greek Religion (Oxford, 1985), 55-118, esp. 64-66; 84-92; 107; also Homo Necans (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1983), esp. 1-82.

[54]. See Horsley, Document, 8, on the religious character of the meals. Comp. Willis, Idol, 17-64 who seems to favour a social aspect.

situation of the Corinthian letter. The context is one in which Paul is re-addressing an issue on which he had already offered advice either through an envoy or in a former letter.[55] In this dispute there were areas where both parties agreed -- specifically, that idols were unreal and that food does not commend one to God. The dispute resulted because each party applied these facts in different ways. For those with "knowledge" and with a strong conscience idols are not living entities and had no power. However, there is another way that idols can be viewed: while in theory they may be dead they can still be perceived as gods with powers. For those who perceive idols as dead, meat can be eaten in the pagan temple without harm. On the other hand, for those with weak consciences either eating or "seeing" their brethren eat could cause them to stumble (8. 9-10). Therefore, while Paul may agree with the contentions of the strong he applies their understanding of idols and food in a way that amounts to a prohibition against eating meat in a pagan temple (8. 13). Thus, the issue confronting Paul is not only why we should not eat meat offered to idols but more importantly, why should we not do so in the company of unbelieving friends at the temple of a pagan god? It is to this issue that Paul offers a sustained reply in 8.1-13; 10.1-22.[56]

Within this context the argument in 8. 1-13 fits logically with 10. 1-22. After Israel is used as a historical example (10. 1-13) Paul exhorts the Corinthians to flee idolatry. First, it is because a sacred meal involves participation with the deity, and second, idolatry is the locus of the demonic.[57] In view of this we conclude that εἰδωλόθυτα can only refer to the eating of meat at the pagan temple.

---

[55]. Fee, "Food", 151.

[56]. See Fee, Corinthians, passim for a detailed analysis of this point.

[57]. The Jewishness of the argument is evident in his appeal to the common Jewish idea of idolatry being the locus of the demonic: (Is. 65. 11; Dt. 32. 17; Bar. 4. 11; 1 En. 19. 1; 99. 7; Jub. 1. 11; 22. 17; Pss. 96. 6; 106. 37; Rev. 9. 20; Ps. Philo, Bib. Ant. 25).

If the argument for 8.1-13; 10.1-22 refers to meat offered to idols eaten at the pagan temple what is the intention of 10. 23-11. 1? One plausible suggestion is that it serves as an addendum to the more specific problem of eating meat offered to idols at temples.[58] The issue addressed in this section is eating food from the market-place, at home or at the home of friends.[59] In both situations a person is free to eat meat from the marketplace so long as it does not offend another person.

We therefore maintain that a cogent case can be made for the distinction that we have supported: there is a difference in context and situation. For the person who is tempted to eat in the temple Paul insists that this practice be avoided for the sake of the weaker brother. On the other hand, it is entirely permissible to eat market-place food in a non cultic context, i.e. at home or at a friend's; one must only consider the concerns of others. The reason for this distinction is perhaps that eating at home or with a friend does not constitute a cultic meal and does not have the connotations of participating in the veneration of the deity.

From the above discussion we have shown what Paul's view was and how he applied this to the situation of the Corinthians. We must now consider whether his views were compatible with Jewish ideals. One of the distinguishing differences between Jews and Gentiles was the former's decisive rejection of idolatry. Indeed, it may be said that if a Gentile renounced idolatry and accompanied this with observance of the Sabbath, and kept the laws of purity, he was well on the way to conversion (cf. b. Megill. 13a).[60] Furthermore,

---

[58]. Fee, "Food", 149.

[59]. The view is held by Lietzmann, Korinther, 51; Barrett, Corinthians, 241; Willis, Idol, 239, 257-258; A. Robertson and A. Plummer, First Epistle of St Paul of the Corinthians (Edinburgh, 1911), 219; M. Thrall, "The Pauline Use of συνείδησις," NTS 14 (1967-8), 122; H. D. Wendland, Ethik des Neuen Testament (Göttingen, 1970), 83.

[60]. b. Megill. 13a states that the one who renounces idolatry is called in Scripture a Jew. Cf. Moore, Judaism, Vol. 1, 325.

the Jewish evidence is consistent in its rejection of showing honour and allegiance to any other deity (in whatever form this may take) except the one true God. This injunction goes back to the ten commandments: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me and make no graven images nor bow down to them" (Ex. 20. 3-5; Dt. 5. 7-9). This sentiment continues in the prophets (e.g. Is. 45. 5; 43. 10-15; 44. 14; 46. 9) and the abhorrence of worshipping pagan idols is enforced by the satirical manner of expression (e.g. Is. 40. 18-20; 41. 6f; 45. 20; 46. 1f., 5-7; 44. 9-20; Jer. 10. 1-16). However, according to the Wisdom of Solomon idolatry reached the depths of degradation in Egyptian theriolatry (Wis. 15. 18f.; 11. 15; 12. 24 also Arist., 138; Sib. Or. 3. 29-31; Ap. 1. 254-59; Philo, Decalog. 78). Finally, the seriousness of עבודה זרה is seen in the rabbis, where the person who transgresses the commandment against heathenism "throws off the yoke", nullifies the covenant and "comports himself brazenly toward the Law" (cf. Sifre Dt. 54). On the other hand, he who rejects all other religion professes the whole Law (b. Horiayot 8a). The fact that the rabbis forbid any dealings with Gentiles during the time of their festivals, three days before and three days after (m. Abod. Zar. 1. 1ff), is another indication of the rabbinic attitude toward idolatrous worship. It is thus undeniable that the Jewish attitude towards idolatry is a wholesale abhorrence of worshipping other deities.

Let us now summarize the argument with regard to 1 Cor 8-10. First, we argued that 8. 1-13 and 10. 1-22 address the issue of eating meat as part of the Temple cult. This activity Paul forbids Gentile Christians to engage in. Second, the prohibition against such idolatrous acts is consistent with the common Jewish view. In spite of Paul conceding the point that idols possess a certain form of reality, his fundamental outlook stems from his Jewish heritage and Judaism's exclusive outlook when considering her relationship to other religions.[61] In this vein, it is noteworthy that in 10. 15-22 the idea that those who

---

[61]. Willis, Idol, 213, 221; comp. Barrett, "Idols", 50f, and Corinthians, 240.

participate in pagan meals become partners with the demon forms a central feature of these verses. It is also (for the present point) important that this idea is well documented within the Jewish evidence. Third, this leads us to suggest that it is Paul's intention for his predominantly Gentile converts to take on a Jewish outlook regarding the "worship of idols". This is especially the case regarding eating idol meat at pagan temples.

However, there is a departure Paul makes from the common Jewish view to which we need to give attention. This becomes evident if as we have suggested 10. 23 - 11. 1 serves as an addendum to the main discussion of 8. 1ff and concerns eating meat purchased at the market-place in the context of private entertaining. The eating of meat in this context Paul does not prohibit. What he recommends is that the concerns of others be given consideration. However, the fact that Paul permits Gentile food to be eaten at home shows that he has distanced himself from the common Jewish view even if he has not violated biblical law (on the biblical injunction against eating swine see e.g. Dt. 14. 8; Lev. 11. 1. comp. 1 Macc. 1. 47; Ant. 13. 243).

Several examples will suffice to illustrate that for Jews to eat Gentile food was not the common view. 1 Macc. 1.62f, for example, states that many in Israel stood firm and did not eat unclean food in spite of the king ordering all the people of his kindgom to give up their own customs. One consequence of not submitting to the king's orders was death, which many in Israel were willing to accept rather than be defiled by Gentile food. A second example that may be cited is from the Book of Judith (12. 2). Before embarking on a mission to see Holoferness, the general of the Assyrian army, in order to save her people Judith had her maid pack the following items: a bottle of wine, oil, grain, dried fruit, and fine bread. This was to ensure that she would not be defiled at mealtime by eating foreign food. Therefore, when Holoferness invited Judith to dine she accepted but did not eat his food or drink his wine. Rather, she ate and drank what her maid had prepared (12. 19).

There are two additional texts which attest to the abhorrence of eating swine or pork. In Ap. (1. 137) it states that Jews were denounced because they did not eat pork. Similarly 2 Macc. 6. 18 indicates that Eleazar, one of the principal scribes, refused to eat swine's flesh in exchange for escaping death. The point that we have noted from these examples may equally be attested from other witnesses: Josephus, Philo, Mishnah, OT as well as other material from the Apoc.(Ant. 14. 226-7; 12. 120; War 2. 152-3; 2. 591; Life, 74; Embassy to Gaius, 361; m. Abod. Zar. 2. 3, 5. 5; Dan. 1. 8-16; Tob. 1.10-11; 7. 1-2; 3 Macc. 3. 4, 7. Comp. Jos. and As. 7. 1).[62] This evidence indicates that (most) Jews refused to eat Gentile food, such as pork and oil as well as drink foreign wine. What is to be noted from these examples is that while Paul has distanced himself from most Jews by permitting Gentile food to be eaten this was not a violation of biblical law. Since eating pork was not specified as what was eaten at dinner parties at 1 Cor. 10.23ff this point is strengthened.

In addition, it is suggested that when Paul at 1 Cor. 10. 23ff permits the eating of Gentile food it is done as a direct consequence of his Christology (1 Cor. 10. 1-14) and his view that idols did not have any real existence. It follows from this that Paul made a distinction between what took place in the home and at the pagan temple regarding the eating of Gentile food (meat). Eating meat that was sacrificed as a part of the pagan Cultus was not permitted while meat bought in the market-place and served at home was permitted. However, this distinction was not common among Jews: in this way Paul departed from Judaism. Notwithstanding this exception, Paul still expected his Gentile converts to take on a Jewish attitude towards idol-worhship and the eating of meat in connection with the Temple Cultus. What we argued for regarding sexual ethics in 1 Thess.

---

[62]. See on this point Sanders, "Jewish Association", MS 9-13; Dunn, "Antioch", 12-13, 17-18. On the evidence of pagan authors who testify to Jewish indiffference to Gentile food M. Whittaker, Jews and Christians: Graeco-Roman Views (Cambridge, 1984), 73-80; Stern, Authors, Vol. 1 and 2, passim, may be consulted.

4 may thus also be affirmed in 1 Cor. 8. 1-13 - 10. 1-22 where the worship of idol is the issue. On both counts Gentile Christians are to practise Jewish ethics.

CHAPTER 7

A DIALOGUE ON THE JEWISH RELIGION

We have now considered a variety of evidence in our search for common denominators within Judaism. The data not included so far are material where a direct opposition to "Judaism" is expressed. To correct this omission we shall now consider Romans 2. 1-29[1] where we find perhaps the most extensive and direct critique of Jews and Judaism in the letters of Paul.[2] There is general agreement that this passage forms the central section of Paul's demonstration that all mankind is guilty under God's judgement, and therefore in need of salvation in Jesus Christ (1. 18-3. 20).[3]

In this section the universality of sin is stressed, as is entry into righteousness by faith on the same basis for Jew and Gentile. This theme of equality for Jew and Gentile extends to God's way of judgement, because he is an impartial judge (2. 11). In spite of these agreements, interpretative difficulties do emerge within Rom. 1. 18-3. 20, including the

---

[1]. There is a second passage (1 Thess. 2. 13-16) in the undisputed letters of Paul where the Jews are severely criticized. However, since the material in this passage does not assist in determining what Jews shared in common we shall not discuss it. The problems and possible solutions are discussed in the following literature: B. A. Pearson, "1 Thessalonians 2. 13-16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation", HTR 64 (1971), 79-94; G. E. Okeke, "1 Thess. 2. 13-16: The Fate of the Unbelieving Jews", NTS 27 (1980/1), 127-136; J. Coppens "Miscellances bibliques LXXX. Une diatribe antijuive dans 1 Thess. 2. 13-16", ETL 51 (1975), 171-182; O. Michel, "Fragen zu 1 Thessalonicher 2. 14-16. Antijüdische Polemik bei Paulus", in W. Eckert, N.P. Levinson, M.Stöhr (eds.), Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge, (Münich, 1967), 50-59; D. Schmidt, "1 Thess. 2. 13-16. Linguistic Evidence for an Interpolation", JBL 102 (1983), 269-279; R. F. Collins, Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians (Leuven, 1984), 101-105; R. W. Crown, "The Nonliteral Use of Eschatological Language in Jewish Apocalyptic and the New Testament", (diss. Oxford, 1986), 252-280; K.P. Donfried, "Paul and Judaism: 1 Thess. 2. 13-16 as a Test Case", Int 38 (1984), 242-253.

[2]. On our theme see the essay by F. Mussner, "Paul and Israel", Tractate on the Jews (Philadelphia and London, 1984), 133-153, and the bibliography listed on 286 n. 1.

[3]. Cambier, "Jugement", 187-188.

central section. Its difficulties have long been pointed out[4] and have received new attention. If Rom. 2 is to be of assistance in understanding Paul's critique of his fellow Jews and what common features were present within first century Judaism, these difficulties require attention.

One recent contributor to the discussion is H. Räisänen. It is Räisänen's view, for example, that Rom. 2 is "a piece of propagandist denigration."[5] He arrives at this conclusion for two fundamental reasons. First, from a historical viewpoint the general picture given in the chapter is not accurate, just, or a complete portrayal of contemporary Judaism. In Rom. 2 he contends that Paul is characterizing Judaism as a whole -- including every individual Jew. Even if one appeals to rabbinic laments of moral deprivation (e.g. m. Sotah 14. 1ff) to suggest that Paul has a Jewish warrant for what he says, this is inadequate because no one would claim that the gross sins of the heathen (1. 18ff) were also typical of the Jews of the time.

Second, Räisänen claims that the Gentiles were used, not because of a genuine interest in them but as a means to an end. The main end was to prove Jewish guilt.[6] More importantly for Räisänen's judgement of Rom. 2 is that Gentiles are capable of fulfilling the Torah (2. 14f, 2. 26f).[7] Paul uses the Gentiles' fulfilment of the Law not because he is interested in them, but because he is reflecting on the situation of the Jews.

---

4. J.C. O'Neill, Paul's Letter to the Romans (Baltimore, 1975), 48; G. Börnkamm, "Gesetz und Natur (Rom. 2,14-16)", Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum (Münich, 1959), 101ff; Käsemann, Romans, 73; Schlier, "Römerbrief", 38-47; Sanders, Law, 123-135; K.R. Snodgrass, "Justification by Grace - to the Doers: An Analysis of the Place of Romans 2 in the Theology of Paul", NTS 32 (1986), 72-93.

5. Räisänen, Paul, 101. For a view similar to Räisänen see Sanders, Ibid. and Watson, Paul, 112ff, who maintains that Rom. 2 is a "denunication of the Jewish view of the covenant."

6. Ibid., 100

7. Ibid., 101f, 106.

Furthermore, to suggest that Gentiles can fulfil the Law contradicts Paul's main thesis of 1. 18-3. 20 -- that all are under sin. Therefore, Räisänen concludes that "there is something strained and artificial in Paul's theory that nobody can fulfil (or has fulfilled) the law."[8]

If Räisänen's analysis is conclusive several consequences follow. First, Paul must be charged with an inability to construct a consistent argument or present an accurate portrayal of contemporary Jews. Second, because of the peculiar view of the Law, as in Rom. 2 Paul is out of accord with his otherwise diverse view of the Law found in his letters.[9] For these reasons there is justification for further analysis of Rom. 2.1-29.[10] It will be our aim to determine whether within Paul's critique of the Jewish religion there are common elements of Judaism. A suitable point of departure is to observe that the concerns of Rom. 2 may correctly be seen as an "inner Jewish debate."[11] There is good reason to see it in this way because of the general Jewish context of the early chapters of Romans.

One of the striking features throughout chapters 1-4 (and also 9-11, in distinction from chapters 5-8) is the sparseness of explicit Christian language and content.[12] Conversely, what is emphasized is "God language." The important place which statements about God have in Romans is clear from the frequency with which language about God

---

[8]. Ibid., 107.

[9]. This point is made by Sanders, Law, 123.

[10]. A further study on Romans 2 is that of Bassler, Impartiality. As will be shown, we are in general agreement with her contention that the impartiality of God controls the argument of Romans 2.

[11]. Sanders, Law, 128; similarly, Dunn, Romans, Vol. 1, 108, sees Rom. 2 as an "in house" critique of the Jewish view that being the people of God puts one in a uniquely privileged position in relation to the rest of mankind. However, the claim of Watson, Gentiles, 113ff, that Paul in Rom. 2 is answering Roman Jewish Christian critics is to be contested. See also Davies' helpful remarks on disputes among Jews in "People", 135-136.

[12]. Scroggs, "Rhetorician", 277. Also see Beker, Paul, 74ff. Several examples of Christian language are Rom. 2. 16; 3. 23-6; 9. 32; 10. 4.

occurs.[13] Moreover, one such context where we find statements about God is when Paul is in discussion (debate) with Christians or Jews over a correct concept of the "Jewish" God.[14] Two examples are present in Rom. 2: God will render to each according to his works (v. 6); his judgement is without partiality (v. 11).[15] Therefore, a basis exists to conceive of the chapter as an inner Jewish debate.[16]

In addition to the Jewish context, the structure and subject-matter of ch. 2 also support our case. The literary style of dialogue (diatribe), whereby "questions or objections are put into the mouth of an imagined critic"[17] in order to argue a case, has been long recognized as relevant to an understanding of Rom. 2.1ff.

In order to set chapter 2 of Romans in its most immediate context, we must go back to 1. 16ff. There Paul affirms that he is not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ because in it the righteousness of God is revealed. Through the Gospel one is able to believe in the righteousness of God because it is God's universal salvation. And Paul is not ashamed to preach universal salvation because it is universally needed. God's wrath is revealed against all ungodliness. In Paul's proof of this universal need for salvation he employs a strategy familiar to Amos -- he starts with Israel's enemies, the Gentiles. Just when Paul has his

---

[13]. For details and statistics see Moxnes, Theology, 15ff. The importance of God in Romans can also be observed from the title of A. Schlatter's commentary on Romans--- Gottes Gerechtigkeit.

[14]. Moxnes, Ibid., 53.

[15]. See also 3. 1-8, 27-31, 9. 6-18.

[16]. The fact that Romans 2 has been read as a synagogue sermon would also lend weight to our point. However, since we do not possess any diaspora synagogue sermons to which Romans 2 may be compared we resist appealing to this possibility.

[17]. Bruce, Romans, 86; also, Michel, Römer, 63; Kuss, Römerbrief, Vol. 1, 60; Dodd, Romans, 30; Moxnes, Conflict, 34; Stowers, Romans, 93ff; Zeller, Juden, 199; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 1., 122 n. 268; Bultmann, Diatribe, passim; Dunn, Romans, Vol. 1, 78.

Jewish readers applauding him for his critique of the Gentiles, he turns to a category of person that he refers to as the πᾶς ὁ κρίνων (2. 1).

It is clear at v.17 that Paul has the Jew in mind since he designates him as such Ἰουδαῖος: however, this word does not occur at v. 1. Various scholars think that Jews[18] are intended from v. 1, but some believe that the general nature of the description is an indication that both Jews and Gentiles are being referred to.[19] At vv. 9ff reference is made to both Jews and Gentiles and at v. 14 Gentiles are mentioned as those who do not have the Law. And if Bassler is correct that between 1. 16-2. 10 there exists a "logical thought unit", which focuses on Jew and Gentiles, this would add further force to this view.[20]

It seems more probable, however, to understand this general designation not as a reference to the Jew nor to the Jew and Gentile as such, but as a reference to anyone who judges another and condemns him on the basis of performance, to whom henceforth we shall refer as the "critic".[21] Yet if the structure and content of the argument of Rom. 2 are considered, the argument itself requires that he who sits in judgement over others is the "Jew".

Paul puts in the mouth of the "critic" four objections to argue the overall view that the whole world is equally sinful and in need of the same Gospel of redemption. It is significant that not only are the objections typically Jewish but so likewise are the answers.

---

[18]. Käsemann, Romans, 53f; Moxnes, Conflict, 35; Black, Romans, 54; Bruce, Romans, 87; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 54; Kuss, Ibid., 60f; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 1, 137-9; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 1, 121; Lagrange, Romains, 42f; Watson, Gentiles, 109ff; Dunn, Romans, Vol. 1, 79. Comp. Gaston, Torah, 119-120. Michel's view (Römer, 64) however that the "rabbi" is intended is unwarranted.

[19]. Barrett, Romans, 43; F.J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans (London, 1962), 74; Bassler, "Letter", 46f; Schlatter, Gottes, 74-75; H. W. Bartsch, "Die historische Situation des Römerbriefs" in F. L. Cross (ed.), Studia Evangelica IV (TU 102, 1968), 286.

[20]. Bassler, Ibid., cf. M. Pohlenz, "Paulus und die Stoa", ZNW 42 (1949), 73-74.

[21]. For further discussion see F. Flückiger, "Zur Unterscheidung von Heiden und Juden in Rom. 1, 18-23" TZ 10 (1954), 154-158; Zeller, Juden, 149 n. 36.

Whether this was a real encounter or not makes little difference;[22] it is used by Paul in his argumentto prove his case. Since it is our concern to uncover the Jewish presuppositions present in the chapter, its historicity is not of the essence. What is important is that the material may be used to indicate what Paul and the "critic" shared in common with the Jewish tradition and where they departed from it, or how they applied the tradition in a new way. Within this context the appeal made to the OT and Jewish tradition shows that each of these objections are ones that Jews could have raised. But similarly, Paul's reply to these objections can be illustrated from the OT and Jewish sources. Therefore, what we find in this chapter is a series of Jewish attitudes all related to God's judgement and salvation of the Jew and dictated by the "axiom" that God's judgement is impartial (2. 11).[23] These attitudes are set in the form of objection by the "critic" and response by Paul, yet seen from different perspectives. In his argument Paul utilizes one strand of Jewish answer while the "critic" quite another.

It is in this context that we shall now address the nature of Paul's critique of Judaism; and the common ground shared between Paul and the "critic". The case we shall put forward stated negatively, is that there is no indication that Paul's difficulty with the Jews was legalism. Neither did he critize them for not believing in the Jewish covenant or election by grace. Furthermore, it does not appear that Paul's indictment of the Jew was simply that he was a transgressor of the Law or that he did not obey the Law well enough.

---

[22]. N. Schneider, Die rhetorische Eigenart der paulinishen Antithese (Tübingen, 1970), 68-69; Moxnes, Conflict, 34.

[23]. Bassler, Divine Impartiality, 121ff; also "Impartiality in Paul's Letter", 43ff; Dahl, Studies, 80. The importance of divine impartiality for an understanding of the early chapters of Romans has been noted also by F. C. Synge, "The Meaning of προεχόμεθα in Romans 3.9" ExpT 81 (1970), 351, and P. W. Meyer, "Romans 10. 4 and the 'End' of the Law", in J. L. Crenshaw and S. Sandmel, The Divine Helmsman: Studies on God's Control of Human Events (New York, (1980), 70-71 also Dunn, Romans, Vol. 1, 78, 89.

Finally, there is no direct suggestion of a christological reason for Paul's critique (as e.g. at Rom. 9.30-2).

Positively, Paul's criticism is that the Jews' practice is inconsistent with central beliefs and convictions of the Jewish religion. The view adopted by the "critic" is that, because he is a Jew, one of God's chosen, he should be treated preferentially, placed in a different class from the Gentile.[24] To do so, however, violates central tenets of the Jewish religion that Paul elucidates in Romans 2, showing that the Jew is under God's wrath and in need of salvation.

Paul utilizes the critic's four objections -- moral superiority (1-11),[25] possession of Torah (12-16), Jewish national privilege (17-24), and circumcision (25-9) -- to argue his case. In addressing the Gentile in 1. 18ff Paul indicates that he is without excuse because he has sinned against the knowledge of God derived from the creation (1. 20). In 2. 1ff he claims that the Jew is equally without excuse. Paul states his charge against the "critic" in v. 1 -- the one who passes judgement on others passes sentence on himself. To this the "critic" can offer little defence, since in v. 2 a generally acknowledged principle[26] of God's manner of judgement is brought to the "critic's" attention -- God's judgement is without προσωπολημψία. God judges justly in accordance with facts because of his impartial character.[27] This is the basis of Paul's critique, though we must wait until v. 11 for this point to be made

---

[24]. This is emphasized by Watson, Gentiles, 110ff, who maintains that the two components of privileged status which distinguishe Jews from Gentiles are the law and circumcision.

[25]. Contra Watson, Gentiles, 111, who maintains that the focus of vv. 1-11 is false reliance on the covenant.

[26]. The inclusion of the word οἴδαμεν in the verse indicates that what follows is a generally accepted statement on the part of writer and recipients so: Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 1, 143; Moxnes, Conflict, 35; Dunn, Romans, Vol. 1, 80.

[27]. According to Ljetzmann, Romer, 39, κατὰ ἀλήθειαν has as its counterpart προσωπολημψία

explicitly. Therefore, taking vv. 1 and 2 together, it appears that the "critic" expected to be judged one way while all others would be judged on a different basis. His basis for claiming such treatment was that since God chose Israel and demonstrated his mercy to her she should be treated specially. Such criteria for judgement commit the "critic" to the principle that judgement is determined by ancestry and performance. This is the burden of the critic's plea.

This line of argument is carried forward by employing several rhetorical questions which take the form of accusations (vv. 3-4).[28] Verse 3, "Do you suppose, O man, that when you judge those who do such things and yet do them yourself you will escape the judgement of God?" Similarly, at v. 4 "Do you presume upon the riches of his kindness and forbearance and patience? Do you not know that God's kindness is meant to lead you to repentance?" What God intended to lead to Israel's repentance she took to mean privilege in judgement.[29] In claiming such privilege, the Jew has been accumulating for himself God's wrath on the day of wrath (v. 5).

The Jewish sources amply substantiate the fact that the Jew thought of himself as special in relation to the Gentile. For example, in the Book of Wisdom there are striking parallels to the ideas of Romans, "For when they were tried, though they were being disciplined in mercy, they learnt how the ungodly were tormented when judged in wrath. For thou didst test them as a father does in warning, but thou didst examine the ungodly as a stern king does in condemnation" (11. 9ff, cf. 12. 22).

However, preferential treatment of the Jew was not a universally held belief, as the prophet Amos indicates, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore,

---

[28]. Comp. Moxnes, Conflict, 36 who maintains that vv. 3-5 form part of an accusation-sentence structure e.g. vv. 3a, 3a, 5a = accusation; vv. 3b, 4b 5b-6 = sentence. See also Weiss, "Rhetorik", 216f.

[29]. Barrett, Romans, 45.

I will punish you for all your iniquities" (3. 2). When Paul goes on in these verses to state his positive case against Jewish moral superiority, he does so by appealing to traditional statements about God, beliefs that are well established in the OT and other Jewish literature. Both of the traditional statements about God are conclusions to the two sections of vv. 1-11 -- v.6 concludes vv. 1-5, while v. 11 concludes vv. 7-10.[30] Paul's conclusion for the critic, v. 6, is that God is one who renders to each according to his works (Ps. 62. 12); privilege and special claim on God are incompatible with his character.[31]

In v. 11 (which functions as the parallel to v. 6) Paul concludes there is no προσωπολημψία with God (Dt. 10. 18 comp. 2 Chron. 19. 7; Jub. 5. 16; Sir. 35. 15; Pss. Sol. 2. 18; m. Abot. 4. 22). In vv. 7-8 Paul says that God gives eternal life to those who do good and wrath to those who follow the path of unrighteousness. When these ideas appear at vv. 9 and 10 the addition is made "for the Jew first and also the Greek".[32] This would have made the point that God is not partial in his judgement, but Paul adds his traditional statement of belief in God to draw out the point.

---

[30]. Käsemann, Romans, 59; Moxnes, Conflict, 36; similarly Michel, Römer, 66.

[31]. The reference to "works" must be seen in the argument as a whole. While the idea of accountability based on works has presented difficulties to theologians and exegetes alike, because of Paul's belief in justification by faith he does not seem to pay much attention to such a problem. For him v. 6 serves to enforce the point that God judges impartially. He will do so at the last judgement when he renders to each (Jew and Gentile) according to good deeds done. Paul's focus seems to be as narrow as this. So Bruce, Romans, 89; Dahl, Paul, 80; Moxnes, Conflict, 37; Lagrange, Romains, 45. See also discussions in Barrett, Romans, 46-48; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 1, 151ff; Käsemann, Romans, 57ff; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 1, 127-131; Snodgrass, "Doers", 72ff; Dunn, Romans, Vol. 1, 86. Comp. 1 Cor. 3.13-15, 4.4.

[32]. The chiastic structure of these verses is noted by J. Jeremias, "Chiasmus in den Paulusbriefen", ZNW 49 (1958), 149; K. Grobel, "A Chiastic Retribution-Formula in Romans 2", in E. Dinkler (ed.), Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an R. Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstage (Tübingen, 1964), 255-261 also Kuss, Römer, Vol. 1, 65; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 1, 126; Käsemann, Romans, 59; Cambier, "Jugement", 195.

What we have, therefore, are two incompatible Jewish answers offered to the question of the Jew's need for salvation (as seen in relation to the Gentile). The critic's claim is that since the Jews are God's chosen people, God must deal with them mercifully by treating them as his privileged ones in a way that exceeds Jewish historical priority, one aspect of their privileges which is rightfully theirs. Paul's charge against the critic is that he has missed seeing the internal contradiction of talking about God's mercy in a way that sets it above his justice and therefore impugns his righteousness and accuses him of partiality.

From these observations the question emerges as to what kind of Judaism could believe in Jewish privilege and God's impartiality simultaneously. The answer to this is that it was a religion whose practice was out of accord with its deepest convictions. It is a type of Judaism which adopts an attitude of superiority to the Gentiles because of superiority of performance. Therefore, we have evidence that the attitude of the Judaism reflected by the "critic" concerns a salvation which maintains that performance and descent play a fundamental role in the judgement of God. If one central tenet of the Jewish religion is that God judges justly without favouritism, the "critic" has not been true to this premiss of his religion and it is this which leads Paul to his critique. We have thus seen that Paul and the "critic" agree on the importance of God acting justly and in accord with historical priority. However, they disagree on how this premiss is applied. The result is that ancestry and superiority of performance play a fundamental role in the "critic's" view.

Let us move onto the second objection, one that centred on the Torah (vv. 12-16). The "critic" claims that since the Jew is the possessor of God's special revelation and all the privileges that go with it, he cannot be classed and judged alongside the Gentiles.[33] This section makes clear that Paul, however, draws upon a different strand of Jewish material.

---

[33]. Käsemann, Romans, 61f; Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 1, 131; Denny, Romans, 597; Barrett, Romans, 49; Dunn, Romans, Vol. 1, 95.

He amplifies the idea that God shows no partiality (v. 11), taking into consideration the different situations in which the Jew and Gentile have been placed with respect to their knowledge of the Torah. The general principle is stated in v.12 -- those who have sinned without the Law of Moses will perish without the Law. Alternatively, all who have sinned under this Law will be judged by this Law.

This statement of the Jew is carried forward (v. 13) by offering the criteria by which the Jew will be judged -- in accordance with whether he is both a hearer of the Law (presumably as it was presented to him in the synagogue) and a doer of it. In this verse Paul makes the main point of the section -- knowledge of the Law alone will not protect the Jew from the judgement of God: he must obey it.[34] This, no doubt, is an assumption of OT religion (Ex. 24. 7) and the aim of the words of the Shema שמע ישראל (Dt. 6. 4ff). Furthermore, it is a point that would not have been contested in Judaism. This idea of obedience accompanying possession of the Law by no means originated with Paul. The point is illustrated well in the prologue to Ecclesiasticus "those who love learning should make even greater progress in living according to the Law." Or similarly, the words ascribed to Rabban Simeon, the Son of Rabban Gamaliel I (Paul's own teacher, according to Acts 22. 3) in m. Abot. 1. 17 can be cited: "not the expounding of the Law is the chief thing but the doing of it; and he that multiplies words occasions sins." (cf. Wis. 6.18f; Ant. 20. 44; 1 Macc. 2. 67; Praem. 152).

It is vv.14-16 that the real difficulties of this paragraph emerge. This is evident from vv. 14-15, which imply that Gentiles have the ability to keep the Law, something not even attributed to the Jew. One way of resolving this problem has been to propose that Paul by

---

[34]. Similarly Bassler, Divine Impartiality, 141: "Verse 13 established performance, not possession, as the decisive factor, and Paul here claims that Gentiles as well as Jews meet this criterion."

is not referring to Gentiles qua Gentiles but Gentile Christians.[35] If, however, the rhetorical nature and the limited scope of Paul's concern are kept in clear focus his argument does not require us to attribute the "fulfilment of the Law" to Gentile Christians or Gentiles qua Gentiles.[36]

It is Paul's view that obedience to the Law is the criterion that proves whether or not possession of the Torah rightfully classes Jews differently from Gentiles at the judgement of God. On this basis the thrust of the argument is as follows. The Gentile is not in a different class because he has an analogous or corresponding law to that of the Jew. Gentiles[37] who by virtue of birth do not have the Law of Moses do what the Law requires (τὰ τοῦ νομοῦ ποιῶσιν),[38] and thus are a law unto themselves. What the Gentile possesses is an analogue to the Law of Moses. It is not that the Gentiles have and fulfil the Torah as such,[39] but they have a law corresponding to the Torah and so experience the transcendent divine will of God.[40] They have in their natural endowment and conscience (cf. Rom. 1.19-20) enough moral guidance to enable them to do the sort of thing the Law

---

[35]. e.g. Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 1, 155-156; F. Flückiger, "Die Werke des Gesetzes bei den Heiden", TZ 8 (1952), 17-42; A. Konig, "Gentiles or Gentile Christians? On the meaning of Rom. 2: 12-16", Journal of Theology for South Africa 15 (1976), 53-60; K. Barth, A Shorter Commentary on Romans (London, 1959), 36. This view was also at one time held by Augustine: so Kuss, Römer, Vol. 1, 70. For a survey of the debate see F. Kuhn, "Römer 2. 14f und die Verheissung bei Jeremia 31. 31ff", ZNW 55 (1964), 243-261.

[36]. Other solutions to this problem are presented in Räisänen, Paul, 103-105.

[37]. The omission of the article before ἔθνη may imply that not all Gentiles are intended.

[38]. This phrase is synonymous with τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νομοῦ at v. 15: so Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 1, 134 n. 315; Cambier, "Jugement", 201.

[39]. Kuss, Römer, Vol. 1, 69.

[40]. Käsemann, Romans, 63f; Bassler, Divine Impartiality, 146.

requires.[41] For Paul to make his case what is required is that the Gentiles do the law. He argues this by creating an analogue to Torah (i.e., conscience) which assists in moral guidance (comp. Praem. 206).[42] What is not required is that Gentiles do the Law's requirements with complete consistency. This is evident from the fact that sometimes they are assured that what they have done is right; other times accused because they have done wrong (v. 15). Regardless, the Gentile has demonstrably operative within him a moral guide analogous to the Jew's Torah, and thus his (the Gentile's) conduct is regulated by a transcendent law. Therefore, the "critic's" claim that the Jew, unlike the Gentile, has the Law and therefore has a safeguard at the time of judgement loses its impact. What matters is obedience, and the Gentile has a law corresponding to the Torah which he can obey. Though the Law can be claimed as a privilege which exempts one from the general indictment, it is such only for those who obey it. And it is this that Paul claims the critic has not done.[43] Regardless, we see here another characteristic of the religion of the "critic". Those who had been given the Law were expected to obey it.

The next objection is found in vv. 17-24: "We cannot be judged on the same standard as the Gentile", claims the "critic", "We are Jews with all their privileges." This section begins with an explication of some of the privileges. In vv. 17-20, depicted by Bornkamm

---

[41]. Dodd, Romans, 35; Cambier, "Jugement", 204; Mussner, Tractate, 142, 288 n. 24. This seems to be the thrust of Paul's reasoning in vv. 12ff, and not that the Jews put too much emphasis on grace and therefore have become oblivious of the fact that the law needs to be obeyed in practice so Watson, Gentiles, 113.

[42]. Similarly Wilckens, Römer, Vol. 1, 135.

[43]. If one understands Romans 2 as a dialogue of Jewish attitudes set in relation to the judgement of God a problem arises when we come to v. 16. Here we find the only explicit reference to Christian language. However, it may be correct that the language offers a liturgical end to the paragraph, Käsemann, Romans, 68. See Snodgrass, "Doers", 73-74, on how this problem has been treated.

as an example of Pauline anacoluthon,[44] the influence of diatribe is obvious. "The discrepancy between claim and performance could hardly be more impressively emphasized."[45] While irony pervades the whole of vv. 17-24,[46] Paul's main intention at vv. 17-20 is not ironic but to take up claims of his fellow Jews as represented by the "critic". Paul takes up such claims as the Jew's reliance on the Law, his pride in God, his knowledge of God's will because of being instructed in the Torah.[47]

Having accumulated such an impressive list of the Jew' privileges, in vv. 21ff Paul moves on to allegations against the Jew. In these allegations Paul has one thing primarily in mind. It is not to show that every Jew steals, or commits adultery and sacrilege. It is not enough simply to claim that because one is a Jew one is superior, since there are Jews who by the way they act show themselves not to be in a different class from anyone else. Paul's purpose would seem to be as limited as this. It is only by divorcing his description of Jewish behaviour in vv. 21ff from his argument (of dismissing the claim that being a Jew is advantageous at the time of judgement) that one can reach the conclusion that Paul is characterizing Judaism as a whole.[48]

---

[44]. G. Bornkamm, "Paulinische Anakoluthe", Das Ende des Gesetzes (Münich, 1952), 76-78.

[45]. Ibid., 78.

[46]. Bassler, Divine Impartiality, 150.

[47]. See our earlier discussion of vv. 17-20 in ch. 3 above, as well as Zeller, Juden, 156-157, and Schlier, "Juden", 44, for evidence that Paul uses traditional Jewish imagery in these and other of his epithets in vv. 17-20. Commentators who may be consulted are: Käsemann, Romans, 69-71; Wilckens, Römer, Vol.1, 147-149; Michel, Römer, 72-3; Cranfield, Romans, Vol.1, 163-7. An excellent example which collects several of the features present in our verses is found in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, especially T. Sim. 2. 13; T. Levi 4. 3, 7. 3, 17. 6; T. Naph. 2. 10: so S. Aalen, Die Begriffe "Licht" und "Finsternis" im Alten Testament im Spätjudentum und im Rabbinismus (Oslo, 1951), 191. On the origin of the Testaments see "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Introduction" in H. F. D. Sparks (ed.), The Apocryphal Old Testament, (Oxford, 1984), 505-152.

[48]. So Räisänen, Paul, 100. Similarly, Dodd, Romans, 37, inaccurately titles his section on Romans 2.17-29 "Moral Failure of Judaism". See also Watson above (n.4). Since an understanding of these verses as a description of Judaism has not been persuasive to some

Paul's first allegation is that the Jew who teaches others does not first teach himself. This charge is made in contrast to the Jew being the "instructor of the foolish" (v. 20) as well as "world teacher" (v. 14ff).[49] The words that occur in Abot. R. Nath. 29 (8a) echo this idea utilized by Paul, "Thou hast many a man who teaches himself and others . . . The man who teaches others but does not teach himself. How, for example? A man learns a piece of teaching twice or thrice, then teaches it to others, and then concerns himself with it no further, but forgets it; that is one who teaches others but does not teach himself."

The second allegation is found in the rhetorical question "You who preach do not steal, do you steal?", a violation of the seventh commandment (Ex. 20. 15, Dt. 5. 19).

To these is added the third allegation, which is against a violation of an OT commandment, "You shall not commit adultery" (Ex. 20. 14; Dt. 5. 18). For this David and Bathsheba can be cited. David as king of Israel committed adultery and then arranged for the death of his general ina n attempt to cover his wicked actions.

With the fourth allegation, "You who abhor idols, do you rob temples?", it is best not to take Paul's intent literally since it cannot be said that Jews in general were temple thieves.[50] In this connection, however, there is an incident recorded by Josephus in Ant. 18. 81-4 of a Jew who "played the part of an interpreter of the Mosaic law and its wisdom". He with three confederates enlisted a female proselyte to give money to the Temple in

---

scholars, other explanations are suggested, for example, Käsemann, Romans, 69; Schlier, "Juden," 45, interpret the verses apocalyptically. Barrett, Romans, 56f, on the other hand, understands the charges of vv. 21ff figuratively, similar to Mt. 5.21-48. Wilckens, Römer, Vol.1, 149, correctly (in our view) considers the rhetorical questions of vv. 21ff in the light of the claim of the Jewish objector. In this connection see also Dunn, Romans, Vol. 1, 114, who suggests that Paul was drawing upon a well-known Jewish tradition of rebuke and exhortation material (e.g. Pss. Sol. 8. 8-14; Philo, Conf. 163; T. Levi. 14. 4-8; CD 6.16-17).

[49]. The emphasis on the Jew as teacher of Torah to the non-Jewish world is noted by Schnabel, Law and Wisdom, 233-234.

[50]. Barrett, Romans, 56ff; Dunn, Romans, Vol. 1, 114. Comp. Watson, Gentiles, 111.

Jerusalem. However, they took the money and used it for their own gain (comp. Acts 19. 37; Ant. 4. 18). One is not to conclude from Paul's allegation that all Jewish teachers were thieves. Yet it does serve with the previous rhetorical questions to show that it is not enough to call oneself a Jew, because there are ill-behaved Jews as well as well-behaved Jews.

It is this focus which best coheres with the argument and context of the paragraph as a whole. Paul has shown the view held by the "critic" to be inadequate by means of appealing to examples known and used by Jews.[51] In so doing, however, Paul is not offering a historical characterization of Judaism as a whole. Even though examples can be cited from Jewish literature of ways in which Jews did or could behave, this does not suggest that all contemporary Jews were guilty of such ills. Paul is responding to a specific issue and uses rhetorical language and the medium of example to do so. What he says requires to be interpreted in that light.

No doubt Paul has been thinking on scripture throughout these allegations, but it is only at the conclusion of his argument that he cites a specific text. This is Is. 52.5,[52] which is cited in a form adapted from the LXX. Paul's accusation is that the Jew has not lived up to his call, and therefore that his behaviour has not hallowed God's name; it is thus brought into disrepute. Israel has let God down; it seems as if God is not able to take care of his own, when in fact the Jews are being punished for their sin. Paul emphasizes to the "critic" that the Jews' claim will not keep them from the judgement of God if by their

---

[51]. While several of the Jewish texts given above are later than Paul, corroborating evidence for the period before the destruction of the Second Temple may be cited (T. Levi 14. 4-8; Pss. Sol. 8. 8-13).

[52]. Cf. Ezek. 36. 21, where Paul's point may situationally be better paralled. However, the wording of the verse precludes any direct dependence on Paul's part, Bassler, Divine Impartiality, 263 n. 109. In this context see the commentary on Ex. 36. 21 by Rabbi Simeon ben Eleazar in Mek. Exod. 15. 2 (44b).

behaviour they incur condemnation. The application of the Jewish tradition by the "critic" is again the essential thrust of the critique. This paragraph thus confirms the picture already observed: the Judaism of the "critic" stresses a Jewish pride of race, and this boast must be accompanied by a corresponding life in order for a Jews boast of race to be effective in the judgement of God.

We shall now proceed to the final objection put forward by the "critic" (vv.25-29). Having completed his refutation of three of the Jews' central reasons for their self confidence --moral superiority, the possession of the Torah, Jewish national privilege -- Paul now turns to another, circumcision, before the "critic" intercedes again at 3. 1f with a question, "What shall we say, then the Jew has no advantages?" The "critic" could assert that even if what Paul says about the Law has merit, circumcision is an entirely different matter. This is a unique privilege of the Jew and his alone; it is a mark of his Jewishness.[53] Paul's response here is that in order for circumcision to be an asset at the judgement the Law had to be obeyed. And if the Jew did what the Law required of him, then circumcision would be of value.

Paul's rebuttal makes a distinction between a literal and non-literal understanding of circumcision. The "critic" assumes that circumcision was a sign and symbol of the covenant God made with Abraham. Paul claims that the essential significance of circumcision is not the rite but its metaphorical significance -- one's relationship to God and a fulfilment of the stipulations of the covenant. Therefore, Paul's plea is that in the sight of God the important thing is not merely the rite of circumcision but what it symbolizes.

With this distinction in mind, let us now consider how Paul answers the "critic's" objection. The logic in Paul's reply stems from the assumption that circumcision will be

---

[53]. While circumcision was practised by Israel's neighbours (e.g. Gen. 17. 23) it was only the Israelites for whom it was a sign of God's covenant (see e.g. Gen. 17. 9-14; Jub. 15. 25-34; comp. Ant. 13. 257-58, 318).

advantageous only if one obeys the Law, i.e. obeys the stipulations of covenant.[54] It will count for very little if a Jew who has not kept the requirements of covenant uses circumcision as a criterion for judging himself differently from a Gentile. If the Law is not kept then it is not that circumcision is annulled (as some exegetes maintain),[55] so that it is illegitimate to claim that the rite of circumcision is an advantage. To do so contradicts the axiom assumed in each of Paul's replies to the objector: God is an impartial judge of all mankind.

In v. 26 Paul considers his assumption from the viewpoint of the Gentile.[56] Two points are brought to the "critic's" attention by means of a rhetorical question. The first (v. 26) is the possibility that a Gentile may τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσσῃ . While on the surface Paul may be saying that Gentiles can fulfil the Torah,[57] closer considerations weigh against this. The phrase Paul uses appears only one other time in his letters (Rom. 8. 4). In that context, however, the reference is clearly to Christians who fulfil the requirements of the Law by living according to the Spirit. We maintain that a genuine parallel does not exist between Rom. 2. 26 and 8. 4 unless, of course, one postulates the theory that Rom. 2. 26 is referring to Gentile Christians.[58] Since throughout Rom. 2 it is the Gentiles who form an integral part of the discussion there is little reason here to alter

---

[54]. Dodd, Romans, 50; Denny, Romans, 601; Michel, Römer, 75f; Cambier, "Jugement", 201.

[55]. e.g. Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 1, 172. However, see Barrett, Romans, 58; Michel, Römer, 76; Kuss, Römer, Vol. 1, 89; Käsemann, Romans, 73.

[56]. Barrett, Romans, 58.

[57]. So Räisänen, Paul, 101-106; Sanders, Law, 123, 6; Michel, Römer, 76f; Althaus, Römer, 24f. However, Käsemann, Romans, 63f finds the idea of Gentiles keeping the Law at vv. 26f to be "fictional". Lagrange, Romains, 56, places the emphasis on the conditional aspect of v.26, thus treats the question as theoretical.

[58]. Barth, Shorter, 38; Cambier, "Jugement", 208; Cranfield, Romans, Vol. 1, 173; Bultmann, Theology, 261n.

this assumption. If we seek assistance from the parallel phrase τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα (v. 27), the problem of v. 26 is not resolved since τελεῖν is not used elsewhere by Paul in association with νόμος . This approach to the problem does not yield satisfactory results.

It may be better to determine Paul's meaning from the overall context and use of similar language in Rom. 2. If our previous discussion of Rom. 2. 14ff is borne in mind, the reference at 2. 26f may very well be to the Gentiles' instinctive obedience of the requirements of the Law which are written on their hearts and confirmed by their conscience.[59] This interpretation sufficiently satisfies the requirement of Paul's argument, showing what the Jew has done with reference to the Law, and the Gentile too, even if for him it is expressed in a corollary way.

The second point to be noted from the question of 2. 26 is that if the Gentile obeys the law he will obtain a status like that of the Jew. To avoid over-interpreting Paul, we must be clear about what is implied by this second point as it relates to Paul's dismissal of the "critic's" objection. Paul is not saying that Gentiles who do what the Law requires are counted as members of the people of God.[60] His intention is to demonstrate that the Jew may not be put in a different class from the Gentile. He shows that the Gentile who does what the Law requires is in the same position as the Jew, though the Gentile remains physically uncircumcised. Paul makes the point that while Gentiles are not referred to as the circumcised, i.e. Jews, they may obtain the status of the circumcised because they share with the Jews the experience of doing what is expected of those who possess the Torah.

---

[59]. Dodd, Romans, 41; Denny, Romans, 601; Michel, Römer, 76. Käsemann, Romans, 73, is correct in claiming that vv. 26ff recall v. 14f. However, he does not seem to follow this view forward in his judgement on vv. 26f. This is in part because for Käsemann νόμον πράσσειν (v. 26) and τελεῖν (v. 27) reach further than the statement of v. 14. Consequently, the phrase τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου refers to an attitude of strict adherence to the Law and the word δικαιώματα to the whole Torah defined by legal statements.

[60]. Barrett, Romans, 58; Michel, Römer, 77.

This is so because Paul held the conviction that circumcision has a metaphorical, non-literal dimension which Gentiles can experience. Consequently, when circumcision is not understood merely as a symbol of Jewish identity, but includes another dimension known and observed by Gentiles, the "critic's" position is shown to be inadequate. Furthermore, the example of the Gentile shows that simply because the Jew possesses privileges, e.g. circumcision (physical) and the sacred Scripture (v. 27), this will not ensure special standing. The very fact that those without privileges expose[61] those who do what the Law requires indicates that Jews cannot be classified in a different category from Gentiles. This is the thrust of Paul's rebuttal to the critic.

However, Paul has yet to define the non-literal aspect of circumcision in very clear terms. This is taken up in vv. 28-29 in the course of formulating a definition of the Jew. This is first stated negatively (v. 28), and then positively (v. 29). Negatively, one is not a Jew if one externalizes one's religion in terms of national descent. Similarly, circumcision is not the external mark of the flesh. Positively, the true Jew is defined in a threefold manner. First, he is one who does not esteem himself by visible means. Second, true circumcision is a circumcision of the heart. Paul again focuses on Scripture, and he reminds the "critic" that the vital thing is not the external mark of circumcision but a "humble response to God's gracious love and election."[62]

---

[61]. The Gentiles are not thought to assume the role of judges over Jews. This would indeed be blasphemous (so Käsemann, Romans, 74). On the contrary, as in Mt. 12. 41, Lk. 11. 31, the Gentile by his actions judges those (actions) of the Jews: so Denny, Romans, 601; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 67; Lagrange, Romains, 56; Michel, Römer, 77; Dunn, Romans, Vol. 1, 122.

[62]. Barrett, Romans, 60.

What is interesting for our purposes is that these ideas put forward by Paul are not, in the first instance, Christian, but from the Old Testament.[63] For example, Jeremiah taught "Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will punish all those who are circumcised, but yet uncircumcised Egypt, Judah, Edom, the sons of Ammon, Moab . . . for all these nations are uncircumcised and all the house of Israel is uncircumcised in heart" (Jer. 9. 25f, cf. 4. 4; Dt. 10. 16, 30. 6; Lev. 25. 4). Or similarly, "Circumcise therefore the foreskins of your heart" (Dt. 10. 16).[64] Therefore, the view of the "critic" that the Jew has the privilege of circumcision is no argument against God's judgement, since circumcision must be accompanied by a corresponding reality.

In this closing section the third definition of the Jew is given. He is one who does not seek the approval of men but of God. At v. 17 we have already seen Paul indicate that one of the "critic's" Jewish confidences was to have the name Jew, Ἰουδαῖος. What is meant by Jew is further defined here. This can be seen in the final statement of the chapter, couched in a relative clause οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος κτλ. The clue to what is the true Jew is evident when one recognizes that in the Greek word ἔπαινος a word-play well known in Judaism may be intended (Gen. 29. 35, 49. 8).[65] This is found in the connection between יְהוּדָה Yehudah-Jew and the Hebrew verb meaning "to praise", the Hiphil of יָדָה : Yadah.

Let us now draw several conclusions based on our analysis of Romans 2. 1-29. First, we have found convincing evidence for the case that Romans 2 may be conceived as an "inner Jewish debate" where Paul and his objector are debating points regarding the

---

[63]. Paul in accord with the prophets, applies the principle of "inversion of values": so Cambier, "Jugement", 207.

[64]. For further evidence on circumcision of the heart see Watson, Gentiles, 217 n. 73.

[65]. Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 68; Michel, Römer, 78 n. 5; Lagrange, Romains, 57; F. Brown, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford, 1976), 392.

essential nature of the Jewish religion. Second, there is sufficient evidence for the view that what Paul found wrong with the Jewish religion (as perceived through the "critic") was that the Jew violated central tenets of his own religion by claiming a criterion of judgement for himself different from all others. To claim two different standards of judgement depending on race assumes that some possess merits or advantages in God's economy of salvation while others do not; some possess ways of restraining God's judgement while others do not. Our study has yielded a positive case that the Jewish "critic" misapplied the place of ancestry as it related to the judgement of God in a way that exceeded the Jews' historic priority and their inherent privileges of race.

From the case put forward we have seen the way in which a belief in God as judge of the world was applied by two Jews (Paul and the "critic"), the result being the emergence of differing points of view. Nevertheless, Paul's rebuttal of the "critic" is one from which few pious Jews would have dissented. Therefore, we maintain that Romans 2 is not simply "a piece of propagandist denigration" nor a complete portrayal of all of Judaism ---including every individual Jew. Rather, Romans 2 is an interpretation of the Jewish religion by two Jews who offer differing perspectives. Within these perspectives there are several discernable elements common to the Jewish religion: (1) performance and descent play a central role in Judaism; (2) Jews possess a historic advantage yet this is not to exclude others from obtaining salvation; (3) to this end the God of the Jews acts in a just and impartial manner; (4) convictions must be accompanied by a corresponding morality; (5) circumcision has a literal and symbolic meaning; (6) observance of the Torah is the integrating characteristic which binds together correct behaviour, circumcision as rite and symbol and a Jew's pride of race.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSIONS: THE SHARED JUDAISM OF PAUL & JOSEPHUS

We shall now draw together some overall conclusions from the study. The aim of our study has been to search for common themes or "denominators" within the Jewish religion by considering two principal sources: Josephus' Contra Apionem 2. 190-219, and the undisputed letters of Paul. The context of the investigation was to ask whether, given that the Second Temple situation is characterized by variety and plurality, there are discernible shared ideas to which most Jews would have adhered. The focus of our analysis was to determine what ideas Jews shared in common. The stimulus for this study is that scholars agree that shared ideas existed among first-century Jews but disagree on their definition. Since there has been little critical analysis of this theme it was our aim to determine and describe the content of Judaism as an ism.

In our consideration of Ap. 2. 190-219 we suggested that there were a number of shared ideas of the Jewish religion reflected in this material. A list of these has already been given in the summary on Contra Apionem (ch. 2 above). The list included the following shared ideas. (1) God, as presented in Contra Apionem, is monotheistic in nature, in control of the world as well as its sole creator. He forbids idolatry and expects the practice of virtue by observance of the Torah. (2) The Temple is a symbol of Jewish identity; the Cultus, its existence and practices, were in actual use. Prayer has a central place in the life of the cultic community. (3) The purpose of marriage is procreation. (4) There is a prescribed behaviour for sexual relations in marriage. Sodomy, homosexuality, and adultery are forbidden. (5) Purity laws are to be observed in marriage (following sexual relations and childbirth) and after a funeral ceremony. (6) Women are to be subservient to their husbands. (7) Woman are not to abort or do away with a foetus. (8) Training in the Torah

is prescribed for all Jewish children; they are also to show honour and obedience to their parents. (9) Jews are to behave towards each other in a prescribed manner -- not steal, charge interest, bear false witness or commit unfair play regarding weights and measures. Help is to be shown towards the poor and needy. (10) The Jewish religion is available to non-Jews. (11) Burying the dead is universally obligatory. (12) Humane treatment of animals is expected. (13) There is hope of a life after death. (14) Obedience and disobedience to the Law each has its own consequences. (15) Piety must be shown towards God; the consequence of not doing so is death.

The analysis of the letters of Paul considered material under the following categories: autobiography, Jewish elements in Paul's theology, debates with Jewish opponents, Jewish ethics for Gentile converts, and a dialogue on the Jewish religion. A summary of this evidence offers another source for describing the shared ideas of first-century Jews. The first category is autobiography. The common features we noted from this evidence are as follows (1) Jews have a strong sense of national pride. (2) They are zealous for their God and for his Law, which is the norm, final revelation, and the centre of the religious outlook. (3) Correct behaviour is of fundamental importance. (4) Some Jews hold their beliefs with such tenacity that any one who opposes them could be liable to severe treatment.

The second type of material we classified as Jewish elements in Paul's theology. Our analysis of this material indicated there were nine shared points among Jews consisting of the following. (1) Jews share a monotheistic view of God; he is just in his dealings with mankind. (2) Jews have a privileged status by virtue of their nationality. (3) Jewish are considered to be the elect people of God. (4) Gentile entry into the people of God is an integral dimension of Jewish eschatological hope. (5) Holiness is a virtue to be emulated by the fulfilment of the Torah. (6) A belief in a remnant is appealed to as a means of explaining the hiatus between God's promise and reality. (7) God's saving actions arise out

of his gracious nature. (8) A future afterlife is expected. (9) Reward and punishment are related consequentially to obedience and disobedience.

A third category of evidence we considered was that which reflects Paul in debate with Jewish opponents. From this material we concluded that Paul and his opponents share the following ideas. (1) The significance of Abraham and conditions of entry into his "family" were central tenets held by Paul and his opponents. (2) It was assumed that Gentiles would become members of the new people of God. (3) The OT was the legitimating authority of appeal. (4) An accountability to the historical plan and purposes of God is assumed. (5) Symbols of Jewish ethnicity that were integral to the debate included circumcision, the covenant, and observance of the Torah. (6) Gentiles were considered to be "sinners". (7) Jews boasted of their pride of race.

A fourth kind of evidence assessed was ethical in nature. It is material relating to the ethical behaviour of Gentile converts. The ethics for these converts were, surprisingly, thoroughly Jewish. We have thus classified the material as Jewish ethics for Gentile converts. There are two central ideas shared among Jews which we hold to be present in this material. (1) Immorality was to be shunned. In accordance with common Jewish sentiment the practice of incest, homosexuality, and adultery was to be avoided. While in the case of prostitution the Jewish evidence is mixed, there is a strand of opinion that abhorred it, and Paul is in agreement with this view. (2) Idolatrous practice, especially that surrounding the pagan temple Cultus, is to be avoided. This was a consequence of the fact that for Jews there was only one true God who was to be worshipped and to receive sacrifice. It was also to be avoided because idolatrous practice was a distinct feature of pagan religion which was to be left behind as part of the convert's past life and experience.

There is a final of category of material we investigated. For this we treated Rom. 2. 1-29 as a dialogue between two Jews from differing perspectives on the the nature of the

Jewish religion. In spite of the fact that Rom. 2 gives an interpretation of the Jewish religion from two different points of reference the results of this analysis showed that there were the following common ideas discernible. (1) Jewish ancestry played a central role in Judaism. (2) Jews possess a historic advantage, yet this does not hinder the availability of God's promises to others. (3) God acts are just and impartial in nature. (4) Convictions must be accompanied by a corresponding ethic. (5) Circumcision has a literal and symbolic significance. (6) The observance of the Torah is what binds together correct behaviour, circumcision as rite and symbol, and a Jew's pride of race.

There is one other category of evidence that could have been included in our study. It is material of the "Pauline School" i.e. those writings which seek to preserve and promote the Pauline legacy---Ephesians and Colossians. A cursory reading of this material indicates the presence of commmon Jewish ideas: the centrality of the Torah, monotheism, Jewish national pride and the inclusion of Gentiles in the new people of God. Each of these ideas occurs in contexts which suggest that the significance of the ideas is presupposed. What can be observed from these examples is the influence of a Jewish heritage. However, it is not known whether these emphases come from the influence of Paul or distinctly from the "Pauline School". If it could be determined that the Jewish ideas listed above have their origin in the "Pauline School" and were not formulated under the influence of Paul, then we would have an independent source which supports the emphasis present in the undisputed letters of Paul. Since, however, in our judgement it is not possible to affirm this we omitted such evidence from our analysis and simply suggest that Ephesians and Colossians reflect a continuing influence of a common Jewish heritage.

There is a similar difficulty that arises with the material at Eph. 5. 21-6. 9 and Col. 3. 18-21, known as the Haustafel. The problem is to establish whether the Haustafel has its origin solely in the Jewish synagogue. The fact that debate over the origin of the Haustafel

continues ought to make one cautious. The suggested backgrounds are (1) popular Hellenistic ethics; (2) a Christian creation; (3) Hellenistic Jewry. Several examples can be cited which suggest multiple backgrounds which enforces the point that caution should be observed regarding the origin of the Haustafel. For example, at Eph. 6. 1-3a and Col. 3. 20-1 instruction is given on relationships between parents and children. Children are to obey their parents. They are not to be provoked by their parents; rather, parents are to train and instruct their children. The fact that each of these dicta is shared by the Jewish and Graeco-Roman world supports the view that it is difficult to argue the case that the Haustafel is distinctly Jewish in orgin. Indeed, the extent of Jewish influence on the Haustafel would have to be analysed on its own before the evidence could be confidently used for our purposes. Therefore, we have omitted the material of the "Pauline School" from our study.

We shall now bring together Jewish ideas that are common in Ap. 2. 190-219 and the undisputed letters of Paul. The fact that common ground exists suggests the plausibility of a "common denominator Judaism". The shared ideas between these two sources, we maintain, include the following. (1) God is monotheistic in nature; he is able to control the affairs of the universe and direct history. (2) There is hope of a future life after death. (3) The people of God shall be defined in terms which include non-Jews. (4) The moral structure of the universe consists of reward for obedience and punishment for disobedience. (5) There is an appropriate ethic which shows that a person is a member of the "in-group". This ethic includes sexual behaviour: immorality, adultery, and homosexuality must be avoided. The ethic also applies to worshipping gods other than the one true God: one must shun all idolatrous practices. (6) The observance of the Torah is a category that is retained by Josephus and Paul. In Contra Apionem the observance of the Torah is the focus of the resume on the Jewish religion. For Paul, on the other hand, the notion of Torah's

fulfilment continued to form part of what was expected from converts, both Jews and Gentiles. Josephus, while not defining Torah's fulfilment in terms of the love commandment (as Paul does), none the less depicts the "practice of virtue" (Ap. 2. 192) in ways which amount to "love your neighbour as yourself". (7) The blessing of God is not something to be earned but freely received. Since God graciously offers his blessing, he expects his people to do his will. (8) Jews possess a strong sense of national pride: this point we observed in several different contexts in the letters of Paul. While this is not stated explicitly in Ap. 2. 190ff it does occur in the preface to this passage, which begins at 2. 175ff: "Among us alone will be heard no contradictory statements"; "Among us alone there will be seen no difference in the conduct of our lives". (9) Jews are the elect people of God. This point is assumed by Paul in his discussion of Rom. 9-11 and by Josephus in Ap. 2. 190ff. While Paul directly refers to the idea of Israel's election, Josephus omits any such reference. Yet the idea of Israel as the people of God is presupposed in Contra Apionem. If the case was otherwise injunctions such as those to observe the Law, worship and honour the one God, and live in anticipation of a future life, would lack the necessary stimulus.

Let us now formulate our thesis in the light of the above conclusions. We have argued in this study that common ideas or "denominators" existed within first-century Judaism. To prove this first we analysed Ap. 2. 190-219 in connection with other Jewish evidence of the period, especially Philo's, Hypothetica and the Pseudo-Phocylides. We also, when appropriate, considered other Jewish evidence (e.g. DSS, rabbis, and the apocalyptic literature) to add support for the proposal of a "common denominator Judaism". Second, we assessed the undisputed letters of Paul and with the assistance of a series of criteria we considered different types of material. From this analysis we suggested that there are discernible ideas which may be deemed common before AD 70 since all the letters of Paul

are clearly dated before this time. The shared ideas from both of these investigations we have listed in summary form above. These two separate investigations lead us to suggest that there existed Jewish ideas which were both common and dated before 70. The criterion (as stated already in the Introduction) was that ideas may be considered both common and pre-70 whenever those found in Contra Apionem and attested in a wide variety of Jewish evidence (thus common) are also attested in the letters of Paul (and so pre-70). We have listed above those ideas which satisfy these criteria.

While space does not allow a detailed comparison of our results with those of others who have sought or presupposed and attempted to describe common features in first-century Judaism, a general sketch can be given. With regard to the old debate on works and grace, or soteriology, represented in an earlier generation by Moore's attack on Bousset, and more recently by Sanders', attack on Bousset's followers: we do not find a soteriology in which mercy is earned by works, but rather one based on God's grace, to which obedience to the law is the proper response.

If we were to compare in greater detail our results to Moore's presentation of Judaism, we should have to explain some missing features, especially a lack of emphasis in our material on repentance and forgiveness. This may show more a limitation of our study than an error on Moore's part. Josephus does not focus on how transgressions were repaired, nor does Paul. They both emphasize that disobedience is punished, and Paul was aware of repentance as a way of gaining restoration (2 Cor. 7.9f; 12.21), and a thorough canvass of Josephus would reveal the same awareness (Ant. 9. 176), but they do not discuss in any detail the possibility that repentance can lead to a cancellation of punishment. We do not wish to challenge this as a common Jewish idea, but it must be said that our study does not confirm it.

Collins's view that there exists within diaspora Judaism a common ethic is affirmed by our study. Furthermore, the focus of this ethic he suggests as common (monotheism, the avoidance of idolatry, and sexual behaviour (e.g. the prohibition against homosexuality)) we also found to be so in Paul and Josephus. Finally, the evidence Collins used to support his case was the same material that formed the basis of our comparison with Josephus. However in distinction to Collins we did find that the ethic suggested by him for the diaspora may in certain instances be found also in Palestine.

Chadwick's use of the analogy of two Jews who "fished out of the same pool" as a means of understanding the relationship between Paul and Philo we suggested was also an appropriate way of viewing part of the aims and results of our study on Paul and Josephus. What we found was that there were big fish in the pool as well as small ones. The large fish were significant and equivalent by analogy to common themes in the Jewish religion and discernible enough so that we may speak in terms of a common Judaism.

While it was Meeks's concern to show there existed within Judaism diverse views on ethics he affirms the presence of "recurring themes" which were consistent with elements we noted in our study on Paul and Josephus. (1) Behaviour is of central importance to being "Israel". (2) God is able to contol the course of history. (3) Scripture serves a constitutive function in the process of making ethical decisions.

Support for the above points is provided by McEleney, who in his search for a "minimal orthodoxy" suggests that this orthodoxy consists of monotheism, Israel as the people of God, and the acceptance of the Mosaic law. Regardless of whether it is accurate to use the term "orthodoxy" in connection to first-century Judaism it is significant that the elements noted by McEleney were those found in Josephus' summary and the letters of Paul.

Hengel's view that Jews of Palestine shared common features that were characteristic of the diaspora is confirmed by our study. We have seen that Josephus in specific

injunctions often shared common ground with both Palestinian and diaspora materials. In certain instances, though, the only common evidence came from the OT, or material outside Palestine. But in general our analysis supports the view of Hengel regarding the interplay between hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism.

Our study supports, to varying degrees, the views of the scholars whom we have just named. It argues against other positions, such as Neusner's view that Jews of the time would not have understood one another, let alone accepted one another as part of the same social group. As we argued there were important ways in which Josephus shared ideas with the Jewish tradition; this was also the case with Paul. In addition we showed that there were commonly shared ideas between Paul and Josephus so that we could speak of a "common denominator" Judaism. Because of Neusner's strict application of the document-by-document approach to the evidence the common themes have gone unnoticed. Regarding Neusner's point that Jews of the time would not have accepted one another as part of the same social group needs careful definition. The outstanding example of this is Qumran yet one should be more dubious when it is claimed that Akiba and Bar Kokhba fall within different social categories. Similarly the point may be made regarding Josephus and Philo.

Watson is another example of one who has depicted Judaism in a way that is absent from Ap. 2. 190ff. This is especially so, since for Watson Judaism is described by circumcision and the synagogue. While Josephus acknowledges circumcision as a practice among Jews, it does not form part of his summary in Ap. 2. 190ff. Furthermore, we did find in our analysis the presence of the temple Cultus is explicitly stated, however, the synagogue as a Jewish institution was not explicitly mentioned in the summary though several essential injunctions of the summary must have been taught via the synagogue.

My particular study does not bring in circumcision as crucial, but this does not rule it out. Galatians makes it appear that it was central to many, and Josephus mentions it outside his summary. Similarly other passages in Josephus show that Jews routinely attended synagogue on the sabbath (War 2. 289), and the Gospels and Acts lend further support. Also, three ancient Jews regarded assembly on the sabbath as a Mosaic decree (Philo, Hypothetica 7.12-12; cf. Creation 128; Josephus, Ap. 2.175; Pseudo-Philo, Biblical Ant. 11.8 (who makes it part of the ten commandments) enforces the point.

This brief recollection of scholars (which we noted in our Introduction) was to show that our study forms part of a larger discussion of how to describe and define first-century Judaism. If our study may be considered a cogent and convincing attempt to describe Judaism of the first-century, there are several implications for future research. First, it may enable others to pursue a related question, namely the relationship between unity and diversity in Judaism in the light of the presence of common ideas. Second, the present study could assist in redefining the question of the nature of Paul's Judaism. As well as noting that Paul has affinities with the rabbis, the apocalyptists, and Philo we may need to add those features which suggest his affinities with Josephus as the inheritor of a "common denominator Judaism". Finally, future work on first-century Judaism may need to give more attention to Ap. 2. 190ff as a source with useful and instructive data to be considered with other witnesses in portraying early Judaism.

PRIMARY SOURCES

The Babylonian Talmud, English translation ed. by I. Epstein (London, 1935-52), 35 Vols.

Biblica Hebraica, ed. R. Kittel (Stuttgart, 1962)

P. Blackman (ed.), Mishnayoth (London, 1954), 7 Vols.

R.H. Charles (ed.), The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (Oxford, 1913), 2 Vols.

J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (New York, 1983/5), 2 Vols.

H. Danby (ed.), The Mishnah (London, 1933)

The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, translated by G. Vermes (Middlesex, 1968)

Die Texte aus Qumran, E. Lohse (ed.) (Darmstadt, 1964)

The Essene Writings from Qumran, A. Dupont-Sommer (Oxford, 1961)

J. Frey (ed.), Corpus inscriptionum iudaicarum (Roma, 1936/52), 2 Vols.

Josephus, with an English translation by H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, A. Wikgren & L.H. Feldman (London, 1926-65), 9 Vols.

Novum Testamentum Graece, ed. E. Nestle, K. Aland et al. (Stuttgart, 1979), 26th ed.

Philo, English translation by F.H. Colson, G.H. Whitaker & R. Marcus (London, 1953), 12 Vols.

Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, ed. & trans. by J.Z. Lauterbach (Philadelphia, 1933-35), 3 Vols.

Septuaginta, Ed. A. Rahlfs (Stuttgart, 1962), 2 Vols.

H.F.D. Sparks (ed.), The Apocryphal Old Testament (Oxford, 1984)

J.F. Stenning (ed.& trans.), The Targum of Isaiah (Oxford, 1949)

M. Stern, Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism (Jerusalem, 1974, 1980), 2 Vols.

Le Talmud de Jérusalem, translated by Moïse Schwab (Paris, 1878-89), 9 Vols.

The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targums I-II, J.W. Etheridge (London, 1862-65)

P.W. van der Horst, The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides (Leiden, 1975)

M. Whittaker, Jews and Christians: Graeco-Roman Views (Cambridge, 1984)

SECONDARY LITERATURE

J. W. Aageson, "Scripture and Structure in the Development of the Argument in Romans 9-11", CBQ 48 (1986), 265-289

S. Aalen, Die Begriffe "Licht" und "Finsternis" im Alten Testament im Spätjudentum und im Rabbinismus (Oslo, 1951)

M. Aberbach, "Josephus: Patriot or Traitor", Jewish Heritage 10 (1967), 13-19

M. Adinolfi, "La santità del matrimonio in 1 Tess. 4,1-8", in RivB 24 (1976), 165-184

R. Albertz, et al. Werken und Wirken des Alten Testament (Göttingen, 1980), 428-445

P.S. Alexander, "Jewish Law in the Time of Jesus" in B. Lindars (ed.) Law and Religion, (Cambridge, 1988), 44-58

E.B. Allo, Saint Paul, Second Épître aux Corinthiens (Paris, 1936)

E.B. Allo, Premiere Épître aux Corinthians (Paris, 1934)

G. Alon, The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age (Jerusalem, 1980)

G. Alon, Jews, Judaism and the Classical World (Jerusalem, 1977)

P. Althaus, Der Brief an die Römer (Göttingen, 1959)

D. Altshuler, "The Treatise by Flavius Josephus", JQR 69 (1979), 226-232

M. Z. Andrews, "Paul and Repentance", JBL 54 (1935), 125

H. W. Attridge, The Interpretation of Biblical History in Antiquitates Judicae of Flavius Josephus (Missoula, MT., 1976)

H. W. Attridge, "Josephus and His Works" in M.E. Stone (ed.), Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period (Assen and Philadelphia, 1984), Vol. 2, 185-232

D. E. Aune, "Orthodoxy in First Century Judaism: A Response to N.J. McEleney", JSJ 7 (1976), 1-10

R. D. Aus, "Paul's Travel Plans to Spain and the 'Full Number of the Gentiles' of Rom. 11.25", NovT 21 (1979), 232-62

N. Avigad, Discovering Jerusalem (Nashville, 1983)

L. Baeck, "The Faith of Paul", JJS 3 (1951), 93-110

R. Baile, Women and the Jewish Law (New York, 1984)

J. L. Bailey, "Josephus' Portrayal of the Matriarchs" in L.H. Feldman, and G. Hata (eds.), Josephus, Judaism and Christianity (Detroit, 1987), 154-179

D. L. Balch "Two Apologetic Encomia: Dionysius on Rome and Josephus on the Jews", JSJ 13 (1982), 102-122

H. Baltensweiler, "Erwagungen Zu 1.Thessalonians 4, 3-8", in TZ 19 (1963), 1-13

K. Baltzer, The Covenant Formulary in Old Testament, Jewish and Early Christian Writings (Oxford, 1971)

B.J. Bamberger, Proselytism in the Talmudic Period (New York, 1968)

E. Bammel, "Gottes Diatheke (Gal. III. 15-17) und das jüdische Rechtsdenken," NTS 6 (1959/60), 313-319

E. Bammel and C.F.D. Moule, (eds.), Jesus and the Politics of His Day (Cambridge, 1984)

R. Banks (ed.), Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris (Exeter, 1974)

J. Barclay, "Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case", JSNT 31 (1987), 73-93

J. Barclay, Obeying the Truth (Edinburgh, 1988)

E. Barnikol, Die vorchristliche und frühchristliche Zeit des Paulus (Kiel, 1929)

C. K. Barrett, "The Allegory of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar in the Argument of Galatians", in Essays on Paul (London, 1982), 154-170

C.K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (London, 1973)

C. K. Barrett, The Epistle to the Romans (London, 1957)

C.K. Barrett, Essays on Paul (London, 1982)

C. K. Barrett, The First Epistle to the Corinthians (London, 1968)

C.K. Barrett, Freedom and Obligation (London, 1985)

C. K. Barrett, From First to Last Adam (London, 1962)

C. K. Barrett, "Paul's Opponents in 2 Corinthians", Essays on Paul (London, 1982), 60-86

C. K. Barrett, "Paul's Opponents in 2 Corinthians", NTS 17 (1971), 333-354

C. K. Barrett, "Things Sacrificed to Idols" in Essays on Paul (London, 1982), 40-59

G. Barth, Der Brief an die Philipper (Zürich, 1979)

K. Barth, The Epistle to the Philippians (London, 1962)

K. Barth, A Shorter Commentary on Romans (London, 1959)

M. Barth, People of God (Sheffield, 1983)

M. Barth, "St. Paul--A Good Jew", HBT 1 (1979), 7-45

H.W Bartsch, "Die historische Situation des Romerbriefs" in Studia Evangelica IV F.L. Cross (ed.), (TU 102) (Berlin, 1968), 281-291

J. Bassler, "Divine Impartiality in Paul's Letter to the Romans", NovT 26, 1 (1984), 43-58

J. Bassler, Divine Impartiality : Paul and a Theological Axiom (Chico, Ca. 1982)

W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek- English Lexicon of the New Testament (Chicago, 1952)

G. Baumbach, "Die Frage nach den Irrlehrern in Philippi", Kairos 13 (1971), 252-66

A. I. Baumgarten, "The Name of the Pharisees", JBL 102-3, (1983), 411-28

F.W. Beare, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians (London, 1959)

J.C. Beker, "The Faithfulness of God and the Priority of Israel in Paul's Letter to the Romans", HTR 79 (1986), 10-16

J.C. Beker, Paul the Apostle (Philadelphia and Edinburgh, 1980)

S. Belkin, Alexandrian Halakah in the Apologetic Literature (Philadelphia, 1936)

S. Belkin, "The Alexandrian Source for Contra Apionem II", JQR 27 (1936-7), 1-32

S. Belkin, Philo and Oral Law (Cambridge, Mass., 1940)

Schalom Ben-Chorin, Paulus: Der Völkerapostel in jüdischer Sicht (München, 1980)

P. Benoit, J. T. Milik and R. de Vaux Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (Oxford, 1961), Vol. 2

P. Bergen, Philo, John and Paul (Atlanta, 1987)

K. Berger, "Abraham in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen", München Theologischen Zeitschrift 17 (1966), 47-63

K. Berger, Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu (Neukirchen - Vluyn, 1972)

E. Berkovits, "The Centrality of Halakhah", in Understanding Rabbinic Judaism, J. Neusner (ed.) (New York, 1974), 63-70

J. Bernays, "über das phokylideische Gedicht. Ein Beitrag zum hellenistischen Literatur", Gesammelte Abhandlungen (Berlin, 1885), Vol. 1, 192-261

E. Best, The First and Second Epistle to the Thessalonians (London, 1977)

H.D. Betz, Galatians (Philadelphia, 1979)

H.D. Betz, Nachfolge und Nachahmung Jesu Christi im Neuen Testament (Tübingen, 1967)

H. D. Betz, Paul's Apology: II Corinthians 10-13 and the Socratic Tradition (Berkeley, 1970)

O. Betz, "Paulus als Pharisäer nach dem Gesetz: Phil. 3, 5-6 als Beitrag zur Frage des frühen Pharisäismus", Treue zur Thora, ed. P. von der Osten-Sacken, Festschrift für G. Harder (Berlin, 1977), 54-64

0. Betz, K. Haacker and M. Hengel, (eds.), Josephus-Studien, Festschrift für 0. Michel (Göttingen, 1974)

O. Betz, M. Hengel & P. Schmidt (eds.), Abraham unser Vater, Festschrift für O. Michel (Leiden, 1963)

W. Beyschlag, Die paulinische Theodicee (Halle, 1868)

E.J. Bickermann, "The Jewish Historian Demetrios", in J. Neusner, (ed.), Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Part 3 (Leiden, 1975), 72-84

P. Bilde, Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome (Sheffield, 1988),

C. J. Bjerkelund, " 'Nach menschlicher Weise rede Ich'. Funktion und Sinn des paulinischen Ausdrucks", ST 26 (1972), 63-100

M. Black, Romans (London, 1973)

J. Blank, Paulus und Jesus (Münich, 1968)

F. Blass, A. Debrunner and R. Funk, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament (Cambridge and Chicago)

D.J. Bleich, "Abortion in Halakhic Literature", Contemporary Halakhic Problems (New York, 1977), 325-371

J. Bligh, Galatians. A Discussion of St. Paul's Epistle (London, 1969)

J. Blunt, "Rejected, Ignored, or Misunderstood? The Fate of Paul's Approach to the Problem of Idol Food in Early Christianity", NTS 31 (1985), 113-124

P. Bonnard, L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Galates (Neuchâtel, 1972)

P. Bonnard, L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Philippiens (Neuchâtel and Paris, 1950)

J. Bonsirven, Exégese rabbinique et Exégese paulinienne (Paris, 1939)

M. Borg, "The Currency of the term Zealot", JTS 22 (1971), 504-12

P. Borgen, Philo, John and Paul (Atlanta, 1987)

P. Borgen, "No Apostolic Decree", NT Seminar, Oxford, Feb. 1989

G. Bornkamm, Early Christian Experience (London, 1969)

G. Bornkamm, "Gesetz und Natur, (Rom. 2,14-16)", Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum, (Munchen, 1959), 93-118

G. Bornkamm, "Paulinische Anakoluthe", Des Ende des Gesetzes (München, 1952), 76-92

G. Bornkamm, "The Revelation of Christ to Paul on the Damascus Road and Paul's Doctrine of Justification and Revelation. A Study in Galatians 1", in R. Banks (ed.), Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament on Atonement and Eschatology presented to L.L. Morris (Exeter, 1974), 90-103

G. Bornkamm, "Theologie als Teufelkunst", Geschichte und Glaube (Munich, 1971), 140-8

W. Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (Berlin, 1903)

W. Bousset and H. Gressman, Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter (Tübingen, 1926)

G. H. Box and W. 0. E. Osterley, "The Book of Sirach" in R.H. Charles (ed.), The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (Oxford, 1913), Vol. 1, 268-517

S. G. F. Brandon, "Josephus: Renegade or Patriot", in Religion in Ancient History: Studies in Ideas, Men and Events (New York, 1969), 298-309

W.G. Braude, Jewish Proselytizing in the First Five Centuries of the Common Era (Providence, R. I., 1940)

R. Bring, Christus und das Gesetz (Leiden, 1968)

R. Bring, Commentary on Galatians (Philadelphia, 1961)

B. Brimsmead, Galatians-Dialogical Response to Opponents (Chico, 1982)

F. Brown, S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford, 1976)

F.F. Bruce, "The Curse of the Law", in M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson (eds.), Paul and Paulinism: Essays in honour of C. K. Barrett (London, 1982), 27-36

F.F. Bruce, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (Leicester, 1976)

F.F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Galatians (Exeter, 1982)

F.F. Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians (London, 1978)

F.F. Bruce, 1 and 2 Thessalonians (Waco, (TX) 1982)

F.F. Bruce, "Further Thoughts on Paul's Autobiography (Gal. 1. 11 - 2. 14)", in E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer (eds.), Jesus und Paulus, Festschrift für W. G. Kümmel (Göttingen, 1975), 21-29

F.F. Bruce, "Galatians Problem 3. The 'Other' Gospel", BJRL 53 (1970-1), 253-271

F.F. Bruce, Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit (Exeter, 1977)

B. Brüne, Flavius Josephus und Seine Schriften in ihrem Verhältnis zum Judentume,zur griechisch = römischen Welt und zum Christentume (Wiesbaden, 1969)

R. Bultmann, Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe (Göttingen, 1910)

R. Bultmann, Der zweite Brief an die Korinther (Göttingen, 1976)

R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament (London, 1952), Vol. 1

B. Byrne, "Sons of God" -- "Seed of Abraham" (Rome, 1979)

H.J. Cadbury, "The Macellum of Corinth", JBL 53 (1934), 134-141

G. B. Caird, Language and Imagery of the Bible (London, 1980)

G. B. Caird, Paul's Letters from Prison (Oxford, 1976)

T. Callan, "Pauline Midrash: The Exegetical Background of Gal. 3.19b", JBL 99 (1980), 549-567

J. Calvin, The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians (Edinburgh, 1965)

J. Calvin, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians (Edinburgh, 1961)

J.-M. Cambier, "Le jugement de tous les hommes par Dieu seul, selon la vérité, dans Rom. 2,1-3,20", ZNW 67 (1976-7), 187-213

A. Cameron, "The Exposure of Children and Greek Ethics", Classical Review 46 (1932), 105-14

W.S. Campbell, "Romans III as a Key to the Structure and Thought of the Letter", NovT 23 (1981), 22-40

H.C.C. Cavallin, "Leben nach dem Tode im Spätjudentum und im frühen Christentum I. Spätjudentum in W. Haase (ed.), Aufstieg und Niedergang römischen Welt (Berlin and New York, 1979), Vol. 19.1, 240-345

H.C.C. Cavallin, Life after Death (Lund, 1974)

H.C.C. Cavallin, "'The Righteous Shall Live by Faith'. A Decisive Argument for the Traditional Interpretation", ST 32 (1978), 33-43

L. Cerfaux, "Le Privilège d'Israël selon Saint Paul", ETL 17 (1940), 5-26

H. Chadwick, "2 Cor 4-5 and Christian Platonism", Henton Davies Lecture, Regent's Park College, Oxford, Feb. 1987, MS 1-10

H. Chadwick, "St. Paul and Philo of Alexandria", BJRL 48 (1966), 286-307

R. E. Clements, "'A Remnant Chosen by Grace' (Romans 11.5)", in D. A. Hagner and M. J. Harris (eds.), Pauline Studies: Essays presented to F. F. Bruce (London and Grand Rapids, 1980), 106-121

S.J.D. Cohen, From the Maccabees to the Mishnah, (Philadelphia, 1987)

B. D. Cohon, "Josephus: Traitor? Patriot?", in Men at the Crossroads (South Brunswick, NJ, 1970), 151-172

J.-F. Collange, Énigmes de la deuxième épitre Corinthiens (Cambridge, 1972)

J.-F. Collange, The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Philippians (London, 1979)

J.J. Collins, "A Symbol of Otherness: Circumcision and Salvation in the First Century", in J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs (eds.), "To See Ourselves As Others See Us" : Christians, Jews "Others" in Late Antiquity (Chico, 1985), 163-185

J.J. Collins, Between Athens and Jerusalem (New York, 1983)

R.F. Collins, Christian Morality: Biblical Foundations (Notre Dame, 1986) = "The Unity of Paul's Paranesis in I Thessalonians 4.3-8" in NTS 29 (1983), 421-422

R.F. Collins, Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians (Leuven, 1984)

H. Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians (Philadelphia, 1975)

J. Coppens "Miscellances bibliques LXXX. Une diatribe antijuive dans 1 Thess. 2. 13-16", ETL 51 (1975)

C.H. Cosgrove, "The Law has Given Sarah no Children Gal. (4. 21-30)", NovT 29 (1987), 219-235

C.H. Cosgrove, "What if Some have not Believed? The Occasion and Thrust of Romans 3. 1-8", ZNW 78 (1987), 90-105

C.E.B. Cranfield, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Edinburgh, 1977/9), Vols. 1-2

J.L. Crenshaw and S. Sandmel (eds.), The Divine Helmsman : Studies on God's Control of Human Events (New York, 1980)

J.E. Crouch, The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel (Göttingen, 1972)

R. W. Crown, "The Nonliteral Use of Eschatological Language in Jewish Apocalyptic and the New Testament" (diss. Oxford, 1986)

N. A. Dahl, Studies in Paul (Minn., 1977)

D.Daube, Ancient Jewish Law. Three Inaugural Lectures (Leiden, 1981)

D. Daube, "The Interpretation of a Generic Singular", The NT and Rabbinic Judaism (London, 1956), 438-444

D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London, 1956)

D. Daube, "Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric", HUCA 22 (1949), 239-264

W.D. Davies, "Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter", in Jewish and Pauline Studies (Philadelphia, 1984), 172-188

W.D. Davies, The Gospel and the Land (Berkeley, 1974)

W.D. Davies, "Law in First-Century Judaism", in Jewish and Pauline Studies (Philadelphia, 1984), 91-122

W.D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit", in Christian Origins (London, 1962), 145-177

W.D. Davies, "Paul and the Law : Reflections on Pitfalls in Interpretation", in Jewish and Pauline Studies (Philadelphia, 1980), 91-122 = Hastings Journal 29 (1978), 1459-1504

W.D. Davies, "Paul and the People of God", Jewish and Pauline Studies (Philadelphia, 1984), 123-152

W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (Philadelphia, 1980)

W.D. Davies, "Paul: From the Semitic Point of View", L. Finkelstein and W. D. Davies (eds.), Cambridge History of Judaism (Cambridge), Vol. 2, MS 1-60

L. de Lorenzi (ed.), Freedom and Love : The Guide for Christian Life (I Cor. 8-10; Rom. 14-15) (Rome, 1981)

L. de Lorenzi (ed.) Israelfrage nach Röm 9-11 (Rome, 1977)

R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel (New York and Toronto, 1965), Vols. 1-2

E. de Witt Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians (Edinburgh, 1921)

E. de Witt Burton, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek (Edinburgh, 1976)

M. Delcor, Les Hymnes de Qumrân (Paris, 1962)

S. Demke, "Ein Gott und viele Herren", EvTh 36 (1976), 473-84

A.M. Denis, "L'investiture de la fonction apostolique par 'apocalypse'. Étude thématique de Gal. 1, 16", RB 64 (1957), 335-362

J. Denny, "St. Paul's Letter to the Romans" in The Expositor's Greek Testament (Grand Rapids, 1974)

C.E. DeVries, "Paul's Cutting Remarks about a Race: Gal. 5: 1-12" in G. Hawthorne (ed.) Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation (Grand Rapids, 1975), 115-120

M. Dibelius, An die Thessalonicher I.II an die Philipper (Tübingen, 1937)

M. Dibelius and H. Greeven, James (Philadelphia, 1975)

G. Didier, Désintéressement du Chrétien (Paris, 1955)

W. Dietrich, P. Freimark & H. Schreckenberg (eds.), Festgabe fur K.H. Rengstorf zum 70. Geburtstag, (Theokratia 2) (Leiden, 1973)

C. Dietzfelbinger, Paulus und das Alte Testament (Munich, 1961)

C.H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (London, 1932)

J.W. Doeve, "Some Notes with Reference to τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ in Romans 3.2", Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan septuagenarii (Haarlem, 1953), 111-123

T. L. Donaldson, "The Curse of the Law and the Inclusion of Gentiles: Gal. 3. 13-14", NTS 32 (1986), 94-112

K.P. Donfried, "The Cults of Thessalonica and the Thessalonian Correspondence", in NTS 31 (1985), 336-356

K.P. Donfried, "Justification and Last Judgement in Paul", ZNW 67 (1976), 90-110

K.P. Donfried, "Paul and Judaism: 1 Thess. 2. 13-16 as a Test Case", Int 38 (1984), 242-253

K. Dover, Greek Popular Morality (Oxford, 1974)

K. Dover, Greek Homosexuality (London, 1978)

J.W. Drane, "The Religious Background", New Testament Interpretation, I.H. Marshall (ed.) (Exeter, 1977), 117-125

F. Dreyfus, "Le passé et le présent d'Israel (Rom. 9, 1-5; 11, 1-24)" in L. de Lorenzi (ed.), Die Israelfrage nach Rom 9-11 (Rome, 1977), 131-139

G.S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians (London, 1934)

J.D.G. Dunn, "The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2.11-18)", JSNT 18 (1983), 3-57

J.D.G. Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul", BJRL 65 (1983), 95-122

J.D.G. Dunn, "Paul's Epistle to the Romans : An Analysis", in W. Haase (ed.) Aufstieg und Niedergang römischen Welt (Berlin & New York, 1987), 25.4, 2842-2890

J.D.G. Dunn, Romans (Dallas, 1988), Vols. 1-2

J.D.G. Dunn, "2 Cor. 111.17 - The Lord is the Spirit", JTS 21 (1970), 309-20

J.D.G. Dunn, Unity and Diversity in the New Testament (Philadelphia, 1977)

J.D.G. Dunn, "Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3. 10-14)", NTS 31 (1985), 523-542

J. Dupont, "The Conversion of Paul, and Its Influence on His Understanding of Salvation by Faith", in W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin (eds.), Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F. F. Bruce (Exeter, 1970), 183-91

J. Dupont, Gnosis (Louvain and Paris, 1949)

A.-M. Durbarle, "Paul et l' antiféminisme" Revue des Sciences Philos. et Theol. 60 (1976), 261-280

M. Duschak, Josephus Flavius und die Tradition (Wien, 1864)

B.S. Easton, "New Testament Ethical Lists", in JBL 51 (1932), 1-12

G. Ebling, The Truth of the Gospel: An Exposition of Galatians (Philadelphia, 1985)

J. Eckert, Die urchristliche Verkündigung im Streit zwischen Paulus und seinen Gegern nach dem Galaterbrief (Regensburg, 1971)

A. Edersheim, "Josephus" in W. Smith and H. Wace (eds.), A Dictionary of Christian Biography (London, 1882), 441-460

E.E. Ellis, "Paul and His Opponents : Trends in Research" in J. Neusner (ed.), Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty (Leiden, 1975), Vol. 1, 264-298

E.E. Ellis and E. Grässer (eds.), Jesus und Paulus, Festschrift für W. G. Kümmel (Göttingen, 1975)

W. Eltester (ed.), Apophoreta Festschrift fur E. Haenchen (Berlin, 1964)

E.J. Epp, "Jewish-Gentile Continuity in Paul: Torah and/or Faith? (Romans 9:1-5)", in G.W.E. Nickelsburg and G.W. MacRae (eds.), Christians Among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl on His Sixty-fifth Birthday (Philadelphia, 1986), 80-90

I. Epstein, Judaism (London, 1979)

L.M. Epstein, Sex Laws and Customs in Judaism (New York, 1948)

P.F. Esler, Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts (Cambridge, 1987)

P. Ewald (G. Wohlenberg), Der Brief des Paulus an die Philipper (Leizig, 1923)

W.R. Farmer, Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus (New York, 1956)

G. Fee, "Εἰδωλόθυτα Once Again : An Interpretation of I Corinthians 8-10", Bib 61 (1980), 172-197

G. Fee, The First Epistle to the Corinthians (London, 1987)

G. Fee, "II Corinthians and Food Offered to Idols", NTS 23 (1977), 140-161

H. Feld, "Christus Diener der Sünde", ThQ 153 (1973), 119-131

D.M. Feldman, Birth Control in Jewish Law (New York & London, 1973)

D.M. Feldman, Marital Relations, Birth Control and Abortion in Jewish Law (New York, 1974)

L.H. Feldman, "Flavius Josephus Revisited : The Man, His Writings, and His Significance," in H. Temporini and W. Hasse (eds.), Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, Vol. 21.2 (Berlin and New York, 1984), 763-862

L.H. Feldman, "Hellenization in Josephus' Portrayal of Man's Decline", in J. Neusner (ed.), Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of E.R. Goodenough (Leiden, 1968), 336-353

L.H. Feldman (trans. & ed.), Josephus (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), Vol. 9

L.H. Feldman, "Josephus' Agreements and Disagreements with the Rabbis", in W. Haase (ed.), Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin and New York, forthcoming), MS 68-100

L.H. Feldman, Josephus and Modern Scholarship (Berlin & New York, 1984)

L.H. Feldman, & G. Hata (eds.), Josephus, Judaism and Christianity (Detroit, 1987)

A. Feuillet, "Loi ancienne et Morale chrétienne d'après l'Épître aux Romains NRT 92 (1970), 785-805

F. Filson, St. Paul's Conception of Recompense (Leipzig, 1931)

L. Finkelstein, Mabo le-massektot Abot ve-Abot d'Rabbi Natan (New York, 1950)

L. Finkelstein and W.D. Davies (eds.), Cambridge History of Judaism (Cambridge, forthcoming), Vol. 2

T.M. Finn, "The God-fearers Reconsidered", CBQ 47 (1985), 75-84

J. Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke I-IX (Garden City, N.Y. 1981), Vol. 1

F. Flückiger, "Die Werke des Gesetzes bei den Heiden" TZ 8 (1952), 17-42

F. Flückiger, "Zur Untersheidung von Heiden and Juden in Rom. 1, 18-23" TZ 10 (1954), 154-8

F. J. Foakes-Jackson, Josephus and the Jews (London, 1930)

F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity (London, 1920), Vol. 1

C. Forbes, "Comparison, Self Praise and Irony: Hellenistic Rhetoric and the Boasting of Paul", NTS 32 (1986), 1-30

G. Forkman, The Limits of the Religious Community (Lund, 1972)

R. Fortna and B. Gaventa (eds.) Studies in honor of J. L. Martyn (Nashville, 1990)

J.E. Frame, A Critical and Exegetical Coommentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians (Edinburgh, 1946)

B. Frankel, "Schutzschrift des Josephus Flavius gegen Apion", Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, Vol. 1 (1852), 7-21; 41-55; 81-120; 121-145

P.M. Fraser, Ptolemic Alexandria (Oxford, 1972), Vol. 2

D.N. Freedman (ed.), The Anchor Bible Dictionary (Nashville, 1990)

G. Friedrich, Der Brief an die Philipper (Tübingen and Göttingen, 1962)

G. Friedrich, "Die erste an die Thessalonicher", in Die Brief an die Galater, Epheser, Philipper, Kolosser, Thessalonicher und Philemon (Göttingen, 1976)

G. Friedrich, "Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief" in O. Betz, M. Hengel & P. Schmidt (eds.), Abraham unser Vater, Festschrift für O. Michel (Leiden, 1963), 181-215

P. Fredriksen, "Jewish Restoration Eschatology" read at the NT Seminar, Oxford on 15 June 1989, MS 1-7

D. P. Fuller, "Paul and the Works of the Law'", Westminster Theological Journal 38 (1975-6), 28-42

V.P. Furnish, "The Place and Purpose of Philippians III", NTS 10 (1963-4), 80-88

V.P. Furnish, II Corinthians (Garden City, NY, 1984)

V.P. Furnish, Theology and Ethics in Paul (Nashville, 1968)

W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin (eds.), Apostolic History and the Gospel : Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce (Exeter, 1970)

L. Gaston, "Israel's Enemies in Pauline Theology", NTS 28 (1982), 400-423

L. Gaston, "Paul and the Law in Galatians 2 - 3", in P. Richardson (ed.), Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity (Waterloo: Ontario, 1986), Vol. 1, 37-57

L. Gaston, Paul and the Torah (Vancouver, 1987)

D. Georgi, Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief (Neukirchen, 1964)

D. Georgi, The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians (Edinburgh, 1987)

H. Gese, τὸ δὲ Ἁγὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ Vom Sinai zum Zion (Münich, 1974), 49-62

C.H. Giblin, "Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul", CBQ 37 (1975), 527-47

D.H. Gill, "TRAPEZOMETA : A Neglected Apsect of Greek Sacrifice", HTR 67 (1974), 117-137

J. Gnilka, Der Philipperbrief (Freiburg, Basel, Vienna, 1968)

J. Gnilka, "Die antipaulinische Mission in Philippi", BZ 9 (1965), 258-276

F. Godet, St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians (Edinburgh, 1886-7), Vol. 2

J. Goettsberger, "Die Hülle des Moses nach Ex. 34 und 2 Kor. 3", BZ 16 (1922-4), 1-17

A. Goldberg, Untersuchungen über die Vorstellung von der Schekhinah in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur (Berlin, 1969)

E.R. Goodenough, "Paul and the Hellenization of Christianity", (completed with A.T. Kraabel), in J. Neusner (ed.), Religions in Antiquity, Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough (Leiden, 1968), 23-68

L. Goppelt, Theology of the New Testament (Grand Rapids, 1982)

L. Goppelt, Typos (Gütersloh, 1939)

R. M. Grant, Letter and Spirit (London, 1957)

K. Grayston, "The Opponents in Philippians 3", ExpT 97 (1986), 170-172

A. Green (ed.), Jewish Spirituality : From the Bible Through the Middle Ages (London, 1989)

W.S. Green, Approaches to Ancient Judaism (Missoula, MT, 1978)

K. Grobel, "A Chiastic Retribution-Formula in Romans 2", Zeit und Geschichte. Dangesgabe an R. Bultmann zum 80 Geburtstag, E. Dinkler (ed.) (Tübingen, 1964), 255-261

W. Grundmann, "Paulus, Aus dem Völke Israel, Apostel der Volker", NovT 4 (1960), 267-291

J.J. Gunther, St. Paul's Opponents and their Background (Leiden, 1973)

H. Guttmann, Die Darstellung der jüdischen Religion bei Flavius Josephus (Breslau, 1928)

J. Héring, The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians (London, 1962)

K. Haacker, "Die Berufung des Verfolgers und die Rechtfertigung des Gottlosen", Theologische Beiträge 6 (1975), 1-19

W. Haase (ed.), Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin and New York), Vols. 19.1 (1979), 19.2 (1978), 25.1 (1982), 25.4 (1987)

M. Hadas, Hellenistic Culture (New York, 1959)

D. Hagner, "Paul in Modern Jewish Thought", in D.A. Hagner and M.J. Harris (eds.) Pauline Studies: Essays presented to F. F. Bruce (London and Grand Rapids, 1980), 143-59

D.A. Hagner and M. J. Harris (eds.), Pauline Studies: Essays presented to F. F. Bruce (London and Grand Rapids, 1980)

F. Hahn, "The Confession of One God in the New Testament", HBT 2 (1980), 69-84

F. Hahn, "Das Gesetzverstandnis im Römer und Galaterbrief", ZNW 67 (1976-77), 29-63

F. Hahn, "Gen. 15.6 im Neuen Testament" in H. W. Wolff (ed.), Probleme biblischer Theologie, für Gerhard von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag (Münich, 1971), 90-107

S. Hahn "Josephus on Prayer in c.Ap. II. 197", Études orientales à la mémoire de P. Hirschler (Budapest, 1950), 111-115

D.R. Hall, "Rom. 3. 1-8 Reconsidered", NTS 29 (1983), 183-197

J. Hall, "Paul, the Lawyer, on Law", The Journal of Law and Religion 3 (1985), 331-379

A. Hamel, Über römisches Recht im Galaterbrief (Essen, 1895)

R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs (eds.), Jews, Greeks and Christians : Studies in Honor of W.D. Davies (Leiden, 1976)

A.T. Hanson, Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology (London, 1974)

R.P.C. Hanson, Allegory and Event (London, 1959)

D.R.A. Hare, The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St. Matthew (London and New York, 1967)

M.J. Harris, Raised Immortal (London, 1983)

A.E. Harvey, "Forty Strokes Save One: Social Aspects of Judaizing and Apostasy", in A. E. Harvey (ed.), Alternative Approaches to New Testament Study (London, 1985), 79-96

A.E. Harvey (ed.), Alternative Aproaches to New Testament Study (London, 1985)

G. Hasel, The Remnant (Berrien Springs, 1974)

G. Hawthorne, Philippians (Waco (TX), 1983)

G. Hawthorne (ed.) Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation (Grand Rapids, 1975)

D.M. Hay, "What is Proof?--Rhetorical Verification in Philo, Josephus and Quintilian", in G. MacRae (ed.), Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers, Vol. 2, (Missoula, MT, 1979), 87-100

R.B. Hays, The Faith of Jesus Christ, (Chico, 1982)

R. Heiligenthal, "Soziologische Implikationen der paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre im Galaterbrief am Beispiel der 'Werke des Gesetzes'", Kairos 26 (1984), 38-53

I. Heinemann, Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung (Breslau, 1932)

M. Hengel, The Charismatic Leader and His Followers (Edinburgh, 1981)

M. Hengel, The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century after Christ (London & Philadelphia, 1989)

M. Hengel, Die Zeloten (Leiden, 1961)

M. Hengel, Between Jesus to Paul (London, 1983)

M. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism (Philadelphia, 1974)

M. Hengel, "Zwischen Jesus und Paulus. Die 'Hellenisten', die 'Sieben' und Stephanus (Apg. 6, 1-15, 7, 54-8, 3)", ZTK 72 (1975), 151-206

P. Henry, New Directions in the New Testament (Philadelphia, 1979)

J. Héring, The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians (London, 1962)

M.D. Herr, "Oral Torah", Enc. Jud. Vol. 12, 1439-1442

J.H. Hertz, The Pentateuch and the Haftorahs (London, 1936), Vol. 5

J.W. Hewitt, "Gratitude to Parents in Greek and Romans Literature", American Journal of Philology 52 (1931), 30-48

T. Holtz, "Der Antiochenische Zwischenfall (Galater 2. 11-14)", NTS 32 (1986), 344-61

T. Holtz, Der erste Briefe an die Thessalonicher (Zürich/Koln, 1986)

G. Honnicke, "Paulus und Josephus", Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift 29 (1909), 650-654

M.D. Hooker, "Beyond the Things that are Written: St. Paul's use of Scripture", NTS 27 (1981), 295-309

M.D. Hooker, "Paul and 'Covenantal Nominism'", in eds. M.D. Hooker and S.G. Wilson, Paul and Paulinism: Essays in honour of C.K. Barrett (London, 1982), 47-56

M.D. Hooker, "ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ", NTS 35 (1989), 321-342

M.D. Hooker and S.G. Wilson (eds.), Paul and Paulinism: Essays in honour of C. K. Barrett (London, 1982)

G.H.R. Horsley, New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity (North Ryde, NSW, Australia, 1981)

G. Howard, Paul: Crisis in Galatia (Cambridge, 1979)

G. Howard, "Romans 3. 21-31 and the Inclusion of the Gentiles", HTR 63 (1970), 223-233

H. Hübner, "Das ganze und das ein Gesetz", KD 21 (1975), 239-256

H. Hübner, "Gal 3,10 und die Herkunft des Paulus", KD 19 (1973), 215-231

H. Hübner, Gottes Ich und Israel (Göttingen, 1984)

H. Hübner, "Identitätsverlust und paulinische Theologie", KD 24 (1978), 181-193

H. Hübner, Law in Paul's Thought (Edinburgh, 1984)

H. Hübner, "Pauli Theologiae Proprium", NTS 26 (1980), 445-73

N. Hugedé, La Métaphore du miroir dans les Épîtres de saint Paul aux Corinthiens (Neuchâtel and Paris, 1957)

A.J. Hultgren, "Paul's Pre-Christian Persecutions of the Church: Their Purpose, Locale, and Nature" JBL 95 (1976), 97-111

J.C. Hurd, The Origin of 1 Corinthians (London, 1965)

A. Jaubert, La Notion d'alliance dans le judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne (Paris, 1963)

J. Jensen, "Does Porneia Mean Fornication? A Critique of Bruce Malina", in NovT 20 (1978), 161-184

J. Jeremias, "Chiasmus in den Paulusbriefen" ZNW 49 (1958), 145-156

J. Jeremias, "Einige vorwiegend sprachliche Beobachtungen zu Röm 11.25-36", in L. de Lorenzi (ed.), Israelfrage nach Röm 9-11 (Rome, 1977), 193-203

J. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations (London and Nashville, 1958)

J. Jeremias, "Zur Gedankenführung in den paulinischen Briefen", J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik (eds.), Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan septuagenarii (Haarlem, 1953), 146-54

R. Jewett, "The Agitators and the Galatian Congregation", NTS 17 (1970-1), 198-212

R. Jewett, "Conflicting Movements in the Early Church", NovT 12 (1970), 362-390

L. T. Johnson, The Writings of the New Testament (Philadelphia, 1986)

M. D. Johnson, The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies (Cambridge, 1969)

W.H.S. Jones, Pausanias' Description of Greece (London, 1918)

J. Jortin, "Josephus and St. Paul", Journal of Sacred Literature 13 (1854), 166-169

E. A. Judge, "Paul's Boasting in Relation to Contemporary Professional Practice", ABR 16 (1968), 37-50

P. Jung, "Das paulinische Vokabular in Gal 3, 6-14", Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 74 (1952), 439-449

M. Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind (New York, 1965)

E. Kamlah, Die Form der katalogischen Paranese im Neuen Testament (Tübingen, 1964)

E. Kamlah, "Frömmigkeit und Tugend: Die Gesetzesapologie des Josephus in C. Ap. 2, 145-295", in 0. Betz, K. Haacker and M. Hengel, (eds.), Josephus-Studien, Festschrift für 0. Michel (Göttingen, 1974), 220-232

E. Käsemann, Commentary on Romans (London, 1980)

E. Käsemann, "Die Legitimitat des Paulus. Eine Untersuchung zu II Korinther 10-13", ZNW 41 (1942), 33-71

E. Käsemann, Essays on New Testament Themes (London, 1964)

E. Käsemann, New Testament Questions for Today (London, 1969)

H.A.A. Kennedy, New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism (Chapel Hill, 1984)

H.A.A. Kennedy, The Epistle to the Philippians (Grand Rapid, 1974)

R. Kerst, "1 Kor 8.6 - ein vorpaulinisches Taufbekenntnis', ZNW 66 (1975), 130-9

K. Kertelge, "Rechtfertigung" bei Paulus (Münster, 1967)

R. Kieffer, Foi et Justification à Antioche (Paris, 1982)

S. Kim, The Origin of Paul's Religion (Tübingen, 1981)

C.-N. Kim, Der Kampf des Paulus fur das Evangelium in Galatien (diss. Mainz, 1984)

C.-N. Kim, "The Papyrus Invitation", JBL (1975), 391-402

A.F.J. Klijn, "Paul's Opponents in Philippians III", NovT 7 (1964), 278-284

W.F. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles (Cambridge, 1939)

W.F. Knox, St. Paul and the Churches of Jerusalem (Cambridge, 1925)

H. Koester, " 'Gnomai Diaphoroi'. The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity", HTR 58 (1965), 279-318

H. Koester, "Häretiker im Christientum" in RGG Vol. 3, 17-21

H. Koester, "The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment (Philippians III)", NTS 8 (1961-2), 317-332

H. Koester, "Thessalonians - Experiment in Christian Writing" in Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History, Essays Presented to George Hunston Williams on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday (Leiden, 1979), 33-44

A. Konig, "Gentiles, or Gentile Christians? On the meaning of Rom. 2.12-16", Journal of Theology for South Africa 15 (1976), 53-60

A.T. Kraabel, "The Disappearance of the God-fearers", Numen 28 (1981), 113-126

A.T. Kraabel, "Paganism and Judaism: The Sardis Evidence" in A. Benoit, M. Philoneko and C. Vogel (eds.), Paganisme, Judaisme, Christianisme. Influences et Affrontements dans le Monde Antique: (Mélanges offerts à M. Simon) (Paris, 1978), 13-33

A.T. Kraabel, "Unity and Diversity among Diaspora Synagogues", in L.I. Levine (ed.), The Synagogue in Late Antiquity (Philadelphia, 1987), 49-60

W. Kramer, Christ, Lord, Son of God (London, 1966)

P. Kruger, Philo und Josephus als Apologeten des Judentums (Leipzig, 1906)

E. Kühl, Zur paulinischen Theodicee (Göttingen, 1887)

H.-W. Kuhn, "Jesus als Gekreuzigter in der frühchristlichen Verkündigung bis zur Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts" ZTK 72 (1975), 1-46

O. Kuss, Der Römerbrief (Regensburg), 1957, Vols. 1-2

F. Lacan, "Le Dieu unique et son médiateur, Gal 3, 20", in L'Homme devant Dieu, Mélanges Henri de Lubac (Paris, 1964), Vol. 1, 113-125

M.-J. Lagrange, Evangile selon Saint Luc (Paris, 1921)

M.-J. Lagrange, Saint Paul Épître aux Galates (Paris, 1942)

M.-J. Lagrange, Saint Paul Épître aux Romains (Paris, 1950)

J. Lambrecht, "Abraham, notre père à tous': La Figure d'Abraham dans les Écrits pauliniens" in P.M. Bogaert (ed.), Abraham dans la Bible et dans la tradition juive (Louvain, 1977), 118-157

J. Lambrecht, "Structure and Line of Thought in 2 Cor. 2.14-4.6", Bib 64 (1983), 344-380

J. Lambrecht, "Transformation in 2 Cor. 3,18", Bib 64 (1983), 243-254

E. Larsson, "Die Hellenisten und die Urgemeinde", NTS 33 (1987), 205-225

F. Laub, Eschatologische Verkündigung und Lebensgestaltung nach Paulus. Eine Untersuchung zum Wirken des Apostels beim der Gemeide in Thessalonike (Regensburg, 1973)

R. Le Deaut, "Traditions targumiques dans le Corpus Paulinien?", Bib 42 (1961), 37-43

F.J. Leenhardt, The Epistles to the Romans (London, 1962)

H. J. Leon, The Jews of Ancient Rome (Philadelphia, 1960)

L.I. Levine (ed.), The Synagogue in Late Antiquity (Philadelphia, 1987)

H.D. Liddell and R. Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, rev. by H.S. Jones (Oxford, 1940)

H. Lietzmann, An die Galater (Tübingen, 1932)

H. Lietzmann, An die Korinther I.II. (Tübingen, 1969)

H. Lietzmann, An die Römer (Göttingen, 1933)

J.B. Lightfoot, Notes on Epistles of St. Paul (London, 1904),

J. B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistles to the Galatians (London, 1896)

J. B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians (London, 1890)

B. Lindars (ed.), Law and Religion (Cambridge, 1988)

E.A. Livingstone (ed.), Studia Biblica 1978 III (Sheffield, 1980)

E. Lohmeyer, Der Brief an die Philipper (Göttingen, 1964)

R. Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period (Grand Rapids, 1977)

G. Lüdemann, Paulus und das Judentum (Münich, 1983)

D. Lührmann, Das Offenbarungenverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden (Neukirchen, 1965)

D. Lührmann, Der Brief an die Galater (Zürich, 1978)

D. Lührmann, "Paul and the Pharisaic Tradition", JSNT 36 (1989), 75-94

D. Lührmann, "Tage, Monate, Jahreszeiten, Jahre (Gal 4.10)", in R. Albertz et al., Werken und Wirken des Alten Testament (Göttingen, 1980), 428-445

W. Lutgert, Die Vollkommenenim Philipperbrief und die Enthusiasten in Thessalinsich (Gütersloh, 1909)

W. Lutgert, Freiheitspredigt und Schwarmgeister in Korinth : Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik der Christuspartei (Gütersloh, 1908)

W. Lutgert, Gesetz und Geist : Eine Untersuchung zur Vorgeschichte des Galaterbriefs (Gütersloh, 1919)

M. Luther, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (London, 1953)

U. Luz, Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus (Münich, 1968)

U. Luz, "Der alte und der neue Bund bei Paulus und im Hebräerbrief", EvTh 27 (1967), 318-336

U. Luz, review of Hübner, Law in TZ 35 (1979), 121-3

G. Lyons, Pauline Autobiography: Towards a New Understanding (Atlanta, 1985)

H. Lyungmann, Das Gesetz erfüllen (Lund, 1954)

H. Maccoby, "Jacob Neusner's Mishnah", Midstream 30 (1984), 24-32

H. Maccoby, Judaism in the First Century (London, 1989)

G. MacRae (ed.), Society of Biblical Literature 1975 Seminar Papers (Missoula, MT, 1975)

F.W. Maier, Israel in der Heilsgeschichte nach Röm 9-11 (Münster, 1929)

J. Mann, "Rabbinic Studies of the Synoptic Gospels", HUCA 1 (1924), 323-355

T. W. Manson, "St. Paul's Letter to the Romans--and Others", Studies in the Gospels and Epistles (Manchester, 1962), 225-241

A. Marmorstein, The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God (New York, 1968)

A. Marmorstein, "The Unity of God in Rabbinic Literature", HUCA 1 (1924), 467-499

I. H. Marshall, 1 and 2 Thessalonians (Grand Rapids and London, 1983)

I. H. Marshall, The Gospel of Luke (Exeter, 1978)

I. H. Marshall, Last Supper and Lord's Supper (Exeter, 1980)

P. Marshall, Enmity in Corinth (Tübingen, 1987)

R.P. Martin, Philippians (London, 1976)

R.P. Martin, Reconciliation (London, 1981), 29-30

R.P. Martin, 2 Corinthians (Waco (TX), 1986)

J.L. Martyn, "A Law-Observant Mission to the Gentiles: The Background to Galatians", Michigan Quarterly Review 22 (1983), 230-35 = SJT 38 (1985), 307-24

W. Marxsen, Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher (Zürich, 1979)

S.N. Mason, "Was Josephus a Pharisee? A Re-Examination of Life 10-12", JJS 40 (1989), 31-45

C. Masson, Les deux Epîtres de Saint Paul aux Thessaloniciens (Neuchâtel and Paris, 1957)

L. Mattern, Das Verständnis des Gerichts bei Paulus (Zürich and Stuttgart, 1966)

U. Mauser, "Galater III.20: Universalität des Heils", NTS 13 (1966-7), 258-270

N.J. McEleney, "Conversion, Circumcision and the Law", NTS 20 (1973-4), 319-341

N.J. McEleney, "Orthodoxy in Judaism of the First Christian Century", JSJ 4 (1973), 19-42

R. McL. Wilson, "Gnostics-in Galatia? in Studia Evangelica IV, F.L. Cross, (ed.) (Berlin, 1968), 358-367

C. Mearns, "The Identity of Paul's Opponents at Philippi", NTS 31 (1987), 194-204

W. Meeks, The Moral World of the First Christians (London, 1987)

W. Meeks, "Towards a Social Description of Pauline Christianity", in W. S. Green (ed.), Approaches to Ancient Judaism (Missoula, MT, 1980), 27-42

W.A. Meeks and J. Jervell (eds.), God's Christ and his People: studies in honour of N. A. Dahl (Oslo, 1977)

J. Meier and R. Brown, Antioch and Rome (New York, 1983)

B. Mengel, Studien zum Philipperbrief (Tübingen, 1982)

Ph.H Menoud, "Le sens du verbe πορθεῖν (Gal. 1, 13, 23; Acts 9, 21)", in W. Elster (ed.), Apophoreta Festschrift für E. Haenchen (Berlin, 1964), 178-186

B.M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (London and New York, 1971)

P.W. Meyer, "Romans 10.4 and the 'End' of the Law", The Divine Helmsman: Studies on God's Control of Human Events, J.L. Crenshaw and S. Sandmel (eds.) (New York, 1980), 59-78

D. W. Michaelis, Der Brief des Paulus an die Philipper (Leipzig, 1935)

O. Michel, Der Brief an die Romer (Göttingen, 1955)

O. Michel, "Fragen zu 1 Thessalonicher 2. 14-16. Antijüdische Polemik bei Paulus", in W. Eckert, N.P. Levinson, M.Stöhr (eds.), Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge (Münich, 1967), 50-59

O. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel (Gütersloh, 1929)

H.R. Moehring, "Some remarks on σάρξ (sarx) in Philippians 3:3ff", in F.L. Cross (ed.), Studia Evangelica, (Oxford, 1968), vol. 4, 432-6

A. Momigliano, "Intorno al 'Contro Apione'", in Quinto contributo alla storia degli studi classi e del mondo antico (Roma, 1975), Vol. 2, 765-784

A. Momigliano, "Un' apologia del Giudaismo : il Contro Apione' di Flavio Giuseppe", in Terzo contributo alla Storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico (Roma,

1966), Vol. 1, 513-522

A. Momigliano, "What Josephus Did Not See" in On Pagans, Jews, and Christians (Middletown, Ct., 1987), 108-19

T. Mommsen, "Die Rechtsverhältnis des Apostels Paulus", ZNW 2 (1901), 81-96

J.A. Montgomery, "The Religion of Flavius Josephus", JQR 2, (1920-1), 277-305

A.L. Moore, 1 and 2 Thessalonians (London, 1969)

G.F. Moore, "Christian Writers on Judaism", HTR 14 (1921), 197-254

G.F. Moore, Judaism (Cambridge, Mass., 1927-1930). 3 Vols.

L.L. Morris, "The Theme of Romans", in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin (eds.), Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F. F. Bruce (Leister, 1970), 249-63

L.L. Morris, The First and Second Epistle to the Thessalonians (London and Edinburgh, 1959)

B. Motzo, "Il Κατὰ Ἰουδαίων di Apione". Atti della R. Accademia delle Scienze di Torino 48 (1912-13), 459-468

C.F.D. Moule, "Once More, Who Were the Hellenists?", ExpT 70 (1958/9), 100-102

J.H. Moulton, A Grammar of the New Testament : Prolegomena (Edinburgh, 1978)

J.H. Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (London, 1914-1929)

H. Moxnes, Theology in Conflict (Leiden, 1980)

C. Müller, Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk (Göttingen, 1964)

J.G. Müller, Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion (Basel, 1877)

J. Munck, Christ and Israel (Philadelphia, 1967)

F.J. Murphy, "God in Pseudo-Philo", JSJ 19 (1988), 1-18

F.J. Murphy-O'Connor, "Freedom or the Ghetto (I Cor., VIII 1-13; X, 23-XI, I)", RB (1978), 543-574

F. Mussner, Der Galaterbrief (Freiburg, 1974)

F. Mussner, "Hagar, Sinai, Jerusalem", ThQ 135 (1955), 56-60

F. Mussner, "Theologische 'Wiedergutmachung.' Am Beispiel der Auslegung des Galaterbriefes", Freiburger Rundbrief 26 (1974), 7-11

F. Mussner, Tractate on the Jews (Philadelphia and London, 1984)

W. Neil, The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians (London, 1950)

H. Neitzel, "Zur Interpretation von Gal 2. 11-21", ThQ 163 (1983), 16-30

P. Neuenzeit, Das Herrenmahl (Münich, 1960)

V.P. Neufeld, The Earliest Christian Confession (Leiden, 1963)

J. Neusner, "The Formation of Rabbinic Judaism", in W. Haase (ed.), Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin and New York, 1978), Vol. 19.2, 3-42

J. Neusner, From Politics to Piety (Engelwood Cliffs, NJ, 1973)

J. Neusner, A History of the Mishnaic Law of Holy Things, Vol. 6 (Leiden, 1980)

J. Neusner, A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities XXII (Leiden, 1977)

J. Neusner, Judaism: The Evidence of the Mishnah (Philadelphia, 1980)

J. Neusner, Judaism and Its Social Metaphors (Cambridge, 1989)

J. Neusner, Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity (London, 1984)

J. Neusner, "The Meaning of 'Oral Torah' with Special Reference to Kelim and Ohalot", in Early Rabbinic Judaism (Leiden, 1975), 3-33

J. Neusner, The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70 (Leiden, 1971), 3 vols.

J. Neusner, "The Task of Theology in Judaism", in Methods and Meaning in Ancient Judaism (Missoula, MT, 1979), 185-200

J. Neusner, Torah (Atlanta, 1988)

J. Neusner, "The Use of the Later Rabbinic Evidence for the Study of First Century Pharisaism", in W.S. Green (ed.) Approaches to Ancient Judaism (Missoula, MT, 1978), 215-228

J. Neusner, "Varieties of Judaism in the Formative Age" in ed. A. Green Jewish Spirtuality: From the Bible Through the Middle Ages (London, 1989), 171-197

J. Neusner (ed.), Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults : Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty (Leiden, 1975)

J. Neusner, Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of E.R. Goodenough (Leiden, 1968)

J. Neusner and E. S. Fredrichs (eds.), "To See Ourselves As Others See Us" : Christians, Jews "Others" in Late Antiquity (Chico, 1985)

J. Neusner, W.S. Green and E. Fredrichs (eds.), Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era (Cambridge and New York, 1987)

M. Newton, The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul (Cambridge, 1985)

G.W.E. Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism (Cambridge, Mass., 1972)

G.W.E. Nickelsburg and G.W. MacRae (eds.), Christians Among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl on His Sixty-fifth Birthday (Philadelphia, 1986)

A. Nissen, Gott und der Nächste im antiken Judentum (Tübingen, 1974)

J. Nolland, "Uncircumcised Proselytes?", JSJ 12 (1981), 173-194

A. Oepke, Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater (Berlin, 1960)

G. E. Okeke, "1 Thess. 2. 13-16: The Fate of the Unbelieving Jews", NTS 27 (1980/1), 127-136

M. Olitzki, Flavius Josephus und die Halacha (Berlin, 1885)

J.C. O'Neill, Paul's Letter to the Romans (Baltimore, 1975)

D.W. Oosterdorf, Another Jesus (Kampen, 1967)

W.F. Orr and J.A. Walther, I Corinthians (New York, 1976)

C.D. Osburn, "The Text of I Corinthians 10.9", in E.J. Epp and G.D. Fee (eds.), New Testament Textual Criticism. Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honour of Bruce Metzger (Oxford, 1981), 201-212

L. M. Pasinya, La Notion de Nomos (Rome, 1973)

B. A. Pearson, "1 Thessalonians 2. 13-16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation", HTR 64 (1971), 79-94

S. Pedersen (ed.), Die paulinische Literatur und Theologie (Aarhus, 1980)

N. Perrin and D. C. Duling, The New Testament: An Introduction (New York, 1982)

R. Pesch, Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverständnis (Freiburg, 1978)

E. Peterson, ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ (Göttingen, 1926)

J. Piper, The Justification of God (Grand Rapids, 1983)

J. Piper, "The Righteousness of God in Romans 3. 1-8", TZ 36 (1980), 3-16

C. Plag, Israels Wege zum Heil (Stuttgart, 1969)

A. Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke (Edinburgh, 1905)

A. Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (Edinburgh, 1915)

J. S. Pobee, Persecution and Martyrdom in the Theology of Paul (Sheffield, 1985)

M. Pohlenx, "Paulus und die Stoa", ZNW 42 (1949), 69-98

F. C. Porter, "Review G.F. Moore Judaism" JR 8 (1928), 30-62

J. R. Porter, Leviticus (Cambridge, 1976)

B. Powell, Greek Inscriptions from Corinth (American Journal of Archeology, 2/7: 1903), 60-1

A. Poznanski, über die religionsphilosophischen Anschauungen des Flavius Josephus (Halle, 1887)

H. Rabinowicz, "Dietary Laws", Enc. Jud. Vol. 6, 26-45

P. Rainbow, "Monotheism and Christology in 1 Corinthians" (diss., Oxford, 1987)

H. Räisänen, "Das 'Gesetz des Glaubens' (Röm. 3.27) und das 'Gesetz des Geistes' (Röm. 8. 2)", NTS 26 (1979-80), 101-17

H. Räisänen, "Galatians 2.16 and Paul's Break with Judaism", NTS 31 (1985), 543-553

H. Räisänen, "Legalism and Salvation by the Law", in S. Pedersen (ed.), Die paulinische Literatur und Theologie (Aarhus, 1980), 63-83

H. Räisänen, Paul and the Law (Tübingen, 1983)

H. Räisänen, "Paul's Theological Difficulties with the Law" in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), Studia Biblica 1978 III (Sheffield, 1980), 301-320

H. Räisänen, "Römer 9 - 11: Analyse eines Geistigen Ringens" in W. Haase (ed.), Aufstieg und Niedergang römischen Welt (Berlin and New York), 25.4, 2891-2939

T. Rajak, Josephus (London, 1983)

T. Rajak, "Josephus and the 'Archaeology' of the Jews", JJS 33 (1982), 465-477

William Ramsay, A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (London, 1900)

B. Reiche, "Um der Väter willen (Röm 11.28)", Judaica 14 (1958), 106-114

Th. Reinach, Flavius Josèphe: Contre Apion (Paris, 1930)

K. H. Rengstorf, A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus (Leiden, 1979), Vols. 1-3

M. Rese, "Die Rettung der Juden nach Römer 11" in A. Vanhoye (ed.), L'Apôtre Paul (Leuven, 1986), 422-430

M. Rese, "Die Vorzüge Israels in Rom. 9. 4f und Eph. 2. 12: Exegetische Anmerkungen zum Thema Kirche und Israel", TZ 31 (1975), 211-22

J. Reumann, Righteousness in the New Testament (Philadelphia and New York, 1982)

J. Reumann, "St. Paul's Use of Irony", Lutheran Quarterly 7 (1955), 140-145

P. Revel, "Some Anti-Traditional Laws of Josephus", JQR 14 (1923-4), 293-301

D. Rhodes, Israel in Revolution: 6-74 C.E. (Philadelphia, 1976)

C.T. Rhyne, Faith Establishes the Law (Chico, 1981)

E. Richards "Polemics, Old Testament and Theology. A Study of II Cor. III, I-IV, 6", RB 88 (1981), 340-367

R.R. Richards, "I Thessalonians 4.4-6" in BT 29 (1978), 245-247

P. Richardson, Israel in the Apostolic Church (Cambridge, 1969)

P. Richardson, "Judgement in Sexual Matters in I Cor. 6:1-11" in NovT 25, 1 (1983), 37-58

P. Richardson (ed.), Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity (Waterloo, 1986), Vol. 1

H. Ridderbos, St. Paul's Epistle to the Churches of Galatia (Grand Rapids, 1981),

B. Rigaux, Les épîtres aux Thessaloniciens. Etudes bibliques (Paris, 1956)

S. Riskin, "The Halakah in Josephus as Reflected in Against Apionem and the Life", (M.A. diss., Yeshiva University, New York, 1970)

M. Rissi, Die Taufe für die Toten (Zürich, 1962)

M. Rissi, Studien zum zweiten Korintherbrief (Zürich, 1969)

E. Rivkin, "Defining the Pharisees: The Tannaitic Sources" HUCA 40-1 (1969-71), 205-249

A. Robertson and A. Plummer, First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (Edinburgh, 1911)

CJ. Roetzel, "The Judgement Form in Paul's Letters", in JBL 88 (1969), 305-312

C. J. Roetzel, Judgement in the Community (Leiden, 1972)

C. J. Roetzel, The World that Shaped the New Testament (London, 1987)

H. Ronning, "Some Jewish Views of Paul", Judaica 24 (1968), 82-97

C. Rowland, Christian Origins (London, 1985)

S. Safari and M. Stern (eds.), The Jewish People in the First Century (Philadelphia and Assen, 1976), Vol. 2

A. Sand, Der Begriff "Fleisch" in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen (Regensburg, 1967)

W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Edinburgh, 1902)

E.P. Sanders, "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism", in R. Hammerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs (eds.), Jews, Greeks and Christians: Studies in Honor of W. D. Davies (Leiden, 1976), 11-44

E.P. Sanders, "Paul and Sex", a paper delivered in the NT Seminar, Oxford, 19 June 1986, MS 1-15

E.P. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism (London, 1985)

E.P. Sanders, "Jesus, Paul and Judaism", W. Haase (ed.) in Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin and New York, 1982), Vol. 25.1, 390-450

E.P. Sanders (ed.), Jewish and Christian Self Definition (London, 1981), Vol. 2

E.P. Sanders, "Jewish and Non-Jewish Elements in Paul's Theology" was given at the Third Solon Symposium, "Paul the Jew", Nov. 1988, MS 1-15

E.P. Sanders, "Jewish Association with Gentiles in Galatians 2.11-14", in R. Fortna and B. Gaventa (eds.), Studies in Honor of J.L. Martyn, (1990), MS 1-29

E.P. Sanders, "Judaism and the Grand 'Christian' Abstractions: Love, Mercy, and Grace", Int 39 (1985), 357-372

E.P. Sanders, "Law (Judaism, NT Period)", in D. N. Freedman (ed.), The Anchor Bible Dictionary, MS 1-39 (Nashville, 1990)

E.P. Sanders, "Parallels and Comparisons: Paul and Diaspora Judaism", Paper in Memory of Samuel Sandmel at the SBL Meeting, Chicago, Dec. 1984, MS 1-17

E.P.Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism (London, 1977)

E.P Sanders, Paul, the Law and the Jewish People (London, 1983)

E.P. Sanders, "Paul on the Law, His Opponents, and the Jewish People in Philippians 3 and 2 Corinthians 11" in P. Richardson (ed.), Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity (Waterloo, 1986), Vol. 1, 75-90

E.P. Sanders, Review of F. Watson, Gentiles JJS 39 (1988), 296-300

J.A. Sanders, "Torah and Christ", Int 29 (1975), 372-390

J.A. Sanders, "Torah and Paul", in W.A. Meeks and J. Jervell (eds.), God's Christ and His People : Studies in Honour of N.A. Dahl (Oslo, 1977), 132-140

J.T. Sanders, "Paul's Autobiographical Statements in Galatians 1-2", JBL 85 (1966), 335-343

S. Sandmel, The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity (New York, 1969)

S. Sandmel, The Genius of Paul (Philadelphia, 1958)

S. Sandmel, "Parallelomania", JBL 81 (1962), 1-13

S. Sandmel, Philo of Alexandria (New York and Oxford, 1979)

S. Sandmel, "Philo: The Man, His Writings, His Significance", in H. Temporini and W. Haase (eds.), Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, Vol. 21. 1 (Berlin and New York, 1984), 3-46

P. Schäfer, "Das Dogma von der mündlichen Torah im rabbinischen Judentum", in Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des Rabbinischen Judentum (Leiden, 1978), 153-197

S. Schechter, Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (New York, 1975)

L.H. Schiffman, "At the Crossroads: Tannaitic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christians Schism", in E.P. Sanders (ed.), Jewish and Christian Self Definition (London, 1981) Vol. 2, 115-156

L.H. Schiffman, Who Was A Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish Christian Schism (Hoboken, NJ, 1985)

W. H. Schinz, Die christliche Gemeinde zu Philippi (Zürich, 1833)

A. Schlatter Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus (Gütersloh, 1932)

A. Schlatter, Gottes Gerechtigkeit (Stuttgart, 1935),

H. Schlier, "Auslegung des I Thessalonicherbriefes (4:1-12)" in BibLeb 3 (1962), 240-9

H. Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater (Göttingen, 1962)

H. Schlier, Der Römerbrief (Freiburg, Basel, Wien, 1977)

H. Schlier, "Von den Juden : Römerbrief 2, 1-29" in Die Zeit der Kirche (Freiburg, 1956), 38-47

D. Schmidt, "1 Thess. 2. 13-16. Linguistic Evidence for an Interpolation", JBL 102 (1983), 269-279

H.W. Schmidt, Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer (Berlin, 1963)

K.L. Schmidt, Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kap. 9-11 des Römerbriefes (Zürich, 1947)

W. Schmithals, "Die Irrlehrer des Philipper-briefes", ZTK 54 (1957), 297-341

W. Schmithals, "The False Teachers of the Epistle to the Philippians" in Paul and the Gentiles (Nashville, 1972).

W. Schmithals, Gnosticism in Corinth (Nashville and New York, 1971)

W. Schmithals, "The Heretics in Galatia" in Paul and the Gnostics (Nashville,1972), 13-64 (revised ET from "Die Häretiker in Galatien") ZNW 47 (1956), 25-67

W. Schmithals, "Paul and the Gnostics -- in Galatia", Studia Evangelica IV, F.L. Cross (ed.), (TU 102) (Berlin, 1968), 358-367

O. Schmitz, Abraham im Spätjudentum und im Christentum (Stuttgart, 1922)

E. J. Schnabel, Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul (Tübingen, 1985)

R. Schnackenburg, The Gospel According to St. John (New York, 1982), Vol. 1

N. Schneider, Die Rhetorische Eigenart der Paulinishen Antithese (Tübingen, 1970)

J. Schniewind, "Die Leugner der Auferstehung in Korinth", in E. Kähler, Nachgelassene Reden und Aufsätze (Berlin, 1952), 110-139

H.J. Schoeps, Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History (London, 1961)

W. Schrage, The Ethics of the New Testament (Edinburgh, 1988)

H. Schreckenberg, Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus (Leiden, 1977)

H. Schreckenberg, "The Works of Josephus and the Early Christian Church", in L. Feldman and G. Hata (eds.), Josephus, Judaism and Christianity (Detroit, 1987), 315-324K.

K. Schubert, "Die Entwicklung der Auferstehungslehre von der nachexilischen bis zur frührabbinischen Zeit", BZ NF 6 (1962), 177-214

E. Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, Vols. 1 & 2 rev. ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Black (Edinburgh, 1973, 1979), Vols. 3.1 & 3.2 rev. ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Goodman (Edinburgh, 1986, 1987)

S. Schulz, "Die Decke des Moses: Untersuchungen zu einer vorpaulinischen überlieferung in II Cor. 3,7-8", ZNW 49 (1958), 1-30

H. Schurmann, Das Lukasevangelium (Freiburg, Basel, Wien, 1969)

D.R. Schwartz, "Josephus and Nicolaus on the Pharisees", JSJ 14 (1983), 151-171

R. Scroggs, New Testament and Homosexuality (Philadelphia, 1983)

R. Scroggs, "Paul as Rhetorician: Two Homilies in Romans 1-11," in R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs (eds.), Jews, Greeks and Christians Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Studies in Honor of W.D. Davies (Leiden, 1976), 271-298

C. Senft, La Premiere Épitre de Saint-Paul aux Corinthiens (Neuchatel, 1979)

J.N. Sevenster, The Roots of Pagan Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World (Leiden, 1975)

J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik (eds.), Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan septuagenarii (Haarlem, 1953)

R.J.H. Shutt, "The Concept of God in the Works of Flavius Josephus", JJS 31 (1980), 171-189

R.J.H. Shutt, Studies in Josephus (London, 1961)

F. Sieffert, Der Brief an die Galater (Göttingen, 1899)

F. Siegert, Argumentation bei Paulus (Tübingen, 1985)

L. Silbermann, "God: Justice and Mercy", Enc. Jud. Vol.7, 669-670

M. Simon, Jewish Sects in the Time of Jesus (Philadelphia, 1967)

M. Simon, Verus Israel (Oxford, 1986)

E. M. Smallwood, "Domitian's Attitude toward the Jews and Judaism", Classical Philology 51 (1956), 1-13

J. Smit, "The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: A Deliberative Speech", NTS 35 (1989), 7-26

M. Smith, "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century", M. Davis (ed.), in Israel: Its Role in Civilzation (New York, 1956), 67-81

M. Smith "Zealots and Sicarii : The Origins and Relations", HTR 64 (1971), 1-19

W. Smith and H. Wace (eds.), A Dictionary of Christian Biography (London, 1882)

K.R. Snodgrass, "Justification by Grace - to the Doers : An Analysis of the Place of Romans 2 in the Theology of Paul", NTS 32 (1986), 72-93

B. Solomensen, "Some Remarks on the Zealots with Special Regard to the term Qannaim in Rabbinic Literature", NTS 12 (1965-6), 164-176

D. Sperber, "Gentile", Enc. Jud. Vol 7, 410-414

C. Spicq, Agapé dans le Nouveau Testament (Paris, 1958)

C. Spicq, "Ἀμεταμέλητος dans Rom 11.29", RB 67 (1960), 210-9

St. John Chrysostom, Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians and Homilies on the Epistle to the Ephesians (Oxford, 1890)

R. St. J. Parry, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (Cambridge, 1926)

A. Stegmann, "Gal. 3,20", BZ 22 (1934), 30-42

A. Stegemann, "Der Neue Bund im Alten : zum Schriftverstähdnis des Paulus in II Cor. 3", TZ 42 (1986), 97-114

M. Stern, "The Jews in Greek and Latin Literature", in S. Safrai and M. Stern (eds.), The Jewish People in the First Century (Philadelphia and Assen, 1976), Vol. 2, 1101-59

M. Stern, Josephus and the Roman Empire (Haifa, 1981)

V. Stolle, "Die Eins in Gal. 3, 15-29", in W.Dietrich, P. Freimark, and H. Schreckenburg (eds.), Festgabe für K.H. Rengstorf zum 70. Geburtstag, (Theokratia 2) (Leiden, 1973), 204-213

M.E. Stone (ed.), Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period (Assen and Philadelphia, 1984), Vol. 2.

S.K. Stowers, The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans (Chico, 1981)

S.K. Stowers, "Paul's Dialogue with a Fellow Jew in Romans 3.1-9", CBQ 46 (1984), 707-22

H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash (Münich, 1922-28), 5 Vols.

P. Stuhlmacher, "Das Ende des Gesetzes", ZTK 67 (1970), 14-39

P. Stuhlmacher, Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus (Göttingen, 1966)

P. Stuhlmacher, "Zur Interpretation von Römer 11. 25-32", in H.W. Wolff (ed.), Probleme biblischer Theologie, Festschrift für G. von Rad (Münich, 1971), 555-570

J.P.M. Sweet, "The Zealots and Jesus" in E. Bammel and C.F.D. Moule, (eds.), Jesus and the Politics of His Day (Cambridge, 1984), 1-9

F.C. Synge, "The Meaning of προεχόμεθα in Romans 3.9" Exp. Times 80 (1970), 351

E. Synofzik, Die Gericht-und Vergeltungsaussagen bei Paulus (Göttingen, 1977)

W.W. Tarn with G. T. Griffith, Hellenistic Civilization (New York, 1952)

I. Ta-Shma, "Abraham" Enc. Jud. Vol. 2, 111-117

J.M. Taylor, "The Function of πιστις χριστου in Galatians", JBL 85 (1966), 58-76

V.A. Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews (New York, 1970)

V.A. Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered", Symbolae R. Taubenschlag dedicatae III (Warsaw, 1957), 169-193

H. Temporini, Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin and New York), 21.1 (1987), 21.2 (1984)

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), trans. by G. Bromley (Grand Rapids, 1964-1976), 10 Vols.

G. Theissen, The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity (Edinburgh, 1982)

K. J. Thomas, "Covenant in Relation to Hagar and Ishmael in Galatians", Bib. Trans. 37 (1986), 445-446

R.W. Thompson, "Paul's Double Critque of Jewish Boasting: A Study of Rom. 3.27 in Its Context," Bib 67 (1986), 520-31

M. Thrall, "The Pauline Use of συνείδησις", NTS 14 (1967/8), 122

W. Thüsing, Per Christum in Deum (Münster, 1965)

A.A. Trites, Witness in the New Testament (Cambridge, 1977)

L. Troianai, Commento storico al 'Contro Apione' di Giuseppe (Pisa, 1975)

N. Turner, A Grammar of New Testament Greek (Edinburgh, 1963), Vol. 3

J.B. Tyson, "Paul's Opponents in Galatia", NovT 10 (1968), 241-254

J.B. Tyson, "Paul's Opponents in Philippi" Perspectives in Religious Studies 3 (1976), 82-95

J.B. Tyson, " 'Works of Law' in Galatians", JBL 92 (1973), 423-431

H. Ulonska, "Christen und Heiden. Die paulinische Paranese in I Thessalonians 4, 3-8", in TZ 43 (1987), 210-218

E.E. Urbach, "Halakhah and History", in R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs (eds.), Jews, Greeks and Christians - Essays in Honor of W.D. Davies (Leiden, 1976), 112-128

E.E. Urbach, The Sages (Jerusalem, 1975), Vol. 1

W.C. van Unnik "Het godspredikaat "Het Begin en het Einde' bij Flavius Josephus en in de openbaring van Johannes", Mededelingen der Kon. Ned. van Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Lett., NS 39/1 (Amsterdam, Oxford and New York, 1976)

W.C. van Unnik, Tarsus or Jerusalem (London, 1962)

W.C. van Unnik, "With Unveiled Face: An exegesis of 2 Corinthians III 12-18", NovT 6 (1963), 153-169

P.W. van der Horst, "Pseudo-Phocylides" in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (London 1985), Vol. 2, 565-582

P.W. van der Horst, "Pseudo-Phocylides Revisited", JSP 3 (1988), 3-30

P. von der Osten-Sacken (ed.), Treue zur Thora, Festschrift für G. Harder (Berlin, 1977)

H.E. von Soden, "Sacrament and Ethics in Paul", in The Writings of St. Paul, W. Meeks (ed.) (New York, 1972), 257-68

A. Vanhoye (ed.), L'Apôtre Paul (Leuven, 1986)

A. Vanhoye, "Un médiateur des anges en Ga 3, 19-20", Bib 59 (1978), 403-11

R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel (New York and Toronto, 1965), Vol. 1

G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective (Philadelphia, 1977)

G. Vermes, "A Summary of the Law by Flavius Josephus", NovT 23 (1982), 289-303

P. Vidal-Naquet, "Du bon usage de la trahison", in P. Savinel, translation, Flavius Josèphe, La guerre des juifs (Paris, 1977), 9-115

B.I. Viviano, Study As Worship : Aboth and the New Testament (Leiden, 1976)

A. Vogtle, Die Tugend und Lasterkatolge im Neuen Testament (München, 1936)

T.C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology (Oxford, 1958)

D. Walker, "The Legal Terminology in the Epistles to the Galatians", The Gift of Tongues and Other Essays (Edinburgh, 1906), 81-175

A. Wasserstein (ed.), Flavius Josephus : Selections from His Works (New York, 1974)

D.F. Watson, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians and its Implications for the Unity Question", NovT 30 (1988), 57-88

F.B. Watson, Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles (Cambridge, 1986)

E. Weber, Das Problem der Heilsgeschite nach Romer 9-11 (Leipzig, 1911)

A.J.M. Wedderburn, Baptism and Resurrection (Tübingen, 1987)

A.J.M. Wedderburn, "The Problem of the Resurrection in I Corinthians XV", NovT 23 (1981), 229-241

A.J.M. Wedderburn, The Reasons for Romans (Edinburgh, 1988)

K. Weganast, Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen (Neukirchen, 1962)

J. Weiss, "Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik", Theologische Studien B. Weiss. zu seinem 70 Geburtstage dargebract (Göttingen, 1897), 165-247

J. Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief (Göttingen, 1910)

H.D. Wendland, Ethik des Neuen Testament (Göttingen, 1970)

P. Wendland, "Die Therapeuten und die philonische Schrift vom beschaulichen Leben", Jahrbächer für class. Philol., Suppl. 22 (1896), 693-772

S. Westerholm, Israel's Law and the Churches' Faith (Exeter & Grand Rapids, 1988)

C. Westermann, Praise and Lament in the Psalms (Edinburgh, 1981)

G.P. Wetter, Der Vergeltungsgedanke bei Paulus (Göttingen, 1912)

D.E.H. Whiteley, Thessalonians (Oxford, 1969)

J. Whitton, "A Neglected Meaning for SKEUOS in I Thess. 4:4", in NTS 28 (1982), 142-143

S. Wibbing, Die tugend - und Lasterkalaloge im Neuen Testament und ihre Traditionsgeschichte (Berlin, 1959)

W. Wiefel, "Paulus in jüdischer Sicht", Judaica 31 (1975), 109-115

W. Wiefel, "Paulus und das Judentum", Die Zeichen der Zeit 40 (1986), 60-64

A. Wiener, Die jüdischen Speisegesetze nach ihren Vershiedenen Gesichtspunkten (Breslau, 1895)

U. Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer, (Zürich and Neukirchen, 1978-82), Vols. 1-3

U. Wilckens, "Die Bekehrung des Paulus als religionsgeschichtliches Problem ZTK 56 (1959), 273-293

U. Wilckens, "Was heisst bei Paulus: 'Aus Werken des Gesetzes wird kein Mensch gerecht?'", in Rechtfertigung als Freiheit: Paulusstudien (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1974), 77-109

U. Wilckens, "Zur Entwicklung des paulinischen Gesetzesverständnisses", NTS 28 (1981-2), 154-198

M. Wilcox, "Jesus in Light of his Jewish Environment", in W. Haase (ed.), Aufstieg und Niedergang der romischen Welt (Berlin and New York, 1982), Vol. 25.1, 131-195

S.K. Williams, "Righteousness of God in Romans", JBL 99 (1980), 241-90

W.L. Willis, Idol Meat in Corinth (Chico, Ca., 1985)

H. Windisch, Der zweite Korintherbrief (Göttingen, 1976)

H.W. Wolff (ed.), Probeme biblischer Theologie. Festschrift für G. von Rad (Münich, 1971)

H.A. Wolfson, Philo, (Cambridge, Mass. 1947), 2 Vols.

H.G. Wood, "The Conversion of St. Paul : Its Nature, Antecedents and Consequences", NTS 1 (1955), 276-282

N.T. Wright, "The Messiah and the People of God" (diss. Oxford, 1980)

N.T. Wright, "The Paul of History and the Apostle of Faith", Tyndale Bulletin, 29 (1978), 61-88

Y. Yadin, Masada Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand (London, 1966)

O.L. Yarbrough, Not Like the Gentiles (Atlanta, 1985)

F. Young and D.F. Ford, Meaning and Truth in 2 Corinthians (London, 1987)

P.S. Zaas, "Catalogues and Context : I Corinthians 5 and 6", NTS 34 (1988), 622-629

T. Zahn, Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer (Leipzig, 1925)

D. Zeller, Juden und Heiden in der Mission bei Paulus (Stuttgart, 1976)

I.M. Zeitlin, Jesus and the Judaism of his Time (Oxford, 1988)

I.M. Zeitlin, "Proselytes and Proselytism During the Second Commonwealth and the Early Tannaitic Period", in Studies in the Early History of Judaism II (New York, 1974), 407-417

J. Ziesler, The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul (Cambridge, 1972)