

LEGALITY AND LIBERTY

A Study of Pauline
Teaching and Practice

by

Richard N. Longenecker

A THESIS

Submitted to the Faculty of the University of Edinburgh
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Edinburgh, Scotland
1959



DEDICATED TO MY WIFE

Whose Love and Life are
a Constant Source of Strength

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is impossible to give due credit to all who have contributed to the mental and spiritual temper of a writer. But for their helpfulness in the completion of this study I desire to mention especially the members of the New Testament Faculty, New College, Edinburgh: the late-Professor William Manson, who gave the initial encouragement in the pursual of this subject; Professor James S. Stewart, whose instruction and spirit have been an inspiration; and Rev. R. A. S. Barbour, whose counsel has been invigorating without being restrictive.

My great debt to all those who have preceded me in theological studies is clearly evident; and that debt is acknowledged, though inadequately, in the footnotes.

And to the staff of New College Library, I express my appreciation for their kindly aid.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABBREVIATIONS	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
I. The purpose of this study	2
II. Principal sources	4
A. Talmudic literature	
B. Non-canonical literature	
C. Historical accounts	
D. The Pauline corpus	
CHAPTER I: THE NATURE OF SAUL'S JUDAISM	26
I. The Biographical claims and the nature of the challenge made against them	27
A. The biographical claims	
1. Hebrew of Hebrews	
2. At the feet of Gamaliel	
3. Brought up in this city	
B. The nature of the challenge to the bio- graphical claims	
II. The objection from his Diaspora home	31
A. The scene of Saul's upbringing	
B. The influence of a Diaspora home	
1. Tarsian Judaism	
2. The Judaism of Saul's home	
III. The witness of his actions and attitudes	41
A. The persecution of the Church	
B. An interest in Gentiles	
C. A mystic temperament	
1. Hebraic mysticism	
2. Saul's Christian mysticism	
D. The Demands of the Law	

IV. The objections from his concepts and presentation.	56
A. The nature of religion	
1. Religion as mystery	
2. Religion as sacrament	
B. Dualism	
1. The first and last man	
2. The spiritual and fleshly man	
3. The distinction between the material and non-material in man	
4. The material aspect in man as defiled	
C. Natural theology	
1. Theistic inference	
2. The conscience as an innate moral factor	
D. Hellenistic forms of presentation	
V. The objections from his hermeneutics	79
A. Allegorical Exegesis	
B. Charismatic interpretation	
CHAPTER II: SAUL AND LEGALITY	88
I. The spirituality of Hebraic Pharisaism	88
A. Externalism and formalistic piety	
B. 1. The testimony of the Talmud	
2. The testimony of the Gospels and Josephus	
B. Inwardness and the prophetic spirit	
1. The testimony of the Talmud	
2. The testimony of the Gospels and Josephus	
C. The correlation of the two elements	
1. Past perspectives	
2. The problem of religious orientation	
3. Acting and reacting tendencies in Hebraicism	
D. The religion of a nomist	
1. The analogy of Qumran	
2. Nomistic Pharisaism	
II. Saul and the Law	114
A. The testimony of Romans 7	
1. The subject of Rom. 7.7-13	
2. The temporal reference of Rom. 7.7-13	
3. The significance of Romans 7 for Saul	

B. Blameless according to the righteousness in the Law	
C. It is hard to kick against the goads	
D. Zealously persecuting	
E. A Pauline evaluation of the Old Covenant	
III. The tension of Saul's religion	139
CHAPTER III: PAUL AND LEGALITY	142
I. Mankind's inability.	142
A. The presentation of Rom. 7.7-25	
1. The problem of vs. 25b	
2. The ἀπὸς ἐγὼ of vs. 25b as the key to Romans 7	
3. The character of this recognition	
B. The problem of Rom. 2.6ff.	
1. Difficulties of the 'ethical ability' interpretation	
2. The two strands of Law and Gospel	
II. The Law in the Old Covenant	162
A. Law as the standard and judgment of God	
B. Law as contractual obligation	
III. Nomism's end	168
A. The background to and sources of Paul's thought	
1. The expectation of Judaism	
2. The impact of the early Church	
3. Christ and the Law	
4. The Damascus encounter	
B. Christ the end of the Law	
1. The abrogation of the Law εἰς δικαιοσύνην	
2. The abrogation of the Law because fulfilled by Christ	
3. The abrogation of the Law παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι	
IV. Righteousness in the New Covenant	205
CHAPTER IV: PAUL AND LIBERTY	209
I. Background and parallels to Paul's thought	210
A. Jewish background	
B. Greek parallels	

- II. Liberty 'in Christ' 215
 - A. Interpretations of the phrase
 - 1. A carry over from the Mystery Religions
 - 2. A literal local dative of personal existence in the pneumatic Christ
 - 3. A dative of instrumentality, source and/or causality
 - 4. A metaphor of personal communion with Christ
 - 5. A locution for corporate communion in the Church
 - B. Significance of being 'in Christ'
- III. The indicative and imperative of liberty 229
 - A. The indicative of liberty
 - 1. Forensic liberty
 - 2. Personal liberty
 - 3. Social liberty
 - B. The imperative of liberty
 - 1. Its essential nature
 - 2. Its relation to the indicative
- IV. The two normative factors in liberty's guidance 241
 - A. The Mind of Christ
 - B. The Law of Christ
 - 1. The new Lawgiver and Torah in the Messianic thought of Paul's background
 - 2. The significance of the Law of Christ for Paul
 - C. The two normative factors in their interrelationship
 - 1. The directing principles and example of the Law of Christ
 - 2. The pneumatic guidance of the Mind of Christ
- V. The place of the apostle and Church in liberty's guidance 262
 - A. The responsibility of the apostle and Church
 - B. The manner in which this responsibility is to be executed
- VI. The conditioning factor in liberty's exercise 270
 - A. Love to those within the Christian community
 - B. Love to those outside of the Christian community

CHAPTER V: THE PAULINE PRACTICE	279
I. Within the Gentile Church	280
A. Paul's missionary activity	
B. Paul's pastoral ministry	
1. In dealing with the libertines	
2. In dealing with the ascetics	
3. In dealing with 'the strong'	
4. In dealing with the ecstasies	
II. Relations between Paul and the Jerusalem Church . . .	300
A. The Judaisers and the Jerusalem Church	
1. Identity of the Judaisers	
2. Relation of the Judaisers to the Jerusalem apostles	
3. Influence of the Judaisers within the Jeru- salem Church	
B. Paul and the Jerusalem apostles	
1. Basic differences between them	
2. Their Christological agreement as the basis for unity	
C. Paul's willingness to expend himself for the Church	
III. The problem practices of Acts	325
A. Jewish vows and customs	
1. The credibility of these practices	
2. The rationale behind these practices	
B. Continued preaching in the synagogue and to Jews	
C. Acceptance of the Jerusalem Decree	
1. The text of the Decree	
2. Arguments against Paul's acceptance of the Decree	
3. Christian liberty and the Decree	
D. Claims in defence	
CONCLUSION	351
APPENDIX: CHRISTIANITY IN JERUSALEM	356
BIBLIOGRAPHY	384

ABBREVIATIONS

<u>Ap. and Ps.</u> -----	<u>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament</u> , ed. R. H. Charles.
<u>B.A.</u> -----	<u>Biblical Archaeologist.</u>
<u>B.A.S.O.R.-S.S.</u> -	<u>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research -- Supplementary Studies.</u>
<u>Beginnings</u> -----	<u>The Beginnings of Christianity</u> , ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake.
<u>E.G.T.</u> -----	<u>The Expositors' Greek Testament.</u>
<u>E.Q.</u> -----	<u>The Evangelical Quarterly.</u>
<u>E.T.</u> -----	<u>The Expository Times.</u>
<u>H.D.A.C.</u> -----	<u>Dictionary of the Apostolic Church</u> , ed. J. Jastings.
<u>H.D.B.</u> -----	<u>Dictionary of the Bible</u> , ed. J. Hastings.
<u>H.D.C.G.</u> -----	<u>Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels</u> , ed. J. Hastings.
<u>H.J.</u> -----	<u>The Hibbert Journal.</u>
<u>H.N.T.</u> -----	<u>Handbuch zum Neuen Testament.</u>
<u>H.T.R.</u> -----	<u>Harvard Theological Review.</u>
<u>I.C.C.</u> -----	<u>International Critical Commentary.</u>
<u>J.B.L.</u> -----	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.</u>
<u>J.E.</u> -----	<u>The Jewish Encyclopedia.</u>
<u>Jewish People</u> --	<u>The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ</u> , E. Schürer.
<u>J.Q.R.</u> -----	<u>Jewish Quarterly Review.</u>
<u>J.T.S.</u> -----	<u>Journal of Theological Studies.</u>
<u>Judaism</u> -----	<u>Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era</u> , G. F. Moore.
<u>M.N.T.C.</u> -----	<u>Moffatt New Testament Commentary.</u>
<u>N.T.S.</u> -----	<u>New Testament Studies.</u>
<u>R.B.</u> -----	<u>Revue Biblique.</u>
<u>S.J.T.</u> -----	<u>Scottish Journal of Theology.</u>
<u>Str.-Bil.</u> -----	<u>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash</u> , H. I. Strack and P. Billerbeck.
<u>Z.N.W.</u> -----	<u>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.</u>
<u>Z.T.K.</u> -----	<u>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.</u>

TALMUD

General:

Mish. -- Mishnah b. -- Babylonian Talmud
Tos. --- Tosephta j. -- Palestinian Talmud
R. -- Rabbi or Rabbah

Tractates:

Aboth -----	Pirke Aboth	Mak. -----	Makkoth
Ab. Zar. --	Abodah Zarah	Nid. -----	Niddah
Bab. Bath.-	Baba Bathra	Pes. -----	Pesahim
Bab. Mez. -	Baba Mezia	Sanh. ----	Sanhedrin
Ber. -----	Berakoth	Shab. ----	Shabbath
Dem. -----	Demai	Shebu. ---	Shebuot
Eduy. -----	Eduyoth	Sheka. ---	Shekalim
Hag. -----	Hagigah	Sot. -----	Sotah
Kel. -----	Kelim	Teb. Yom -	Tebul Yom
Keth. -----	Kethoboth	Suk. -----	Sukkah
Kid. -----	Kiddushin	Yeb. -----	Yebamoth
Meg. -----	Megillah	Yom. -----	Yoma
Men. -----	Menahoth	Yom Tob --	Yom Tob (Betzah)

QUMRAN

(References always to column and line, though for CDC references are also given to chapter and verse in parenthesis.)

1QS ----- Manual of Discipline (serek hay-yohad)
1QH ----- Psalms of Thanksgiving (hodayot)
1QM ----- War Scroll (milhamah)
CDC ----- Cairo Damascus Document (6QD and 4QD^b of Qumran)
1QHab. -- Habakkuk Commentary

The standard abbreviations for Philo's works will be used, e.g., De Abr., De Cherub., De Congr. erud. grat., etc. References in Philo will always be to the sectional divisions.

The standard abbreviations for Josephus' works will be used, i.e., Life, Antiq., War and Contra Apion. References will always be to book, section and number.

INTRODUCTION

The apostle Paul has never ceased to excite the interest of both laymen and scholars. From a purely biographical perspective, he is a favourite subject since "there were probably exceedingly few people of the Imperial age of Rome whom we can study so exactly as we can Paul through his letters."¹ For the historian interested in the origin of the Christian religion, the teaching and work of the apostle is secondary only to that of the Lord. In a very real sense the maxim is true: "Explain the origin of the religion of Paul, and you have solved the problem of the origin of Christianity."² In the field of comparative religions, he stands at the cross-road of Hebraicism and Hellenism -- yet lifts his eyes above and beyond. Theologically, his influence upon Western Christendom is unparalleled by any other apostle or teacher. Heretics and reformers -- Marcion, Augustine, Luther and Barth, to name only the most prominent representative and diversified figures -- have claimed to have received their theological impetus from him. And still today there is a divinely inspired timelessness about his message which has not ceased to grip men and lead them on to their Lord.

As a result of this interest, a great body of literature has arisen about the name of Paul. So diligently and thoroughly has he been investigated that many have considered "the literary and personal

¹A. Deissmann, Paul, p. 25.

²J. G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, pp. 4-5. Cf. F. C. Baur, Paul, His Life and Works, Vol. I, pp. 3-4.

profile of the Apostle" to be unmistakably set in bold relief.¹ And yet there have always been claims that scholarship has grossly misinterpreted even the main outlines of his teaching and life.²

The Purpose of This Study

The present study stems from a conviction that while the efforts of many scholars in the past have resulted in a generally faithful reproduction of the Pauline profile, there still remains an ambiguity regarding certain features which needs to be cleared away. Therefore it is the purpose of this work to investigate two closely related matters which can truly be said to be distinctively Pauline; i.e. his treatment of the subjects 'Legality' and 'Liberty'. And in three areas of this legality-liberty dialectic it has appeared needful to sharpen our understanding of the apostle: (1) in his pre-Christian days under the legal system of Judaism; (2) in his Christian teaching regarding legality and liberty; and (3) in his personal practice of liberty as an apostle of Christ.

Chapter I prefaces the main discussion in reconsidering the much discussed problem of the relation of the pre-Christian Saul to the Judaism of his day. While this chapter does not bring us immediately into the main theme of the work, it is extremely pertinent in clarifying

¹E.g., J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. I, p. 151.

²The latest is that of H.-J. Schoeps, who begins his work on Paul with the following words: "Der Apostel Paulus ist eine wahrhaft grosse Gestalt. Seine Grösse beweist sich darin, dass er keinen kongenialen Interpreten gefunden hat und wohl auch niemals finden wird. Von Marcion bis Karl Barth, von Augustin bis Luther, Schweitzer oder Bultmann hat man ihn immer nur missverstanden oder teilverstanden, eine Seite richtig herausgehoben und die anderen wieder nicht zu sehen vermocht" (Paulus, 1959, p. 1).

the nature of Saul's Judaism and thus giving us an important interpretive key to the understanding of the man and his thought. The answer to the question whether Paul's mental and spiritual background was primarily Hebraic or Hellenistic is of great significance, for it both determines the sources which are to be more heavily relied upon and influences the approach of the investigator to the whole of the apostle's thought.

In Chapter II we consider the topic 'Saul and Legality'. It has been common practice among Christian theologians to paint Saul's pre-conversion spiritual life in the most drab and dismal of colours; while the Jewish writers and advocates can only see the warm glow of true piety in the normative Judaism from which he claimed to have come. It is the argument of this chapter that the tension of Saul's life was not that of externalism versus inwardness, but of anticipation that could find its release only in Messianic realisation. In fact, he could even be viewed in his Judaistic days as possessing at least a remnant of the old prophetic spirit.

Paul's teaching regarding legality and liberty are taken up in Chapters III and IV. We argue in the first place that his opposition to legality stemmed originally from a Judaistic propheticism, but that that opposition was intensified and only received its Christian stamp as it sprang from his Christology. In the following chapter we note that Christian liberty is Christo-centric in its origin, direction, conditioning and goal; but also insist that an injustice is done to the apostle if we accept only the inward Mind of Christ as the factor in the guidance of Christian liberty and ignore

his thought regarding the Law of Christ and the function of an apostle and/or the Church in this matter.

The last chapter has to do with the phenomenon that while many scholars have insisted that in his practice "he is venturing a leap over the abyss, he has all the air of putting one foot calmly before the other on a level road."¹ The problem here concerns the oft-cited apparently contradictory practices of the apostle as presented in both the Acts and his own letters; dealing with the credibility of such practices and the rationale which lay behind them.

Throughout this study we must remember that while the evidence must be evaluated objectively and somewhat disinterestedly, the matter cannot remain in the realm of pure theory.² Paul's teaching regarding legality and liberty and his practice of true Christian liberty have a tremendous relevancy for us, steeped as we are in the "do it yourself" and "live to yourself" attitudes of the world.

Principal Sources

Before turning to the body of this work, it is necessary to delineate those primary sources which are of significance for the present study. Though the extant literature of the Greek world, Diaspora Judaism and sectarian Judaism is not to be ignored in the consideration of this subject, two questions are of principal interest here: (1) What writings truly represent the pre-destruction Hebraic

¹A. Schweitzer, Paul and his Interpreters, p. 72.

²Cf. O. Michel's words regarding his investigation into the problem of the text used by Paul: "Alle theologischen Probleme haben eine praktische Seite; auch das unsere: Man darf die damaligen Verhältnisse nicht vergessen!" (Paulus und seine Bibel, p. 8).

Pharisaism of Paul's day? and (2) What is the extent of the genuinely Pauline literature?

Talmudic Literature¹

With the Jewish endeavour to bring to the world a knowledge of its writings, Christian scholars were faced with the task of evaluating this literature historically. Scholars such as W. Bousset² and A. Schweitzer³ insisted that these Talmudic works were really not representative of pre-destruction Pharisaism at all. Many modern writers have agreed, believing that the Judaism of Johanan b. Zakkai, or possibly that of Akiba or later yet of Judah the Patriarch, was sufficiently different from that before the first destruction to be called a new religion.⁴ Liberal Judaism, too, has its doubts that the Rabbinic Judaism of Christ's and Paul's day can be adequately described from the Talmudic sources.⁵

On the other hand, most Jewish and some Christian scholars maintain that we can form a picture of that pre-destruction Judaism

¹'Talmudic literature' is here meant in its broader aspect: the Mishnah, the Tosephta, the Two Gemaras and the earlier Midrashim. It is used to include those codifications and writings from about 200 to 500 A.D. Thus the term excludes the earlier (probably) Targums and the later Kabbalistic and ethical writings. In its narrow sense 'Talmud' refers to the Gemaras: Palestinian or Jerusalem of c. 400 A.D. and Babylonian of c. 500 A.D.

²W. Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (2nd. ed.), p. 541.

³A. Schweitzer, Paul and his Interpreters, pp. 48-49. On page 49, Schweitzer graphically says: "The picture which they draw for us shows only sun-scorched plain, but this yellow, wilted grass was green and fresh once. What did the meadows look like then?"

⁴Cf. B. S. Easton, Christ in the Gospels, pp. 89-108; F. C. Burkitt, "What Christians Think of Jews," H. J., Vol. XXVIII, No. 2 (Jan., 1930), pp. 267-269.

⁵C. G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, pp. 14-15.

from the Rabbinical writings in our possession.¹ The monumental work of G. F. Moore begins on the premise that "the task of Johanan ben Zakkai and his fellows was one of conservation, not of reformation."² Since the writings give no hint of a new departure or a new religion, we must accept them as possessing a basic continuity with that earlier time -- though undoubtedly there has been a shifting emphasis within this fundamental solidarity through four or five centuries of thought and persecution. But, Moore insists, there is "no indication that the development was on new lines or on different principles from that which preceded it."³

The objections against such a view as Moore's fall into four categories: (1) the late date of the Talmudic materials; (2) the influence of the advent and opposition of Christianity on the records; (3) the influence of the tragic experiences of the first and second destructions on Judaism; and (4) the possibility that Mediaeval Judaism altered the original literature with an eye to religious and political opposition.⁴

The argument from lateness of date is, in itself, not convincing in dealing with those earliest sources; especially when we consider that such a treatise as Pirke Aboth probably had its beginning

¹E.g., L. Finkelstein, "The Book of Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halaka," H.T.R., Vol. XVI, No. 1 (Jan., 1923), p. 39; G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, pp. 71, 87, 172-173, Vol. III, p. 17.

²G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, p. 131.

³Ibid., Vol. III, p. 22.

⁴Arguments one through three are best voiced by W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 3-4. H. L. Strack has insisted that the fourth must be seriously considered along with the others, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, pp. 78, 85-86.

in the days of Johanan b. Zakkai. But as the codifications and formulations become more and more removed from the first century A.D., the argument becomes more telling. And yet, we are dealing with a religious attitude which took great pride in the preservation of tradition. While changes through forgetfulness or differing circumstances would occur, this desire to preserve the traditional -- barring other considerations -- minimises the temporal element.

The factors of religious opposition and political disaster, however, cannot be accounted as negligible. Though Moore has maintained that "neither the Nazarenes in Palestine, . . . nor Gentile Christianity made any mark on Judaism,"¹ it is hard to believe that such was the case. The very rise of a post-canonical body of opposing religious expression, i.e. the New Testament, was probably a major factor in the original desire of the Tannaitic Rabbis to bring together their traditions so as also to have authoritative post-canonical documents from their point of view.² Furthermore, the success of this new religious position, claiming as it did to be truly representing the Old Testament and the religion of Judaism, undoubtedly forced Judaism to look within itself and solidify what it believed to be its positions of strength.³ Certainly the unity of God and the importance of the Torah were emphasised as they never were before. At this time the Shema was invested with the importance of a confession of faith

¹G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, p. 92.

²Cf. R. A. Stewart, The Earlier Rabbinic Tradition, pp. 20-21.

³Cf. S. Schechter: "New laws were enacted and old ones revived, with the object of resisting Christian influences over the Jews. To expand the Oral Law, and give it a firm basis in the Scriptures, were considered the best means of preserving Judaism intact" (Studies in Judaism, p. 232).

the לֵוִי given special prominence;¹ and from this time arise the many explanations of the plural names, pronouns and adjectives used in connection with the Divine Being.² Likewise, the extreme glorification of the written Law³ and the attribution of divine inspiration to the oral⁴ seem to be reactions to the national losses and Christian opposition. As Akiba's rejection of the LXX and his encouragement to Aquila in producing a new Greek translation was clearly in opposition to what he felt to be the misuse of the LXX by the Christians,⁵ so other attitudes and doctrines in the Talmud appear to bear this same stamp. The explicit Tannaitic rejection of the miraculous as evidence,⁶ the Talmudic suspicion of mysticism,⁷ the suppression of eschatological study and the purging of apocalyptic speculation,⁸ to mention only

¹Cf. E. G. Hirsch: "To controvert their {Jewish Christians} departures from the fundamental positions of Judaism, the Palestinian synagogue, as did all later Judaism with the exception of the cabalists, laid all the greater stress on the unity of God" ("God," J.E., Vol. VI, p. 5).

²See R. T. Herford, Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, pp. 250-320, for the reproduction of Talmudic texts on this point.

³Cf. S. Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, p. 123, n. 5, where the Jewish doctrine of the Law's continued full existence in the Messianic Age is suggested to be such a reaction.

⁴Cf. L. Finkelstein, "The Pharisees: Their Origin and Their Philosophy," H.T.R., Vol. XXII, No. 3 (July, 1929), p. 245.

⁵Cf. H. B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, pp. 30-42.

⁶b. Bab. Mez. 59b. Cf. S. Schechter: "When the Rabbis saw their dangerous consequences, they insisted that miracles should have no influence on the interpretation and development of the Law" (Studies in Judaism, p. 231; cf. Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, pp. 6-7).

⁷Cf. W. L. Knox: "Mysticism was associated with an interest in cosmogony which might easily lead to theosophy or even to Christianity" (St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, p. 102). See also G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, p. 413.

⁸Cf. D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 135-136. In dealing with b. Yeb. 47b, Daube says that very possibly it was considered that "speculation about eschatology was dangerous because it might lead to inquiry into or even acceptance of the Christian tenets" (ibid., p. 136)

a few, seem to fall within this category. These matters must be considered later, but suffice it here to say that Christianity and Roman power did have some influence on the Talmudic writings.

It must also be considered possible that Mediaeval Judaism again altered some words and phrases in its literature. But a sweeping revision of the material at that time seems inconceivable.

In our growing knowledge of the diversity within Judaism, of late through the Qumran discoveries, we are led more and more to suspect that Hebraic Pharisaism had within it more tendencies and variations than is readily evidenced by its later literature.

What then can be used from the Talmudic material in understanding the Pharisaism of Paul's day? It would seem from the sweeping indictments above that we have little reason to trust any. And yet there are portions of that literature which can be used by the historian and which are beyond the realm of reasonable suspicion. Portions and passages from which, it is true, a detailed picture is impossible; but from which a general impression can be obtained. These are those which seem to come from an early time and are not under suspicion of being a reaction. The following four categories of such portions are here proposed,¹ and upon these this work will base its primary conclusions regarding the theology of pre-destruction Hebraic Pharisaism in Palestine:

1.) Those practices and rules deemed by Johanan b. Zakkai and his followers to be very ancient; or, as Moore says, to be "customs the origin of which was lost in antiquity."² Quite often these are

¹The debt to A. L. Williams, Talmudic Judaism and Christianity, pp. 38-43, is clearly evident in points 1, 2 and 4.

²G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, p. 29; cf. Vol. III, pp. 6ff.

introduced by such a phrase as "Our Rabbis taught," or "It has been taught," though the context must be noted also.

2.) Those actions and teachings of certain named persons who lived immediately before, during, or personally had their roots in the period before the first destruction.¹ The chief direct authority of this class is the tractate Pirke Aboth, with its Haggadic teachings attributed to specific teachers. The first chapter deals with the teachers up to the 70 A.D. destruction; while the second considers mainly Johanan b. Zakkai, whose roots were firmly planted in the pre-destruction time, and his disciples. These two chapters, together with scattered references throughout the rest of this particular tractate, form the main source of this class.² And yet, while it is true that

¹While it can never be proved, there seems no reason to doubt that "the authorities in whose names statements are quoted are a help, if not an infallible index, to fixing their date" (L. Finkelstein, "The Book of Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halaka," H.T.R., Vol. XVI, No. 1, Jan. 1923, p. 39).

²The following long quotation is given without apology because of its excellence:

The "earliest nucleus of Aboth is contained in ch. i, and, as I believe, ends there. It will be seen from the notes that the last teacher mentioned in ch. i died in the war of A.D. 68-70, a date which is one of the fixed points of Rabbinical chronology. Who it was that drew up this list of 'Fathers' there is no evidence to show; it might well have been R. Zadok, an old man who just survived the fall of Jerusalem. But it is clear that the title 'Fathers' belongs to this earliest list, and, strictly speaking, only to that. The ancient, not the contemporary, teachers were the Fathers of Israel. In ch. ii is found another list, probably suggested by, but not continuous with, the earlier one. It deals mainly with R. Johanan b. Zaccai, his teacher, and his chief pupils; in other words, with the men who re-established the tradition after the war. A connexion with the older series is made by the statement that R. Johanan b. Zaccai 'received from' Hillel. But there is no further attempt to carry on the successive stages of the tradition. The mention in ii. 1, 2 of Rabbi and his son is clearly a later addition, and the same may perhaps be the case with R. Tarphon ii. 19, 20. Chapters iii and iv (which are continuous) abandon chronology altogether, and seem to be due to a desire to enrich the former collections of ancient wisdom with specimens from later times. Ch. v in its

"for a knowledge of the ideals of rabbinical ethics and piety, no other easily accessible source is equal to the Abot [h]"¹ there are also passages of this type scattered throughout the Gemaras, Midrashim and Tosephta.

3.) Those passages and portions which would have no reason to be a reaction to either religious opponents or political trials, and which do not seem to be influenced by a particular local situation or passing fancy but have parallels elsewhere in the literature. Here it is that the subjective element of the interpreter most enters. And yet, here are passages which must not be overlooked.

4.) Those ancient liturgies, confessions and prayers: The Shema, The Shemoneh Esreh (The Eighteen "Benedictions," "Blessings," or "Prayers"), and the broad outlines of the 613 Commandments. It is true that the Benedictions were revised by Gamaliel II; but probably only revised. Minus the confessional insertion, there is no reason to doubt their pre-destruction quality. The antiquity and importance of the Shema is evidenced by its inclusion on the Nash Papyrus;²

turn abandons the form of personal reference, and consists mainly of a series of groups based on numbers. All these different elements are clearly distinguishable; but it is impossible to allot them to their respective authors. I can only suggest that Rabbi found ch. i and ii already in existence, possibly also iii and iv (if he did not compile them himself), and that he added ch. v as a conclusion to the whole collection. Ch. vi was not added until long after" (R. T. Herford, Ap. and Ps., Vol. II, p. 687.

¹G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, p. 157.

²The Nash Papyrus, a small piece of papyrus containing the Decalogue and the Shema, has been variously dated from the second century A.D. back to the second century B.C. But of late, scholarship has tended to favour the latter half of the first century B.C. as its true date (cf. H. H. Rowley, The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 13, for an excellent summary of the dates assigned). The finding in the Wadi Murabbaat caves of a phylactery containing the three passages Exod. 13.1-16 Deut. 11. 13-21 and Deut. 6.4-9, and this find in close conjunction with an apparent marriage contract dated in the seventh year of the reign of Hadrian (c. 124 A.D.), offers further evidence for the antiquity of this celebrated prayer (cf. Y. Yadin, The Message of the Scrolls, p. 70).

while with the 613 commands we can at least accept the broad outlines.

Non-Canonical Literature

The question of the importance of the apocryphal and pseudo-pigraphical literatures in the study of Pharisaism has not ceased to interest and confound investigators of every type and ability. And with the information from Qumran continuing to pour forth, such interest is bound to have a great revival. Definite conclusions, especially in view of the importance of the finds from the Qumran libraries for this field of study and the very great amount of material from there that has still to be even opened,¹ are impossible. Tentative opinions, however, must be expressed.

Such extreme views as that all non-canonical writings, except Sirach, were wholly unknown to real Pharisaism,² or, on the other hand, that they are probably more representative of early Pharisaism than the Talmud,³ need not detain us here. Nor must we view all of these writings as representative of one type of thought or piety. The solution is not to be found in so simple an equation as: They are Pharisaic; or They are not Pharisaic.

With the exception of Sirach, G. F. Moore classes all of the Apocryphal books as outside "the schools" and "not intrinsically of immense importance" in the study of first century Pharisaism.⁴ And

¹The relevancy of the Qumran finds for pre-Christian Judaism has been disputed by such men as S. Zeitlin, G. R. Driver, J. L. Teicher and P. Kahle. But their dating, ranging from the third century A.D. to the Mediaeval Ages, has failed to convince in the face of the evidence from archaeology and paleography. See W. F. Albright, "Postscript," B.A.S.O.R. -- S.S., Nos. 10-12 (1951), pp. 57-60, for an early and altogether reliable summary and bibliography of the evidence both pro and con.

²E.g., S. Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, p. 5.

³E.g., A. Schweitzer, Paul and his Interpreters, p. 50.

⁴G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, pp. 126-127.

yet, while it is possibly true that all of the so-called apocryphal works originated outside "the schools" of official Pharisaism, it does not follow that they neither reflect nor influenced that Pharisaism. Akiba, at the beginning of the second century A.D., "protested strongly against the canonicity of certain of the Apocrypha, Ecclesiasticus, for instance"; yet he had "no objection to the private reading of the Apocrypha, as is evident from the fact that he himself makes frequent use of Ecclesiasticus."¹ The very fact that an early second century Rabbi felt compelled to express himself in this manner against the Apocrypha indicates that at least until this time it had some influence within Palestinian Pharisaism. So too, in view of his own practice, his assertion that the reading of "external books," i.e. those outside the canon, invalidates one for a share in the world to come² must be viewed as only denouncing the reading of such books as if they possessed the authority of Scripture and/or aloud in public study and liturgical recitation.³ In all likelihood, the Pharisaic attitude was like that of Qumran; i.e. a giving of great care and attention to the Scriptures and the traditional interpretations within the group while taking a lesser interest, though definitely an interest, in those works classed as non-canonical.⁴

¹L. Ginzberg, "Akiba ben Joseph," J.E., Vol. I, p. 305; cf. also J.E., Vol. II, p. 6. See Mish. Sanh. 10.1 and b. Sanh. 100b.

²Mish. Sanh. 10.1.

³W. D. Davies, "The Jewish Background of the Teaching of Jesus: Apocalyptic and Pharisaism," E.T., Vol. LIX, No. 9 (June, 1948), p. 237.

⁴F. M. Cross, Jr., points out that while the biblical portions of the Qumran texts usually "have a standard format and are written in an elegant book hand; scribal treatment of non-canonical works is rarely as careful or fine" (The Ancient Library of Qumran, p. 29). This purely mechanical feature probably reflects the attitude of the sect toward the literatures in its possession (cf. J. van der Ploeg, The Excavations at Qumran, p. 154).

It therefore seems wisest to acknowledge the apocrypha's inferiority to both canonical Scripture¹ and oral tradition, but to insist that as devotional and popular literature it influenced Pharisaism and as the expression of individual Pharisees it partially reflects that thought. On the whole, there is the same stress upon and delight in the Law in the Apocryphal books as in the Talmudic literature.² It has every appearance of being commendable to a Pharisee's interest, and, in some cases, expressive of a Pharisaic mind. Thus, we shall use much of the Apocrypha as a secondary source in understanding Pharisaism: the pseudo-historical treatise I Esdras, the wisdom of Sirach, the popular tales of Tobit and Judith and the histories of I and II Maccabees³ as influencing first century Pharisaism; I Baruch and IV Extra as reflecting portions of contemporary Pharisaic thought. The precise placing of the Wisdom of Solomon as preceding or contemporary with the Judaism of Paul's day is very uncertain.⁴ But probably the writing influenced that first century Judaism rather than simply reflects it.⁵ Except for

¹The Prologue to Sirach, Contra Apion I.8.38-42 and, possibly, II Macc. 2.13-14 evidence the Apocrypha's inferiority to Scripture.

²See R. Marcus, Law in the Apocrypha, esp. pp. 52-59.

³The fact that Qumran has not as yet yielded copies of I and II Maccabees, coupled with the realisation that "the Qumran library has not produced works composed in Jewish circles hostile to the sectarians" (F. M. Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran, p. 148, n. 5), is an argument from silence for the non-sectarian character of these histories.

⁴See Ap. and Ps. Vol. I, and H. B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, pp. 265-288, for discussions regarding the dating of the Apocryphal works. The conclusions arrived at in these works have been generally followed here.

⁵Probably C. H. Dodd is right in saying that it "was probably newly published when Paul was a student" (Romans, M.N.T.C., p. 81).

Susanna, the other additions to the canonical books are insignificant.

Of the remaining apochryphal, ethical, polemic and popular literatures which are extant from this period and lie outside the canon and so-called Apochrypha, none, except the Letter of Aristeas and the Story of Ahikar, has sufficient evidence to claim direct influence upon or representation of Pharisaism. It has long been insisted by Jewish and some Christian scholars that "each of these books comes from circles which represented special interests, and were apparently of limited influence. None of them is written with the responsibility attaching to authors who had any official position in Judaism."¹ The Qumran finds have now indicated the sectarian nature of such works as Enoch, Jubilees, The Ascension of Isaiah, The Martyrdom of Isaiah² and the Damascus Document,³ besides, of course, the distinctive Qumran literature itself. Probably the Psalms of Solomon must also be assigned to this class.⁴ And yet we must not suppose that these works are entirely foreign

¹L. Finkelstein, "The Oldest Midrash: Pre-Rabbinic Ideals and Teachings in the Passover Haggadah," H.T.R., Vol. XXXI, No.4 (Oct., 1938), p.293; see also Finkelstein, "The Book of Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halaka," H.T.R., Vol. XVI, No. 1 (Jan., 1923), pp. 39-40.

²Not that these works are definitely Essene, but they are of a common background and mentality. See M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 220-221; K.G. Kuhn, "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, p.257.

³One of the first to point out the relationship between CDC and IQS was K.G. Kuhn, "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament," Z.T.K., Vol. XLVII, Heft 2 (1950), pp. 196ff.

⁴See M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 221-222, for a moderate and reserved evaluation and conclusion that "in their attitudes and their points of view the Psalms of Solomon and the Dead Sea Scrolls have much in common." This similarity of outlook is strongly suggested in Ps. of Sol. 17.17-19: "There was not among them [the rulers?] one that wrought in the midst of Jerusalem mercy and truth. They that loved the synagogues of the pious fled from them, as sparrows that fly from their nest. They wandered in deserts that their lives might be saved from harm."

to the spirit of Pharisaism. Apocalypticism, for instance, is speculatively carried further in these extraneous books than it would be in Pharisaism, but basic eschatology is common to both.¹ There is a difference of emphasis between Apocalypticism and Pharisaism, but "it is grievously erroneous to enlarge this difference into a cleavage."² The heavily apocalyptic Daniel and Ezekiel were accepted as canonical in Pharisaism,³ and, from the response of the Pharisaic IV Ezra, the non-Pharisaic apocalypses seem to have made some impression. As in the case of the Rabbini- cally read Sirach which was also read at Qumran,⁴ so there seems to have been an interrelation on matters eschatological as well as ethical. We cannot assume a Pharisaic acceptance of much of the extreme apocalyptic thought of the day; but we cannot deny its awareness of, basic eschatological agreement with and indirect influence from such presentation. Such opposition to this view as the Talmud affords must be explained as the result of disastrous false hopes, political ruin and opposition from an eschatologically based rival religious movement. And yet, at best, the pseudepi- graphical evidence is only indirect and secondary.

¹See J. Bloch, On the Apocalyptic in Judaism, where the ex- traneous character of these sources for Pharisaism is upheld and yet the overlapping of the two movements on the question of eschatology is pointed out.

²W. D. Davies, "The Jewish Background of the Teaching of Jesus: Apocalyptic and Pharisaism," E.T., Vol. LIX, No. 9 (June, 1948), p. 237.

³Ezekiel was at one time, in light of the popularity of the Apocalyptic extremists, considered to be too troublesome for public use. Even its canonicity was questioned. But its withdrawal was at no time based upon a question of its sacredness, its inspiration or its prophetic authorship. Rather, it was considered "expedient to with- draw the book from public use lest the unlearned or the half-learned be stumbled by the apparent discrepancies between it and the Law" (G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, p. 247). The fact that it remained in the canon must be considered significant.

⁴Cf. M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 219.

From the nature of the Letter of Aristeas and its use by Josephus,¹ it seems probable that this work was current and accepted in Palestine. The Letter is not only a glorification of the Jewish nation and its literature, but also an apology to the Palestinians for the LXX. It was written with an eye to the Hebraic attitude towards translating the sacred into the vulgar, possibly by a former Palestinian Pharisee living in Egypt who well realised the reaction back home -- and knew how to soften the blow. And it appears that it accomplished its purpose. Likewise the Story of Ahikar was probably accepted as edifying reading. It seems to have been assumed by Jesus as common knowledge;² and the attitude of just revenge on the part of some of the Pharisees would give it a receptive audience, if it had not already had a part in forming such an attitude. If it had not earlier been introduced into Palestine, the introduction given it by Tobit would have made its entrance inevitable.³

Regarding The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the very relevancy of the material makes it both important to come to some conclusion concerning its relation to Pharisaism and more difficult to do so. In modern times, it has been generally accepted that the work is definitely Jewish though suffering from extensive Christian interpolations.⁴ Since Qumran, many have seen it as an Essene writing;

¹Antiq., Preface 3 and XII. 2. 1-15.

²Jesus' parables of The Wicked Servant and The Prodigal Son and His teaching on overcoming evil with good seem to have The Story of Ahikar in mind, as pointed out by Harris, Lewis and Conybeare, Ap. and Ps., Vol. II, p. 719.

³Tobit 1.21, 2.10, 11.17-18 and 14.10 refer explicitly to the characters and the plot of The Story of Ahikar.

⁴R. H. Charles, Ap. and Ps., Vol. II, in agreeing with the earlier work of Schnapp and Bousset, has been most influential in establishing this position.

either with Christian additions¹ or strictly Essene.² Lately, M. de Jonge has convincingly argued that it is in reality a Christian composition.³ The conclusion of de Jonge is extremely interesting in light of the revelations so far from Qumran. From internal evidence, and without reference to the Qumran finds, he concludes that "the author knew a Jewish Testament of Levi and a Jewish Testament of Naphtali and used these as examples and as sources of material for the composition of his 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs'."⁴ He cites the fragmentary remains of a known Testament of Levi and a known Testament of Naphtali, and suggests that possibly these were the sources.⁵ Now from the Rockefeller Museum Scrollery in Jerusalem has come the announcement of the identification of a Testament of Levi and a Testament of Naphtali, not identical it seems with those in the Twelve Patriarchs -- with no evidence to date of any other Testaments.⁶ Since many other scrolls have yet to be unrolled, definiteness is not possible. But it could be that The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is the writing of an Essene turned Christian, who, in looking back over his former religious experience from the perspective of his new faith, decided to revise and complete the two

¹E.g., K. G. Kuhn, "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, p. 58.

²E.g., A. Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes, pp. 38-57, 165-166, and The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 94-96.

³M. de Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

⁴Ibid., p. 117.

⁵Ibid., pp. 52-53, and Appendix, pp. 129-131.

⁶J. T. Milik, "Le Testament de Lévi en Araméen," R.B., Vol. LXII (1955), pp. 398-406. F. M. Cross, Jr., in 1958, wrote: "The Testament of Naphtali is unpublished, and only recently identified" (The Ancient Library of Qumran, p. 34, n. 62; see also p. 150, n. 7).

Testaments he had known for the purpose of Christian edification.¹ Whatever the final answer, and here we must literally await the joint efforts of bedouin and scholar, it seems risky to use the Greek version of the Testaments to illustrate any section of pre-Christian Judaism.

We therefore conclude that I Esdras, Sirach, Tobit, Judith, I and II Maccabees, The Story of Ahikar and The Letter of Aristeas had a direct influence upon first century Hebraic Pharisaism; I Baruch and IV Ezra reflect aspects of such thought; while the other writings of the day must be viewed as without sufficient evidence to be any more than at best indirect and remote witnesses to a real Pharisaism. We shall therefore use the major portion of the Apocrypha, The Letter of Aristeas and The Story of Ahikar as sources for Hebraic Pharisaism, though recognising that they are of secondary value to the evidence from the Talmud and that we must still keep in mind the indirect influence of the sectarian literature.

Historical Accounts

For a knowledge of the religious situation in the Palestine of Paul's day, Josephus is somewhat disappointing. While his works promise much and are valuable historically, they reflect the fact that their author had little interest in religion for its own sake. Josephus' value as a source for an understanding of Hebraic Pharisaism is minimised by his evident aloofness from the main stream of normative Judaism. When it comes to theological thought, he must always be used in a purely secondary measure and suspected of telling us no more than what was popularly held by the Jewish people and what would

¹This is the view of J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, pp. 34-35, which has been accepted by M. Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 179-180, and J. van der Ploeg, The Excavations at Qumran, pp. 205-206. J. B. Lightfoot had argued that work was definitely that of a Christian writer, possibly from the Nazarene sect (cf. Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 319-321).

be acceptable to the better of the heathen thinkers.

In the canonical Gospels we have an historical record that is in many respects just the reverse of that of Josephus. Here the purpose is primarily religious, with the chronological recounting of historical events treated in a subsidiary fashion. It is therefore necessary to view all of the references in these works to the contemporary religious scene in Palentine as secondary to and conditioned by the Christian perspective. They were indeed "written out of faith and for faith,"¹ and this situation must constantly be kept in mind when using them historically. And yet, we must agree with G. F. Moore that "the Gospels themselves are the best witness to the religious and moral teaching of the synagogue in the middle forty years of the first century."²

The trustworthiness of the account of Acts as an indirect witness to authentic Jewish tradition and an accurate representation of the life and preaching of the apostle Paul has been often denied. Many have pointed to the evident 'conciliatory purpose' of the work as being a detriment to an objective treatment of history, and thus fatal to a true representation of events and statements. And, indeed, it seems that one of the aims of the writer was to counter a pre-Marcionism by stressing the parallels and unity which existed between Peter and Paul. But the recognition of this aim does not necessarily reflect upon the credibility of the account. J. B. Lightfoot has correctly observed that "such a purpose is at least as likely

¹J. Moffatt, Editor's preface to C. H. Dodd, Romans, (M.N.T.C.), vi.

²G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, p. 132.

to have been entertained by a writer, if the two Apostles were essentially united, as if they were not. The truth or falsehood of the account must be determined on other grounds."¹ The primary argument against the historicity of Acts is that it completely breaks down the moral character of the apostle Paul, presenting him as quite a different person than he appears in his own letters. Events and speeches which have only a loose correspondence to actuality were invented according to the purpose of the author and the pattern of the day. But is this really so? A. Harnack's work on Acts is the notable exception to this view.² The fifth chapter of this study considers the relation of the Pauline practice and speeches in defence as represented in Acts to his teaching as given in the Epistles. Much that could be said here is better left for that later discussion. Suffice it here to anticipate that consideration by saying that such features in the Acts as the Tübingen scholars insisted were entirely non-Pauline are not quite so incredible as has been claimed. And thus, since we believe that "the most weighty reason"³ against the trustworthiness of the Acts presentation is in reality very weak, this study will make use of that record in conformity to the rule of J. Weiss:

It should be considered an axiom that a document must be read in the sense and in the form in which it stands until proof is brought

¹J. B. Lightfoot, Epistle to the Galatians, p. 359.

²See Luke the Physician, The Acts of the Apostles and The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels. Regarding the historicity of the geographical and cultural details in Acts, see W. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, and H. J. Cadbury, The Book of Acts in History.

³F. C. Baur, Paul, His Life and Works, Vol. I, p. 11.

forward that this is impossible. One should first see whether, assuming its genuineness, there is a convincing historical picture; whether the writings suit the setting in which they are placed; and only when this is shown to be impossible should it be declared spurious.¹

Because of the very nature of the Acts as at least one step removed from the inner-most mind of the apostle, the work must always stand as secondary to the Epistles for a knowledge of Paul's thought. And in its reporting of history, it cannot be viewed as presenting a verbatim and complete record of speeches and events. But it seems that it should be accepted as an honest and sincere attempt to relate the affairs of the early church and of Paul, and on that basis be constantly tested as to its correspondence to the Pauline letters and what we know of the historical and cultural situation of the times.

The Pauline Corpus

Although the Tübingen school accepted only the 'Hauptbriefe' -- i.e. Galatians, I and II Corinthians and Romans -- as authentic, there is now general agreement regarding the Pauline authorship of I Thessalonians, Colossians, Philemon and Philippians as well. II Thessalonians has been held in question primarily because of the eschatological section in 2.1-12, which passage is so vital to the purpose of the letter that it cannot be regarded as a later interpolation. But with the increasing realisation that the apostle was not quite so divorced from eschatology as some would like to think, the main argument against this epistle becomes quite weak.

¹J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. I, p. 153; though, of course, Weiss used this argument only in connection with the radical criticism which denied the authenticity of all the Pauline epistles. He really believed that the non-Pauline elements in Acts were conclusive evidence against the view that the work was written by Luke or is to be considered trustworthy (cf. ibid., pp. 4-11).

The general nature and the style of the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians, coupled with the recognition of its striking similarity to Colossians, have led many eminent scholars to view this work as a summary of and/or an introduction to the letters of Paul by a later Paulinist.¹ We need not enter into this dispute here, though we do believe that the hypothesis of a circular letter written at the same time as the Colossian epistle is at least as good an explanation for its nature, style and similarities to Colossians as any other. Suffice it here to point out that even those who most strongly oppose its Pauline authorship insist upon its faithfulness to the Pauline teaching.² And this is all we really need to be concerned about in the present study. Of those letters claiming Pauline authorship, the most problematic are the Pastorals. In 1807 Schleiermacher questioned their genuineness; while in 1922, after a century of debate, the statistical analysis of P. N. Harrison was published.³ To most scholars, Harrison's presentation convincingly demonstrated that the three works are

¹In addition to J. Moffatt and the list of continental scholars he cites (An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, p. 375), note: J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. I, p. 150; E. J. Goodspeed, The Key to Ephesians; W. L. Knox, St. Paul, pp. 147-148, and St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, pp. 182-184; M. Dibelius, Paul, p. 8; C. L. Mitton, The Epistle to the Ephesians; Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose.

²E. J. Goodspeed says that while it was written between 90 and 100 A.D., "every sentence of it owed its vital quality to him" (The Key to Ephesians, p. xiv); and W. L. Knox insists that the non-Pauline authorship "must not be taken as depreciating the value of the letter. The writer combines a real measure of originality with a deep understanding of Paulinism and a thorough loyalty to it" (St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, p. 184).

³P. N. Harrison, The Problem of the Pastorals.

the effort of another writer though they contain genuine fragments of earlier Pauline correspondence. Harrison's methodology, however, has come under cogent criticism; especially by W. Michaelis in 1929 and B. M. Metzger in 1958.¹ And lately there has been seen the beginning of a return to Pauline authorship on the part of some investigators.² The question of whether the Pastorals are the product of a later author and/or editor using Pauline fragments, the expression of the apostle himself in a situation of which we know nothing, or the result of an aged or infirm apostle giving greater liberty to an unknown amanuensis is of great significance in a study of first century ecclesiology and the personality and mission of Paul. But it is not vitally important for the present work. It is in the accepted epistles-- and primarily the Hauptbriefe -- that all the essential features of Paul's thought regarding our subject are found. Thus we will leave the problem of the Pastorals somewhat open, insisting with many that at least they are 'Pauline' and yet not needing to make use of them more than subsidiary documents.

The textual sources in the following pages are Kittel and Nestle, unless indicated otherwise. Undesignated translations from non-biblical sources are those of H. Danby, The Mishnah; the Soncino

¹W. Michaelis, "Pastoralbriefe und Wortstatistik," Z.N.W., Vol. XXVIII, Heft 1 (1929), pp. 69-76; B. M. Metzger, "A Reconsideration of Certain Arguments Against the Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles," E.T., Vol. LXX, No. 3 (Dec., 1958), pp. 91-94.

²E.g., J. Jeremias, Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus (1949), pp. 4-5, and J. Behm, in his revision of P. Feine's Einleitung in das Neue Testament (1950), pp. 206-218.

edition of The Babylonian Talmud, ed. I. Epstein; F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, Philo (The Loeb Classical Library); W. Whiston, The Works of Flavius Josephus; and The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, ed. R. H. Charles.

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF SAUL'S JUDAISM

In order to understand Paul aright, reference must be made to his Jewish background and the influence of that background upon him. But, since the Judaism of the pre-destruction period was a complex within a unity, a general summary of Jewish thought offers little real understanding without first an indication of Saul's relationship to that Judaism. Saul "who is also called Paul"¹ must be located in the thought of his day; the nature of his Judaism must be designated before it can be analysed.

A great deal of investigation and debate has entered into this question. As each aspect of ancient thought became known, e.g. apocalyptic, mystery religion, rabbinic and lately Essene, the process of trial and error -- thesis, antithesis and synthesis -- was repeated. There have been many false starts, but a general concurrence of thought seems to be forming. It is not our purpose here to outline that history of investigation, nor to point out every influence upon or similarity to Saul from these fields. We desire to restrict ourselves to those Hebraic biographical claims made in the New Testament and to those points of criticism made against them; allowing such positive evidence for the Hebraic character of Saul's Judaism as is available to appear later in this work where it is pertinent. In this chapter, therefore, the Pauline assertions will set the theme with the objections to them calling the tune.

¹Acts 13.9.

The Biographical Claims and the Nature of
the Challenge made against them.

The Biographical Claims

It is not necessary to refer to all of the explicit biographical claims in the Pauline literature, for many of them could be ascribed to either a Hellenistic or a Hebraic Pharisee.¹ But three are pertinent; three which associate, or at least imply a thorough acquaintance of, Saul's Judaism with that acclaimed the most Hebraic of the day.

Hebrew of Hebrews. -- Phil. 3.5. and II Cor. 11.22 both state that Saul was a Hebraicist as opposed to a Hellenistic Jew. The phrase 'Εβραϊος ἐξ 'Εβραίων in Philippians certainly means more than simply of Israelite stock, since he has just previously traced his lineage by saying ἐκ γένους 'Ισραήλ, φυλῆς Βενιαμίν. It need not, however, be taken in the other extreme to mean "a Jew born in Palestine of parents also born in Palestine."² On the one hand, we must insist that the phrase claims more than just Israelite stock; on the other, we cannot assert it means more than a Hebraic religious background. It is best rendered "a Hebrew born of Hebrews" (R.S.V.), or more freely "a Hebrew son of Hebrew parents" (Moffatt). In the II Corinthians passage, Paul matches

¹Such as circumcised on the eighth day, of the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, as to the Law a Pharisee, as to zeal a persecutor of the church. Even such statements as "as to righteousness under the law blameless" (Phil. 3.6), "educated according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers" (Acts 22.3), and "I advanced in Judaism beyond many of my own age among my people, so extremely zealous was I for the traditions of my fathers" (Gal. 1.14), could be honestly said by a Pharisee whose only frame of reference was a hellenised Diaspora Judaism. As C. G. Montefiore has said, a Hellenistic Jew "could fancy himself perfectly orthodox" (Judaism and St. Paul, p. 94).

²W. L. Knox, St. Paul, p. 26.

qualification to qualification against the best that can be produced by Jew, Christian or Jewish Christian; and in such a context 'Ἑβραϊστικῶς; κατὰ can only mean a Hebraicist as against a Hellenist.¹

At the feet of Gamaliel. -- Acts 22.3 represents Paul as saying that he was educated "at (παρὰ) the feet of Gamaliel." This is the famous Gamaliel I, who, like Hillel his grandfather,² was highly esteemed by his people: "Since Rabban Gamaliel the elder died there has been no more reverence for the law; and purity and abstinence died out at the same time."³ Such a qualification, if we can accept the Acts account to be a faithful report in this instance and Paul's words to be true, would go far toward establishing that Saul was at least well acquainted with the best of Palestinian Pharisaism.

Brought up in this city. -- Acts 22.3 also indicates Saul's early residency in Jerusalem. Whether we punctuate this verse as ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, παρὰ τοῦς πόδας Γαμαλιήλ πεκατευμένος κατὰ . . . ,⁴ thus opening the way for the possibility that Saul's infancy was spent in Jerusalem before his education under Gamaliel, or ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ παρὰ τοῦς πόδας Γαμαλιήλ, πεκατευμένος κατὰ . . . ,⁵ which would more directly indicate that he came to Jerusalem primarily for an education under Gamaliel, the important implication is that Saul came

¹W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 105, n. 3. See Appendix regarding Hebraic and Hellenistic elements in the Jerusalem Church.

²Or, possibly, his father. For the position that Hillel was the father of Gamaliel, see: E. Schürer, Jewish People, Div. II, Vol. I, p. 363 and n. 164; H. L. Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, p. 109. Probably, however, Hillel as Gamaliel's grandfather is the better view; cf. T. R. Herford, Ap. and Ps., Vol. II, p. 694, and W. Bacher, "Gamaliel I," J.E., Vol. V, pp. 558-559.

³Mish. Sot. 9.15.

⁴As Nestle and Moffatt.

⁵As Souter, A.V. and R.S.V.

to Jerusalem in his youth --- whether before his Gamaliel education or primarily for that purpose.

The Nature of the Challenge to the Biographical Claims

Needless to say, these statements have not gained universal acceptance. Jewish scholars, in light of their Talmudic understanding of first century Judaism and as encouraged by the analogies between the Mysteries and Christianity that have been brought to light, have rejected these claims of him who rejected them.¹ And many of those working in the field of comparative religion have looked askance at

¹The liberal Jewish scholar C. G. Montefiore has been most vociferous in this regard. Though he cannot claim to represent Orthodox Judaism on many points, on this question he has shouted that which all of Judaism has muttered down through the centuries --- especially the Orthodox. His insistence is that Paul's Judaism "was not Rabbinic Judaism, but Diaspora Judaism," and that as such it was of a "poorer and inferior type" to that which existed in Jerusalem (Judaism and St. Paul, p. 93). Paul's view of the Messiah, his concern for the Gentile, his "pessimism," his theory of the Law, his ignorance of the Rabbinic doctrine of repentance, his mysticism, his soteriology, his religious psychology --- all of these are opposite to Rabbinic thought (ibid., pp. 58-60). "For these phenomena Paul's individual genius and the conversation at Damascus do not suffice. Paul must have been less than a Rabbinic Jew, and more. To explain him are needed: (1) a Judaism which was other than Rabbinic; (2) religious influences, conceptions and practices which were not Jewish at all" (ibid., p. 66). It was not that Saul consciously adopted the concepts of Hellenism and the Mystery Religions, for these were viewed with horror by him. But he did unconsciously assimilate their views and outlook so that his religion differed from the Rabbinic Judaism in Jerusalem "in those very points which constitute the essence and bloom of a religion, different less in dogma than in attitude, less in creed than in outlook and emotion" (ibid., pp. 94-95). Thus Montefiore is "disposed to look with much suspicion upon the statement in the Acts . . . that Paul "was brought up in Jerusalem, at the feet of Gamaliel, instructed according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers" (ibid., p. 90). And he regards Phil. 3.4-6 as having "no genuine Jewish ring" (ibid., p. 94). To Judaism, it is the fact of Saul's Diaspora Judaism, a religion which was "poorer, colder, less satisfying and more pessimistic than Rabbinic Judaism" (ibid., p. 126) which underlies the reason why "his profoundly religious nature had not been given the nurture it required" (ibid., p. 127), and why he later "sets up imaginary ninepins in order to knock them down" (C. G. Montefiore, "Jewish Concepts of Christianity," H.J., Vol. XXVIII, Jan. 1930, p. 251). This approach has been taken over by a few Christian scholars, e.g. James Perkes (cf. esp. Jesus, Paul and the Jews, p. 124).

the Hebraic claims, preferring to argue from the analogies between Saul's later Christian theology and the Mysteries to an early dependence of Saul on Hellenistic thought.¹

The question is pertinent. The position that is taken regarding Saul's position in the complex of Pharisaism will affect one's whole understanding of his teaching and practice --- both as a Jew and as a Christian. If his later Christian theology is dependent upon Hellenistic thought at few or many points, and not rooted in a Palestinian Judaism, his conversion and/or his Christian understanding of the Old Testament, then the extent to which it is dependent upon such Hellenism is the extent to which the biographical claims to Hebraic Judaism are fiction. The answer to this question determines the sources and analogies to be stressed and the interpretive principles to be employed in understanding the religious life of Saul and in appreciating much of the Pauline theology.

¹With men such as R. Reitzenstein and W. Bousset leading the field, scores began to turn their attention to the analogies between Greek and Christian thought. In the excitement of discovery, superficialities were so stressed and analogies so used as proof of necessary dependence that some began to ask "whether Comparative Religion has hunted down its game according to fair forest-law, or whether its 'bag' is poached" (A. Schweitzer, Paul and his Interpreters, p. 194). But not all were 'poachers'; and in the endeavour to adjust the excitement of the discoveries to a saner perspective, much thought was expended. So much so, that in 1928 A. D. Nock said in light-hearted irony: "'Saviour-gods' and mysteries probably did not bulk so large in the life of the first century A.D. as in modern study" ("Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background," Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation, ed. A. E. J. Rawlinson, p. 81). But all the effort has not been in vain, for to-day there can be seen what appears to be a gathering of ideas flowing in one general direction.

It is useless at this point to bring in general arguments for either the authenticity or the non-historical character of the speeches in Acts and the letters of Paul. We can only test the Pauline Hebraic assertions by comparing what is known of his personal situation, actions, attitudes, concepts, expressions and hermeneutics with that which is known of Hebraic and Hellenistic thought and mentality.

The Objection from his Diaspora Home

The most obvious objection to Saul's Hebraicism is the fact of his Diaspora home.¹ Acts 21.39 represents him as calling himself Ἰουδαῖος, Ταρσεύς, τῆς Κιλικίας ;² in Acts 22.3 the phrase is γεγεννημένος ἐν Ταρσῷ τῆς Κιλικίας in Acts 9.11 the words of the Lord in the vision to Ananias refer to Saul as "a man of Tarsus" (Ταρσέα) and in Acts 9.30 and 11.25 Saul first flees to and then is called from Tarsus. Yet his Diaspora home is not as obvious a sign of his Hellenism as would first appear.

The Scene of Saul's Upbringing

The problem is complicated by the uncertainty of the proper reading of the text in Acts 22.3. Is ἀνατετραμμένος to be separated by a comma from the instruction at the feet of Gamaliel and thus possibly

¹Many writers consider it evident that "by the circumstances of his birth and upbringing Paul belonged to the liberal Hellenistic side of Judaism" (S. H. Hooke, "Christianity and Mystery Religions," Judaism and Christianity, Vol. I, ed. W. O. E. Oesterley, p. 241). Cf., e.g., also T. R. Glover, Paul of Tarsus, pp. 5-23; M. Dibelius, Paul, pp. 15-26; J.-H. Schoeps, Paulus, pp. 24-26; K. Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," J.E., Vol. XI, pp. 79-80.

²Or ἐν Ταρσῷ ... τῆς Κιλικίας as in the sixth century Bezae.

to refer to a pre-educational upbringing in Jerusalem, or is the participle connected to both the phrases "in this city" and "at the feet of Gamaliel" and thus to be temporally equivalent to *παιδευμένος*? The first reading would open the possibility for Saul's infancy or very early childhood to have been spent in Jerusalem.¹ The second would connect his coming to Jerusalem with his education, and the question of where he was reared would then depend more upon when he came to be so educated.

Both readings are possible. The second, however, seems more probable textually, for then all the verbal nouns in the line of qualifications presented in verses 3 and 4 would each uniformly precede its clause. To separate *ἀναστραφείς* from "at the feet of Gamaliel" would require *παιδευμένος* to function verbally for that phrase and the next, and would land the participle right in the centre of its clause --- disrupting the uniform pattern. Now such disruption is certainly possible. But, with all else equal, certainly symmetry and order should be telling.

This exegesis is not necessarily opposed by the *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* of Acts 26.4. The "from the beginning" need not refer to more than "among my nation," with "and in Jerusalem" indicating a chronological extension of thought.

The question thus turns on the age of Saul when he, or his family for him,² sought an education at the Pharisaic school in Jerusalem.

¹So W. C. van Unnik, Tarsus of Jerusalem, De Stadt van Paulus' Jeugd (Amsterdam, 1952).

²If Saul's father and, possibly, grandfather had been Pharisees (cf. Acts 23.6), then such a family decision would have been natural --- if not inevitable.

And here the evidence is definitely inadequate. That the Mishnaic time schedule of "five years old for the Scripture" and "ten years for the Mishnah"¹ reflects Pharissism's practice in Saul's day, or that Josephus' educational schedule² was normative, are both debatable. We do know that education in the Scriptures and the Laws was stressed in every city for the Israelite boy,³ and that at an early age,⁴ and that there were also special Pharisaic schools where, it seems, prospective Rabbis were trained more intensively.⁵ Thus it would not

¹Mish. Aboth 5.21. The fact that the Qumran "Two-Column Fragment," which probably preceded and was attached to 1QS, enumerates the same age divisions as Mish. Aboth 5.21 makes it more plausible that this is a true reflection of an earlier age. In "The Fragment," one is to study "the Book of Study" for ten years, and then at twenty to undergo an examination preparatory to his admission into the community. CDC 14.3-12 (17.1-8) also corresponds to Pirke Aboth in its age requirements for those governing and officiating positions.

²Josephus, Life, 2: "When I was a child, and about fourteen years of age, I was commended by all for the love I had to learning; of which account, the high priests, and principal men of the city came then frequently to me together, in order to know my opinion about the accurate understanding of points of the law. And when I was about sixteen years old, I had a mind to make trial of the several sects that were among us." He then goes on to tell of his accelerated course in Pharisaism, Sadducean thought, Essene life and under a desert dweller named Banus, and that he returned to live as a Pharisee. We need not agree with him as to the extent of his knowledge or his comparison of the Pharisees to the Stoics, but the ages he relates are interesting.

³Cf. Josephus, Antiq. IV. 8. 12, Contra Apion I. 12; Mish. Kid. 4.13, Mish. Keth. 2.10, Mish. Shab. 1.3; b. Bab. Bath. 21a.

⁴Josephus, Contra Apion II. 18: "From our first consciousness (*ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἐβθῆς αἰσθησεως*)"; Philo, Leg. ad Cai. 210 (Cohn and Wendland, Vol. VI, p. 194): "From earliest youth (*ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας*)."

⁵The schools at Jamnia and Beth Shear'im certainly reflect this practice (cf. b. Sot. 49b).

be at all improbable that the Mishnah and Josephus are both indicating the approximate situation: an early education in the Scriptures and the traditions in each city through the co-operation of the synagogue school, the synagogue and the home,¹ with the possibility of further intensive schooling commencing in one's teens at one of the rabbinical schools. In view of the lack of conclusive evidence for a pre-educational residence in Jerusalem and the known educational schedules for the Jewish boy, it seems that the biographical statements in question best fit into such a context: Saul was reared with his family at Tarsus until sometime in his teens,² and then took up studies under Gamaliel at Jerusalem.

The Influence of a Diaspora Home

Assuming an early Tarsian training for Saul, the extent of Hellenistic influence upon him because of his Diaspora home must be investigated. The answer involves an understanding of both the Judaism of Tarsus and that of Saul's family.

Tarsian Judaism. -- Recent studies have emphasised the fact that we must be careful not to divide Judaism into an absolute geographical dichotomy; i.e. to distinguish too sharply between

¹Cf. E. Schürer, Jewish People, Div. II, Vol. II, p. 44ff.

²R. Eliezer was told he was too old to learn Torah at twenty-two (Aboth de R. Nathan, a, vi and b, xiii) or twenty-eight (Pirke de R. Eliezer, ch. 1).

Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism.¹ And this emphasis is needful in light of the former presentation of a water-tight Hebraic Judaism within Palestine and a syncretistic Hellenistic Judaism beginning near the borders and extending outward. But we must also be careful in the mitigation of the geographical factor that we do not overlook the more important recognition of differing mental climates within the basic unity of Judaism. There are two factors here involved, the geographical and that regarding attitude and outlook. While it is true that Judaism cannot be neatly bisected, the position that only seeks to lessen the force of the geographical confuses while it explains. It is probably truer to view Judaism as "drawn and quartered" within a unity. The 'horizontal' cleavage of geography must be noted. But more important is the 'vertical' break between Hebraic and Hellenistic inclinations and thought in both Palestine and the Diaspora. The geographical distinction of Palestinian and Diaspora and the mental climate demarcation of Hebraic and Hellenistic are, at one and the same time, both distinct and inter-related matters. We must not equate the two sets of terms and believe that in dealing with the one we have also treated the other. We must not erase the distinction of Hebraic and Hellenistic in lessening that of Palestinian and Diaspora, nor emphasise the cleavage between Palestinian and Diaspora in insisting that Hebraic and Hellenistic mental climates are different.

¹W. L. Knox, Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem; C. A. A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul; W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism; W. D. Stacey, The Pauline View of Man. Though this is a more modern emphasis, it is not a new discovery to either Christian or Jewish scholarship; cf. H. A. A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, p. 22, and I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, p. 82. H.-J. Schoeps, however, has attempted to revive the old view of a unity of culture and outlook based purely on geographical lines (cf. Paulus, pp. 24-26).

It is certainly true that on the basis of geography and increased external pressures upon the Jewish mental climate, Diaspora Judaism could be more readily characterised as Hellenistic than that of Palestine. Certainly the Diaspora had its Philo and Palestine produced the Mishnah. But Jerusalem also had its Hellenistic synagogues¹ and Corinth its Hebraic Jews.² Babylon yielded to none as a centre of Hebraic thought. Both Jewish heretics and Jewish patriarchs bore Greek names,³ and both could have originally come from a Diaspora city and carried their city's name with them throughout their life.⁴

To characterise all of the Diaspora as either lax⁵ or hyperstrict⁶ in its outward observance of the Law is precarious indeed.⁷ We might expect a more humane application of the laws in the

¹Acts 6.9. See E. Schürer, "Alexandrians in Jerusalem," J.E., Vol. I, pp. 371-372.

²II Cor. 11.22. Cf. W. Schmithals, Die Gnosis in Korinth, p. 36: "Nennen sie sich betont 'Εβραῖοι', so bezeichnen sie sich damit (im weitesten Sinne) als Palästinajuden. Sie mögen bereits in der Diaspora wohnhaft gesehen sein, wie das bei Pls ja auch der Fall war, ohne doch die innere und äussere Bindung an die palästinische Heimat verloren zu haben." Whatever is thought of Schmithals' main thesis cannot blunt his point here.

³E.g., the Jewish heretics Stephen and Philip, the patriarch Antigonos of Socho (Mish. Aboth 1.3).

⁴E.g., Saul of Tarsus and Hillel "the Babylonian." It is recorded that Hillel's Babylonian origin was once mocked by two men who attempted to make him angry in order to test his patience (b. Sheb. 31a).

⁵W. L. Knox, St. Paul, p. 24.

⁶C. G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul.

⁷Cf. H. A. A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, p. 14.

Diaspora, but the emphatic rejection by the chief Hellenist himself that the Law's demands are to be taken lightly or allegorised away puts us on our guard against assuming a general laxity in the Diaspora.¹ "Absence makes the heart grow fonder" is as true as "absent and forgotten"; and it seems the former is in part indicated by the Diaspora Jew in his enthusiasm to pay the temple tax while the Palestinian collections were gathered with difficulty.² The author of the fictionalised book of Tobit looks toward Jerusalem as "the goal of all his hopes,"³ and sets law-abiding in its strict sense as the ideal of Judaism.

All of these, it is true, are external matters. But they do suggest that we cannot conclude we understand Diaspora Judaism by

¹Though Philo emphasised the rightness of the soul's disposition before God to be the necessary condition in performing the ritual of the Law acceptably before God (*De Spec. Leg.* i, 27lf.), and though his presentation to his Gentile readers was an allegorised rendering of the meaning of the Law, "he roundly condemned those Jews who ignored the literal meanings of the Law as being worthless in favour of a symbolic meaning" (W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 96). He believed that circumcision should be allegorically interpreted, yet must be practised literally (*De Migrat. Abr.* 89-94). He insisted upon the eternality of the Law (*De Vita Mos.* 44), and rebuked those who did not practise it (*De Exsecrat.* 138f.).

²*De Spec. Leg.* i. 3 speaks of the Diaspora's enthusiasm; *Mish. Dem. passim*, *De Spec. Leg.* i. 5, and *Judith* 11.12ff. relate the situation in Palestine. This difference cannot all be attributed to the wealth of the Diaspora as against the poverty of Palestine. A truer reason could be the Palestinian disgust with some of the sham and hypocrisy surrounding the temple and the idealism of those far removed. Cf. W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, pp. 32-33.

³D. C. Simpson, Ap. and Ps., Vol. I, p. 185: "Distance lends enchantment to Jerusalem, the goal of all his hope."

reference only to the map.¹ The strength of Jewish orthodoxy varied not according to geography so much as according to mental climate.

The Judaism of Saul's home. -- We actually know very little about either the social situation or the mental climate of Saul's family. Deissmann's insistence that Saul's training in tent-making and continual occupation with that trade show him to have come "from the unliterary lower classes and remained one of them"² has failed to convince.³ Both the attitude of Judaism toward manual labour⁴ and the tone of Saul's later references to his labour and his acceptance

¹To the Synagogue, with its system of travelling teachers from Jerusalem, must go the credit in large measure for preserving the coherence of a Judaism which was both centered and scattered. Regarding the Synagogue as the external unifying factor in Judaism, see F. J. F. Jackson and K. Lake, Beginnings, Vol. I, pp. 159ff.; O. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel, p. 111; W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 7. Regarding the basic unity between Temple and Synagogue, see I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, p. 2ff.

²A. Deissmann, Paul, p. 48.

³See J. G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, p. 45; C. H. Dodd, The Mind of Paul: A Psychological Approach, pp. 7-8. Deissmann's romantic figure of the horny-handed, sweating stitcher looking up from his work to greet friends and dictating letters in the midst of hard toil falls a little flat in view of the Talmudic view: "A man should always teach his son a clean and not laborious trade. What, for example? R. Hisda said: Needle-stitching" (b. Ber. 63a).

⁴R. Gamaliel II is credited with saying: "Excellent is Torah study together with wordly business, . . . all Torah without work [i.e., manual labour] must fail at length, and occasion iniquity" (Mish. Aboth 2.2). A disciple of R. Akiba is even called "R. Johanan, the Sandal-maker" (Mish. Aboth 4.14). Also b. Kid. 99a: "Whosoever doth not teach his son work, teacheth him to rob." The earliest explicit statement of this nature seems to be Sirach 7.15: "Hate not laborious work, nor husbandry, for it was ordained of God." Box and Oesterley, Ap. and Ps., Vol. I, p. 339, n. 15, point out the parallel between Sirach 7.15 and Job 7.1 in the phrase "hate not a warfare of work." The reference to "the carpenter's son" of Matt. 13.55, Mk. 6.3 is not opposed to this; for there the objection is not raised because of Jesus', or Joseph's, manual labour, but because of His supposedly known lineage.

of money¹ argue against an early proletarian status. Rather, it appears highly probable that he came from a well-to-do bourgeois home; for if he were born a Roman citizen,² then we must credit his family to be of some wealth and some social standing.³ Wealth and standing in society imply contact with the Gentile world, and indeed we must assume a fair share of such contact on the part of Saul's family. But more important than the external contacts are the inward attitudes. C. A. Anderson Scott has concisely and well stated this in saying:

The position of a Jewish family in such a city was not really analogous to that of a family of any other race. Probably the strongest thing in the consciousness of such a family would be the sense of difference, of separateness, of occupying a higher plane religiously and ethically than the Gentiles round about. All the outward expressions of family life, the common meals, the festivals, the study of the Law, the worship of the Synagogue, would tend to preserve and foster this separateness. Even under modern circumstances it is characteristic of many Jewish homes that they retain the Jewish atmosphere with little modification from without. And there is good reason to believe that Paul's home was one of this type.⁴

¹C. H. Dodd's words are apposite. Of I Cor. 4.9-13, he says: "A man born to manual labour does not speak self-consciously of 'labouring with my own hands.' . . . Surely we miss the point of this unless we read it as the utterance of one whose natural place in society is the exact reverse of all this" (The Mind of Paul: A Psychological Approach, p. 7). Of Phil. 4.14-19: "Here Paul is trying to say a graceful word of thanks for a gift of money. How much he hated taking it, we may infer from I Corinthians, ix. 15-18. He can scarcely bring himself to acknowledge that the money was welcome to him, . . . This was a man who had chosen poverty as his lot for ideal ends, but could never feel himself one of the 'poor,' to whom alms might be offered without suspicion of offence" (ibid., pp. 7-8).

²Acts 22.25-29.

³C. H. Dodd, The Mind of Paul: A Psychological Approach, p. 7.

⁴C. A. A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, pp. 3-4.

There is the tradition recorded by Jerome¹ which suggests that Saul's parents originally came from a town in Galilee called Gishala,² and that they fled to Tarsus during the Roman devastation of Palestine. If this be true, it would appear that Saul's parents went to Tarsus at the first not because of the opportunities presented or out of Hellenistic leanings but of "stern necessity."³ It would further portray them as first-generation colonists, whose motto could easily have been: "In the world, but not of the world."

It is interesting that this possible family attitude seems to crop up implicitly in the recorded Pauline reference to Tarsus. In Acts 22.3, when addressing Jews, he just names the city. But in Acts 21.39, when speaking to the Gentile officer, his reference is more profuse. Rendel Harris has argued that the reference to Athens as "a not ignoble Greek City," οὐκ ἄσημος Ἑλληνῶν πόλις as recorded for us by Euripides,⁴ was well-known in the Greek speaking world and was probably used by other prominent cities to compare themselves

¹Comm. on Philem., 23.

²The criticism that Galilee was, after all, closer to apocalyptic thought than Pharisaic is partially countered by W. D. Davies, "The Jewish Background of the Teaching of Jesus: Apocalyptic and Pharisaism," E.T., Vol. LIX, No. 9 (June, 1948), p. 233.

³W. Barclay, The Mind of St. Paul, p. 28. Barclay's full statement is: "We cannot think that at some time Paul's father had emigrated to Cilicia in search of fame and fortune; a Pharisee would never willingly have lived away from the sacred soil of the Holy land; it must have been some stern necessity which brought him there."

⁴Ion, line 8: οὐκ ἄσημος Ἑλληνῶν πόλις, and Dionys. Hal. ant. Rom. 2.35: πόλις οὐκ ἄσημος, γένος ἔχουσαι τὸ Ἑλληνικόν.

favourably with Athens.¹ This could easily have been the case, and Paul seems to be doing just that in referring to Tarsus as οὐκ ἑσθίου πάλαιος.² But the interesting factor is that Paul cannot bring himself to say with Euripides, and possibly with the common designation, Ἑλλήνων --- even to a Gentile soldier. It is possible that here Paul expresses a home-bred attitude: a recognition of certain excellencies within the Gentile world, but a refusal to credit the pagan world for them or to associate oneself too closely to them.

Thus, while it is true that a Hellenistic Judaism could be expected to be more common in the Diaspora than in Palestine and a more tolerant attitude toward the inconsequential practices of the Gentile seems obligatory for the existence of a Diaspora Jew, we must yet insist that "no hasty conclusions must be drawn from the fact that Paul was born in Tarsus."³ It was possible for a thoroughly Hebraic Jew to be born in the Diaspora and to have received his pre-teenage education in such a milieu.

The Witness of his Actions and Attitudes

Montefiore has asserted that Saul's Judaism differed from Hebraic Judaism "less in dogma than in attitude, less in creed than in outlook and in emotion."⁴ This section therefore takes up the four main arguments in this area against Saul's Hebraicism.

¹R. Harris, "Did St. Paul quote Euripides?" E.T., Vol. XXXI, No. 1 (Oct. 1919), pp. 36-37. It is of course always possible that οὐκ ἑσθίου πάλαιος was a common form of speech, even without Ἑλλήνων.

²Though the Western Text omits this phrase.

³H. A. A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, p. 14.

⁴C. G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, pp. 94-95.

The Persecution of the Church

The Tübingen school and others have denied that Saul was trained under Gamaliel on the ground that his harsh attitude and action in Acts 8.1,3 and 9.1,2 are not worthy a pupil of so tolerantly minded a teacher as Gamaliel.¹ Gamaliel's words in Acts 5.34-39 are certainly an example of moderation in the midst of frenzy, and are in the tradition of true Hebraic Pharisaism.²

¹There is no "indication in Paul's writings or arguments that he had received the rabbinical training ascribed to him by Christian writers, ancient and modern; least of all could he have acted or written as he did had he been, as is alleged, the disciple of Gamaliel I, the mild Hillelite" (K. Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," J.E., Vol. XI, p. 79).

²In opposition to J. Weiss' insistence that the words of Gamaliel in Acts are "an historical mistake" and not true to the Pharisaic character (The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. I, p. 185), it must be noted that Antiq. XIII. 10. 6 speaks of the gentleness, mildness and justness of the Pharisees. The statement of the second century R. Johanan, that "any assembling together that is for the sake of Heaven shall in the end be established, but any that is not for the sake of Heaven shall not in the end be established" (Mish. Aboth 4.11), stresses, as Gamaliel's words of Acts 5, the policy of wait and see the end result. And there is every reason to believe that this sentiment ran right through the best in Pharisaism.

Such a policy sprang not only from the natural toleration of the Hasidim, but also from the lessons of history. The Hasmonean Simon's messiahship (I Macc. 14.4ff.), the pretensions of the Hezekiah whom the youthful Herod put down in Galilee (Antiq. XIV. 9. 2), the nationalism of Judas the Galilean from Gamala (Antiq. XVIII. 1. 1 and 6; XX. 5. 2; Wars II. 8. 1, and 17. 8), and the prophetic claims of Theudas (Antiq. XVII. 10. 5 or XX. 5. 1) had all had their day and in the end were proved invalid. Possibly significant is b. Sanh. 98b, 99a, where it is twice stated that "Hillel . . . maintained that there will be no Messiah for Israel, since they have already enjoyed him during the reign of Hezekiah." The statement in 99a has added: "May God forgive him [i.e., Hillel for so saying]." J. Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel, p. 404, and G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. II, p. 347, n. 2, believe this reference to be to another than Hillel the Elder. But S. Mowinkel, He That Cometh, p. 284, n. 6, following Gressmann, Der Messias, pp. 449ff., and M. Bittenwieser, "Messiah," J.E., Vol. VIII, p. 508, insist that this is the great Rabbi. If this be truly the Hillel of Herod the Great's time, then there was in Gamaliel's own family a tragedy of mistaken identity which would strongly urge upon Gamaliel a policy of moderation. The further question of whether this Hezekiah was the king of Judah, as the Talmud insists, or the insurrectionist from Galilee is somewhat inconsequential at this point. Although, in view of Akiba's recognition of Simon ben Kosebah, the latter cannot be viewed as an impossibility. If it had been the Galilean, Hillel's position would have been even more tragic in the eyes of his posterity.

In dealing with this situation, Klausner has asserted that Saul was "that pupil" mentioned in late Talmudic sources as arguing with Gamaliel regarding the material element in the Messianic blessing.¹ Thus he associates Saul with Gamaliel while accounting for the difference. The identification of "that pupil" with Saul, however, is far from settled. At best it would be but a much later Jewish explanation for the roots of Saul's later Christian theology --- his argumentative and pernicious character. Thackeray's explanation is more probable: "It is not paradoxical to suppose in the case of a man of St. Paul's temperament . . . that the same doubt which inclined Gamaliel to leniency only heightened the fervour of persecuting zeal in the Apostle."²

And yet there appears to be a more evident answer in the Acts account itself. Previous to Gamaliel's advice, it is recorded that the witness and central issue of the preaching of the Church had been concerning the divine Messiahship of Christ --- His heaven ordained death, His victorious resurrection and His present status as exalted Redeemer. "The stream of thought flowed in an intense but narrow channel, carrying in its flood much that for the time remained in solution in the sub-conscious rather than in the conscious region of the Christian mentality."³ To the Sanhedrin, and especially to the

¹J. Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel, p. 507, n. 24, and From Jesus to Paul, pp. 309-311.

²H. St. J. Thackeray, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Thought, p. 10.

³W. Manson, Jesus The Messiah, p. 52.

Sadducean and priestly element who instigated the early suppressions, such teaching not only caused turmoil to orderly rule but, more important, impinged upon their authority. But to the more noble and tolerant of the Pharisees, the Jerusalem Christians were yet within the scope of Judaism and not to be treated as 'minim'. Any divine claims for Jesus the Christ as yet lay in the sub-consciousness of the Church, and the Jewish Christians gave no evidence of laxness in the observance of the Law because of their beliefs. Other sects within Judaism were tolerated, and deluded Messianic followers could be countenanced as well. "The Pharisees might wish all men to be even as they were; but that result could be attained only by persuasion."¹ But between Gamaliel's advice and Saul's action there appeared from the under-currents of Christian thought an ominous element of Jewish apostasy. Stephen in Acts 6, egged on by Dispersion Jews who had probably moved to the homeland out of a desire for stricter law-abiding and thus were interested in Christianity's attitude toward the Law,² began to apply the doctrine of the Messiahship of Christ to the area of Jewish law. From the accusation in 6.13-14, this seems to have been the import of his message. And his defence runs along these lines. Here was a dangerous path to tread; one which even the apostles were not ready to take. Stephen's message was Jewish apostasy indeed! And it was especially to be opposed because voiced by a Hellenistic Jew

¹A. D. Nock, St. Paul, pp. 35-36.

²B. Reicke speaks of Stephen's opponents as "zionistischen Diasporajuden" ("Der geschichtliche Hintergrund des Apostelkonzils und der Antioch-Episode," Studia Paulina, In honor J. Zwaan, p. 178).

who had probably claimed to have returned to the Holy City out of religious ardour, but who now was most vociferous against that which he had formerly professed.¹ Had Gamaliel faced this aspect in the Sanhedrin, "his attitude would surely have been different."² With the whole basis of Judaism being thus threatened, Saul's action could have been taken with Gamaliel's full approval.

His action could easily be biblically justified. Numbers 25.12-13 recounts the turning away of God's wrath by one man who was zealous to put apostasy out of Israel, even to the killing of the offenders, and the praise of God that came to him for his action. To Saul the situations of then and now could easily have been analogous: Israel's near entrance into the land with Israel's near Messianic kingdom, and the similar apostasies which could but further delay God's blessings.³ The exhortation of II Maccabees 6.13 could even have rung in his ears: "For indeed it is a mark of great kindness when the impious are not let alone for a long time, but punished at once." This situation had every aspect of a holy war in which the

¹See Appendix regarding the Jewish apostasy of the Hellenists in the Jerusalem Church and Judaism's attitude toward them.

²J. Parkes, Jesus, Paul and the Jews, p. 101.

³"Sins cannot completely frustrate the redemption; but they can delay it. This is the prevalent view in the Talmud" (J. Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel, p. 430; cf. pp. 428-432). Cf. Str.-Bil. on Acts 1.7 for the various positions taken.

The idea that Israel must not be allowed to drift apart into apostasy in the face of near Messianic blessing seems well embedded in the thought of Judaism. "R. Simeon b. Yohai said: Like as when a man who brings together two ships, and binds them together with ropes and cords, and builds a palace upon them; while the ships are lashed together, the palace stands; when they drift apart it cannot stand. So only when Israel does God's will is His heavenly palace secure" (Sifre Deut., Berakah, 346, trans. A Rabbinic Anthology, ed. C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, p. 35). The fact that Qumran reveals parallel thought, e.g., IQS 9.20-21, makes it probable that this sentiment characterised the Judaism of the first century as well.

best of Pharisaism could, and possibly should, participate.¹

An Interest in Gentiles

The correlation between the election of Israel and a missionary emphasis on the part of the Chosen People had always been a problem in Judaism, as witnesses the story of Jonah. And this was in spite of the blessing to the nations included in the Abrahamic blessing,² the promise of light to the Gentiles in Isa. 49.6 and the words regarding the turning of the Gentiles to the worship of God in Isa. 55.6-7, Zeph. 3.9-10 and Zech. 8.22.³ For the homeland, the problem could be more easily disregarded since contacts with Gentiles were fewer.⁴ But for the Diaspora, the Gentile question was constantly pressing. Thus appears the well-known and oft-mentioned missionary interest among the Diaspora Jews.⁵ The success of such activity is indicated by Josephus' mention of the many proselytes in Antioch,⁶ the women sympathisers

¹Such a combination of withdrawal to godliness and zeal for holy war is paralleled in the Qumran community and has for its precedent many cases in Israel's history; cf. infra, pp. 135-136. See Appendix regarding the relations of the Jerusalem Church within the nation.

²Gen. 22.18, 26.4, 28.14.

³Isa. 60 is not in the same class as these passages, for there the emphasis is upon Israel's blessing through the subjugation of the nations.

⁴Yet Gentile contacts were not unknown to Palestinian Pharisaism. The Talmud gives many instances of laws regarding Jewish and Gentile partnerships in agricultural pursuits (e.g., b. Shab. 150a) and Jews bathing with Gentiles (e.g., b. Shab. 151a). Regarding the agricultural associations, H. Loewe has pertinently remarked: "Even if all these Jews were not Pharisees, the recognition of their association with Gentiles was Pharisaic" ("Pharisaism," Judaism and Christianity, Vol. I, ed. W. O. E. Oesterley, p. 112).

⁵Cf. E. Schürer, Jewish People, Div. II, Vol. II, pp. 304ff.; F. J. F. Jackson and K. Lake, Beginnings, Vol. I, pp. 164f. and Vol. V, pp. 74f.

⁶War, VII. 3. 3.

in Damascus,¹ and by Paul's constant encounter with οἱ σαββαιοὶ of the Greeks.² However, we must not suppose that there was no missionary interest in Palestine itself.

Klausner has argued from the fact that the Pharisees accepted "without argument" the Book of Ruth, "in which David and his dynasty, and hence the King-Messiah also, are traced back to a converted Moabite," that "hence the Pharisees and their successors, the Tannaim, could not have been at all opposed to proselytes in general."³ And in the Gospels, Matt. 23.15 speaks of Palestinian Pharisees traversing "sea and land to make a single Proselyte" and Luke 2.32 quotes the aged Simeon as believing that God's blessing contains universal implications. The statement of Hillel is probably the clearest expression of such concern in the Talmud: "Be of the disciples of Aaron, loving peace and pursuing peace, loving mankind and bringing them nigh to the Law."⁴ But Daube's argument that Hillel's ethical maxim in the Tosephta⁵ and its later extensions⁶ were originally "missionary maxims . . . turned into general rules of seemly conduct in strict harmony with the legalistic attitude"⁷ is certainly

¹War, II. 20. 2.

²Acts 13.14, 43, 50; 17.4, 17.

³J. Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel, p. 478.

⁴Mish. Aboth 1.12. Cf. N. N. Glatzer, "Hillel the Elder in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, p. 241, for an excellent summary regarding Hillel's interest in proselytes.

⁵Tos. Ber. 2.24.

⁶Derekh Eretz Rabbah 8.4; Derekh Eretz Zuta 5.5.

⁷D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 340.

possible, and would add more explicit expression to a Hebraic missionary interest.¹ The statement of R. Eleazar at least shows a contact with and an interest in making a proper answer to the Gentiles: "Be alert to study the Law and know how to make answer to an unbeliever (lit. Epicurean)."² And at a time when Gentile persecution and the traitor tactics of proselytes turned the hearts and eyes of Judaism away from the world, and legislation was inaugurated to hinder such proselytising attempts,³ agony and concern over the fate of the majority of mankind was expressed by the writer of IV Ezra.⁴

It is therefore not sufficient to say that Saul's later Christian interest in the Gentiles sprang from his interest in them as a Hellenistic Jew. While it could have had sufficient roots in the experience and call associated with his conversion, coupled with the historical commands and possibly teachings of his new Lord, it is fully possible that it was originally planted and cultivated in the soil of Hebraicism.

¹For further implicit Talmudic evidence regarding a Hebraic interest in the Gentiles, see the articles in J.E.: "Proselyte," Vol. X, p. 222, by E. G. Hirsch; "Conversion," Vol. IV, p. 250, by K. Kohler; and "Judaism," Vol. VII, p. 366, also by Kohler. The thesis of these articles is that "in pre-Christian times very determined efforts were made toward proselytizing the heathens; but as soon as the Church took up the task, following the methods of Paul, . . . the zeal of the Jews diminished, the 'the conversion of the Gentiles,' . . . became obnoxious to the Synagogue" ("Conversion," p. 250).

²Mish. Aboth 2.14.

³Cf. E. G. Hirsch, "Proselyte," J.E., Vol. X, p. 224.

⁴Esp. ch. 7.

A Mystic Temperament

Saul's later mysticism as a Christian has also been set against his Hebraic biographical claims. Montefiore has insisted that the Rabbinic Judaism of Saul's day did not foster a mystic temperament, though mysticism was not altogether foreign to it.¹ Others have gone further in claiming that "the Jewish mind and character, in spite of its deeply religious bent, was alien to Mysticism."² The problem is twofold: (1) Could a mystic temperament spring from the Hebraic Pharisaism of Saul's day? and (2) Was Saul's later Christian mysticism really different from a possible Hebraic type?

Hebraic mysticism. -- The picture painted by the nineteenth century Jewish historians of pre-70 A.D. Hebraic Pharisaism, which portrayal has often served as the basis for twentieth century comparisons of Paul and Judaism, is devoid of a mystical element. However, 'a voice of one crying in the wilderness' has been raised from the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. It is G. G. Scholem's thesis that the rationalistic and mystical tendencies within Judaism have throughout history been "interrelated and interdependent. Neither were they from the start manifestly opposed to each other, a fact that is often overlooked."³ He insists that both the compiler of the Halakic traditions, the "pronounced rationalist" Judah the Patriarch,⁴ and the nineteenth century historians, as Graetz, Zunz and others, saw

¹C. G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, pp. 50-51.

²W. R. Inge, Christian Mysticism, p. 39. Cf. M. Dibelius, Paul, p. 35.

³G. G. Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, p. 23.

⁴Ibid., p. 42.

mysticism as an ally to Judaism's foes and a detriment to that type of Judaism which each desired to make dominant in their day. Mysticism for the nineteenth century historians, as well as for R. Judah,

epitomised everything that was opposed to their own ideas and to the outlook which they hoped to make predominant in modern Judaism. Darkly it stood in their path, the ally of forces and tendencies in whose rejection pride was taken by a Jewry which, in Steinschneider's words, regarded it as its chief task to make a decent exit from the world.¹

Scholem's thesis of the interrelation and interdependence of the rational and mystical tendencies within first century Judaism now seems even more convincing in view of the information from Qumran. Since 1948, it can no longer be said that "mysticism does not thrive where no other service of the eternal God is known than the fulfilling of his commandments."² The Talmud still possesses its faintly glowing embers of the mystical spirit in Hillel's esoteric statement,³ the account of the four Rabbis who entered Paradise,⁴ and the vision of R. Joseph.⁵ But it does seem that somewhere along the line of Rabbinic succession the crude but flaming piety has been extinguished by a more enlightened mind. "The sea of the Talmud" still possesses

¹Ibid., pp. 1-2.

²M. Dibelius, Paul, p. 35. Such a statement died in the same year as its author when Qumran broke its silence. See Ch. II, "The Religion of a Nomist," regarding the spirituality at Qumran.

³b. Suk. 53a: "If I am there [God speaking?], all are there, and if I am not there, who is there?" Cf. Lev. R. 35.1. W. Bacher uses this one statement to illustrate "the almost mystic depth of his [i.e. Hillel's] consciousness of God" ("Hillel," J.E., Vol. VI, p. 399).

⁴Tos. Hag. 14b.

⁵b. Pes. 50a.

"its gulf stream of mysticism,"¹ but that stream has been relegated to subterranean passages. The finger of accusation indeed points to R. Judah.² But as long as the "O taste and see that the Lord is good" of Psalm 34.9 is embedded in Hebrew literature, we cannot say that there was no foundation for a Hebraic mysticism.

Saul's Christian mysticism. -- Saul's Christian mysticism, however, is not the communion of the Old Testament sages nor the best that we can imagine in Pherisaism. Its roots are in the Hebrew concepts of identification and the corporate community of God and His people. But it goes beyond that. The fact that it goes beyond that of the Old Testament and Judaism would be no surprise to the convert Saul. His whole insistence is that the new covenant in its entirety, though having its roots in the old, goes far beyond the old;³ personal communion of the type where one can speak of himself as "in Christ" or "being changed into his likeness" stems not from the old but from that established in and through Christ.⁴

It must then be insisted that a sense of immediacy between God and man was possible in the Hebraic Pherisaism of Saul's day, but that Saul's Christian mysticism is most probably explained by his experience of Christ.

¹S. Schechter, Studies in Judaism, Preface xxix.

²W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 14-15, agrees with Scholem that the absence of mystical elements in the Mishnah is the result of the rationalism of R. Judah.

³II Cor. 3.7-11.

⁴II Cor. 3.18.



The Demands of the Law

Probably the most repeated objection to Saul's Hebraic Pharisaism is that of his later "pessimistic" view of the demands of the Law; i.e., that man is under a curse in not keeping the Law in its entirety. In Gal. 3.10 he refers to Deut. 27.26, and implies that this doctrine is well-known and accepted in Judaism. Gal. 3.10 and 5.3 have been variously described as "Paul's misrepresentation of Pharisaism"¹ or "his overstrained definition of the requirements of the Law."² And many have insisted that here he shows himself familiar with only a variation of Judaism and not the real Hebraicism which he claims.³ The Jewish objection is summarised by Moore:

How a Jew of Paul's antecedents could ignore, and by implication deny, the great prophetic doctrine of repentance, which, individualized and interiorized, was a cardinal doctrine of Judaism, namely, that God, out of love, freely forgives the sincerely penitent sinner and restores him to his favor --- that seems from the Jewish point of view inexplicable.⁴

To insist that one must do all the Law is to ignore Hebraic Pharisaism's central doctrine of the infinite and unceasing willingness of God to forgive the repentant sinner, and thus to show an unawareness, or at best a faulty comprehension, of that doctrine and

¹A. D. Nock, St. Paul, p. 29.

²G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. III, p. 150, n. 209. Cf. K. Lake, Paul: His Heritage and Legacy, pp. 70ff., and W. H. P. Hatch, "The Pauline Idea of Forgiveness," Studies in Early Christianity, ed. S. J. Case, p. 347.

³E.g., C. G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, pp. 72-73.

⁴G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. III, p. 151.

the Pharisaism to which it was basic. If Saul had really known the Judaism he claims, he could never have later misrepresented it so rankly.

Now it is possible to argue that this attitude is the result of his new Christian reinterpretation of the Old Testament; i.e., as a Christian he sees the whole Law in a new and different perspective. Whereas before he could visualise himself as being more capable of keeping the Law and view God as more tolerant, now, knowing righteousness in Christ and seeing himself in His intense light, he sees the awful claims of the Law as he never saw them before and God's grace more abundant because of man's inability. Thus his statements in Galatians are not supposed to represent the accepted theology of the best of Judaism, but his Christian understanding. The truth of this position lies in stressing Saul's heightened understanding of both grace and law as a Christian, but we need not insist that this understanding was entirely different from that of Pharisaism.

It must be noted that this doctrine of doing all the Law is not absent in Palestinian Judaism. The Mishnah speaks of being "heedful of a light commandment as of a weighty one,"¹ running "to fulfil the lightest duty even as the weightiest,"² and recounts how the reader at the scourging of an apostate or immoral man is to read the ominous words of Deut. 28.58f.: "If thou wilt not observe to do

¹Mish. Aboth 2.1.

²Mish Aboth 4.2.

all the words of this law, etc."¹ The Gemaras and Midrashim tell of R. Huna's teaching that adultery is the transgression of all the commandments,² Gamaliel II's turmoil over the "only he that does all these things shall live" of Ezek. 18.1-9,³ and R. Jose's teaching that liability is incurred for any infraction.⁴ The Tosephta, arguing on the principle that the Law and all of life is a single whole stemming from God, insists that the breaking of a commandment reveals a previous denial of the Almighty.⁵ On this same principle, IV Maccabees has the aged Eleazar say to his torturer Antiochus:

¹Mish. Mak. 3.14. Even if Gal. 5.3 had not been part of Saul's Pharisaic theology, the five occasions when these words were forcibly hurled at him as a Christian (II Cor. 11.24) could have convinced him of their Pharsaic nature; cf. A. Deissmann, Paul, pp. 61-62.

²E.g., Num. R. 9.12, on Num. 5.14.

³b. Sanh. 81a. R. Akiba, however, quoted to him Lev. 18.24, and insisted that since one does not have to do all the abominations enumerated to be defiled so one does not have to do all the commands to live (an argument directly countered by Haggai 2.11-13); a conscientious and on the whole successful keeping of the Law was what was meant. The interesting aspect is that here a grandson of Saul's claimed teacher is cited as accepting, or at least being troubled by, the very doctrine which the Christian Saul proclaims, while Akiba, who was so influential in the moulding of the thought of his day and that of the later codified Mishnah, opposes him. In the parallel passage, b. Mak. 24a, Gamaliel's perplexity arises from Psalm 15.

⁴b. Shab. 70b. R. Jose, commenting on the phrase in Lev. 4.2, "if a soul shall sin through ignorance against any one of the commandments of the Lord," says: "'Of one of them' teaches that liability is incurred for one complete act; for one which is but part of one; for performing labours forbidden in themselves, and for labours whose prohibition is derived from others."

⁵Tos. Shebu. 3.6: "No man denies the derivative (i.e. the separate commandments) until he has previously denied the Root (i.e. God), and no man sins unless he has denied Him who commanded him not to commit that sin." (Translation and parentheses from A Rabbinic Anthology, C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, p. 122).

"The transgression of the Law, be it in small things or in great, is equally heinous; for in either case equally the Law is despised."¹ So also in the Qumran texts the emphasis is upon doing all the commandments.² In the New Testament, the Epistle of James, whose roots were in Pharisaism, parallels Paul's statement by saying that guilt in all results from failure at one point.³ It seems that Daube has not overstated the case in saying that "the inter-dependence of all precepts, their fundamental equality, the importance of even the minor ones, or apparently minor ones, because of their association with the weightiest --- these were common themes among the Tannaites."⁴

Further, the forgiveness of God is not necessarily minimised by a belief in the condemnation of the whole Law resting upon one who breaks it at one point. For the writer of IV Ezra, the realisation of man's utter inability, because all men had broken God's law or one point or more and thus were under God's judgment, only set the stage for God's mercy: "For in this, O Lord, shall thy righteousness and goodness be declared, if thou will

¹IV Maccabees 5.20-21. The passage in Sirach 7.8, if the Secondary Syriac reading of "former sins" be rejected, would add further non-canonical evidence: "In respect of one sin thou art not without guilt."

²E.g., 1QS 1.14. W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, p.281, n. 80, says that he counted 73 instances in 1QS alone where the term "all" is used in connection with doing the Law.

³James 2.10.

⁴D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 251. Daube's comments on pp. 119ff. and the condensation of Wetstein's work in J. B. Mayor, The Epistle of St. James, p. 86, are excellent treatments of this whole problem.

compassionate them that have no wealth of good works."¹ Judaism could accept both the condemnation of the whole Law for offence at one point and the forgiveness of God which shows itself abundant in the face of human inability.

As with IV Ezra, so with Paul. It is not a pessimism that is presented, but a pessimistic-optimism; i.e., man's case is hopelessly condemned, but in God there is abundant hope. In Gal. 3.10 and 5.3 the pessimism of human effort is expressed and emphasised to those who would make human endeavour an avenue to righteousness. But Paul's total presentation is not non-Pharisaic.

We can only insist here, as we have for the previous three objections of this type, that the case against the Pauline Hebraic claims from his actions and attitudes is at best inconclusive. The inquiry now turns to his ideas and expressions, and their Hellenistic affinities.

The Objections from his Concepts and Presentation

One of the major matters of interest and controversy in New Testament studies since the latter half of the nineteenth century has been the relation of the concepts of Christianity to those of the religious movements within the Hellenistic world.² Much that has been revealed in the investigations in this area is of pertinence here. But it is not the attempt of this section to

¹IV Ezra 8.36.

²See A. Schweitzer, Paul and his Interpreters, for an extended survey of German scholarship through the turn of the century.

cover so vast an area in a few pages, nor even to summarise Paul's relation to the Mystery Religions. Our interest is exclusively in whether Saul's later expression as a Christian betrays an earlier influence of Hellenistic Judaism.

It cannot be doubted that much had transpired in Saul's life between his student days and his later Christian writings. And it is always extremely precarious to argue from a later attitude to an earlier one, especially when the two situations are separated by a great personal revolution of aim and action. Yet there is an area in which it is legitimate to consider the objections to Saul's Hebraicism from the standpoint of his later Christian expression. The extent to which his later writings show Rabbinic or Hellenistic affinities is the extent to which his Hebraic claims can be accepted or must be looked upon with suspicion. It is to be expected that his conversion would have made him less Rabbinic, but it is hardly to be supposed that it made him more so. Thus, whatever Rabbinic affinities there are in Saul's Christian theology must be assumed to have been carried over from his past. Whatever Hellenistic elements there are could have been picked up later, but their presence still must cast a valid suspicion upon his claims to a Hebraic past. Our concern is therefore to investigate Saul's Christian writings along the lines set by the objections raised.

The Nature of Religion

Religion as mystery. -- In the epistles of Paul, the word $\muυστηριον$ is used twenty times¹ with the majority of these usages

¹As cited in Young's Concordance.

having reference to the nature of the gospel which Paul proclaimed.¹ The Mystery Religions likewise used the term with reference to the nature of their message. In Hellenistic thought the term strictly denoted the rite or rites of the service which could not be divulged to the uninitiated, but popularly it connoted "the spiritual meaning . . . to justify the crude and primitive practices of barbarous religion."² Some have explained Paul's use of the term as being analogous to and showing dependence upon the Mysteries.

Philo's agreement with Hellenistic thought is clear at this point. Of his thirteen uses of *μυστήριον* and one of *μυστικός*³ all explicitly state, or are not contrary to, the correlation of 'mystery' with a secret and sacred knowledge of divinity open only to the initiated and sanctified --- and not to be revealed by them. In eight of the fourteen, the revelation of God through Moses, or an aspect of it, is described as a holy mystery in this sense.⁴ He can speak of Sarah learning that "being admitted into the inmost mysteries" she is "not to blab or babble them thoughtlessly but to store them up and guard them in secrecy and silence,"⁵ and can exhort the initiated to receive the truth through Moses "into your

¹Rom. 16.25-26; I Cor. 2.6-13, 4.1, 15.51; Eph. 3.3-10, 6.19; Col. 1.26-27, 2.2 and 4.3.

²W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, p. 183, n. 1.

³As cited by I. Leisegang, "Indices ad Philonis Alexandrini Opera," Vol. VII of Cohn and Wendland, Philonia Alexandrini Opera.

⁴De Cherub. 48-49; Quod Deus immut. 61; Leg. All. iii. 3, 27, 100; De Sacrif. Ab. et Cain. 60, 62.

⁵De Sacrif. Ab. et Cain. 60.

souls as holy mysteries indeed and babble not of them to any of the profane."¹ The Essenes likewise spoke of true religion as 'mystery', the nature of which they were to keep hidden² even in the face of torture and death.³ So also Wisdom 6.22 shows its acquaintance with such a definition, and possibly this is entailed in the description in 2.2 of those who did not know the mysteries of God.

With Paul, however, the term takes the Palestinian sense of Amos 3.7, Psa. 25.14, Prov. 3.32 and Sirach 3.20; i.e., a hitherto unknown aspect of God or His dealing which has now become known, either to all or to those who will accept such revelation.⁴ Paul's emphasis, as also that of the Talmud,⁵ was not on the hidden or secret nature of the revelation, but on its present manifestation. He spoke of "the mystery hidden for ages and generations," but only that he might emphasise "but now made manifest to his saints."⁶ In I Cor. 14.2 he used the term to mean an unrevealed and unrevealable divine secret. But there he definitely disassociated himself

¹De Cherub. 48.

²See Esp. 1QS 9.16-19. Also 1QS 8.18, the uncorrected text of 1QS 10.24 (where the original scribe wrote $\Gamma\text{Π}\text{O}\text{N}$, "conceal," but a later scribe changed this to $\Gamma\text{E}\text{O}\text{N}$, "relate"), and CDC 15.10 (19.10).

³War, II. 8. 7.

⁴Cf. H. A. A. Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, pp. 124ff.; W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, pp. 183f.; C. A. A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, pp. 127f.; and J. S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, p. 74.

⁵b. Shab. 88b: "That secret treasure [i.e. the Torah], which has been hidden by Thee for nine hundred and seventy-four generations before the world was created, Thou desirest to give to flesh and blood!"

⁶Col. 1.26.

from this concept by censoring unknown and uninterpreted 'tongues' and subjugating them to the principle of edification. Only in I Cor. 2.6-16 and II Cor. 4.3-4 does he approach the idea of a secret and hidden gospel, but that secrecy is never attributed to the intent of the Gospel itself but to the fall of man from the norm God has set. The spiritual Gospel is hidden from man because of the unspiritual character of man, not because it is essentially secret or meant to be kept hidden. It is to be proclaimed to all, even the spiritually dead --- as Paul's missions and defences illustrate. In all,¹ Paul's usage of *μυστήριον* conforms more closely to Hebraic thought than to Hellenistic.

Religion as sacrament. -- Paul's use of *μυστήριον* in Phil. 4.12 and his teaching regarding baptism and the Lord's Supper have appeared to some to have the savour of the Mysteries;² i.e., that the essence of religion in its man-ward aspect is that of efficacious rites.

And yet it must be questioned whether the Hellenistic concept of efficacious and secret rites made any real impression upon any form of Judaism, even though a priestly ritualism often threatened to dominate in the Religion of Israel and Judaism. Not only did the

¹The sense in Eph. 5.32 is not that of a secret spiritual meaning, but is probably to be taken more in our modern meaning of that which is intrinsically difficult to understand: ". . . the two shall become one. This is a great mystery, and I take it to mean Christ and the church, however, . . ."

²E.g., W. H. P. Hatch, The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church (1890), pp. 281-296; K. Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," J.E., Vol. XI, p. 83.

most hellenised forms of Judaism which we know reject the rites of the Mysteries,¹ but such writers as Philo and the Qumran bards also denounced the idea that access into true religion could be gained purely by ritual.² For them, the rites of Judaism had value only when preceded by a correct inner disposition and/or faith;³ and those rites, while performed in modesty and propriety, were not secret.⁴

In his opposition to the idea of efficacious rites, Paul is at one with the leading proponents of Judaism; whether Hebraic, Hellenistic or sectarian. Surely the uncertain reference to baptism for the dead in I. Cor. 15.29 is countered by his many insistences on 'fides sola'. For Paul, 'life in Christ' was to be lived as a sacrament,⁵ but it was not gained by a sacrament. Nor need we press too hard his use of mystery terminology. Terms were in the

¹Wisdom of Solomon 14.15, 23 connects the mysteries with the solemn rites of the rankest idolatry, and 14.16 speaks of the mysteries as an "ungodly custom." In De Spec. Leg. i. 319, Philo equates their rites with "clap-trap and buffoonery" and exhorts Moses' disciples and friends to stay clear of these "ceremonies belonging to the darkness of night" (H. A. A. Kennedy's trans., Philo's Contribution to Religion, p. 220).

²See De Spec. Leg. i. 271f. and Ch. II, "The Religion of a Nomist."

³Quis rer. div. heres 18.

⁴For excellent treatments regarding the Jewish rites of circumcision, baptism and sacrifice, see I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, pp. 36ff., and E. Schürer, Jewish People, Div. II, pp. 319ff.

⁵As implied in Rom. 12.1-2.

air, and meanings differed.¹ Anderson Scott's words regarding *μυστήριον* are pertinent:

In fact, a careful examination of the Apostle's use of the word rather raises the question whether he would have used it so freely in a non-technical sense if he had had any consciousness of a relation between Christian rites and what were specifically described as 'mysteries', or indeed if the technical sense of the word were in such universal use as is commonly supposed. And the doubt is confirmed, by the almost innocent way in which he uses *μεμύημαι* 'I have been initiated'.²

Dualism

There are certainly many contrasts in the Pauline literature that can be given the label 'dualism'; e.g., the contrasts of present and future, death and life, human inability and divine omnipotence and good and evil. But the question is: Are there contrasts reflecting distinctive Hellenistic dualism in his letters?

The first and last man. -- Paul's reference to *ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος* 'Adam who is *ἐκ γῆς κοίτης* and *ὁ ἔσχατος Ἄδამ* who is *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*³ has often been compared with Philo's distinction between *ὁ οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος* and *ὁ γήινος*⁴ Many have seen a direct connection and/or common background between Paul and Philo in this usage.⁵

¹E.g., to the Mysteries, *γνώσις* brought salvation, see R. Reitzensten, Die Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen, p. 114; to Philo, 'knowledge' is a chief human factor in gaining salvation but is ineffectual unless aided by God, see *De Migrat. Abr.* 170f. and H. A. A. Kennedy, Philo's Contribution to Religion, p. 199; to Paul, 'knowledge' is not a path to but a consequence of salvation, cf. C. A. A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, pp. 128-129. For the distinction between Hebrew-Christian and Greek conceptions of *πίστις*, see W. H. P. Hatch, The Pauline Idea of Faith, pp. 75-77; for the distinction between Paul and Philo, see esp. H. A. A. Kennedy, Philo's Contribution to Religion, pp. 131-134.

²C. A. A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, pp. 127-128

³I Cor. 15.45-49; cf. Rom. 5.15-21.

⁴Leg. All. i. 12, 31ff., 53ff., 88f.

⁵E.g., R. Reitzenstein, Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen pp. 346ff.; M. Dibelius, Paul, p. 32; K. Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," J.E., Vol. XI, p. 79.

But besides the fact that Paul's terminology is different, the order of his presentation and his emphasis in the comparison is exactly reversed from that of Philo's and the thought of Hellenism. Paul's 'first man' is a $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\ \zeta\omega\sigma\alpha$ even though 'from the earth', and his emphasis is entirely upon the greater 'last man'. Philo's eyes are upon the past prototype; Paul's are upon the eschatological future which is encompassed in the presently revealed 'man'. The apostle's reversal of Philo's order in his declaration of I Cor. 15.46 --- "but it is not the spiritual which is first but the physical, and then the spiritual" --- speaks volumes against a similar mental background for these two Jewish thinkers at this point. Philo could never have fitted his Platonism into Paul's order.¹

The spiritual and fleshly man. -- A contrast in the Pauline letters is made between the $\pi\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ man and the $\sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$.² Philo has a similar distinction, though he would speak of the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ and, to coin a word, the $\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$.³ Some have viewed the characterisation in Paul's justified spiritual man and Philo's initiated man controlled by reason to be the hellenised one of divinity versus mortality.⁴

¹Cf. W. Manson, Jesus The Messiah, Appendix D, pp. 174-190, and O. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel, p. 23.

²I Cor. 2.14-3.3.

³Quis rer. div. heres 57; Quod Deus immut. 56, 143; De Gigant. 28-31; De Abr. 155; and others.

⁴E.g., W. H. P. Hatch, "The Pauline Idea of Forgiveness," Studies in Early Christianity, ed. S. J. Case, pp. 346-347, and The Pauline Idea of Faith, p. 40.

Yet for neither Paul nor Philo does man become divine --- though the apostle spoke of participating in the "blood" and "body" of Christ.¹ Philo verges the closest to that position in saying that the good man "becomes no man." But he likewise insists "but clearly neither is he God." He is "on the borderline."² Paul roots the spiritual man in humanity, though his orientation is fixed on the spiritual and he awaits glorification.³ But never shall that glorification become absorption or quantitative identity. This usage of similar thought forms by Paul and Philo is an example of common employment of the infiltrating terms and expressions of the Greek world without the necessary acceptance of all that those expressions might convey in the world outside.⁴ There is no direct correlation between these two Jewish thinkers and Hellenism on this point, nor need there be any between the two men themselves.

The distinction between the material and non-material in man. --

Both Paul and Philo speak of man as twofold in his constitution. Paul

¹I Cor. 10.16-17; cf. Heb. 3.14, 6.4; II Pet. 1.4.

²De Somn. ii. 230-231.

³See A. M. Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel, p. 28, and E. Brunner, Man in Revolt, p. 491, for graphic descriptions of justified man's position.

⁴W. L. Knox, Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity, p. 37: "Both St. Paul and Philo have an essentially superficial acquaintance with Greek thought; they are completely indifferent to philosophy as such, and only employ it as a handmaid in the service of a revealed religion which they have accepted for reasons which have nothing to do with philosophy. Philo's knowledge is of course infinitely wider in range than St. Paul's so far as we can judge; it is also far less Jewish; but it is equally superficial." Also see St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, Preface x and p. 90.

speaks of the ἕσω ἄνθρωπος,¹ with πνεῦμα and νοῦς often² and ψυχή sometimes³ being used synonymously, and the ἕξω ἄνθρωπος,⁴ with σάρξ generally used as its equivalent⁵ and σῶμα at times serving that function.⁶ Philo's usual distinction is between ψυχή and σῶμα;⁷ though he also speaks of πνεῦμα and αἷμα;⁸ νοῦς καὶ λόγος and σῶμα;⁹ ψυχή and σάρξ,¹⁰ and similar combinations of terms. But as Hellenistically influenced as this might appear, the division of man into two component parts is not necessarily dependent upon Greek thought.

While it is true that Hebrew psychology insisted upon the fundamental unity of the human personality, division within that unity was not an incompatible concept. The Old Testament speaks of man becoming a $\text{נִשְׁמָתָא בְּרִיחַ}$ by the combination of the breath of lives

¹Rom. 7.22, II Cor. 4.16 and Eph. 3.16.

²Rom. 7.23, 8.10, 16; I Cor. 2.11, 7.34, 14.14; II Cor. 7.1; I Thess. 5.23.

³Usually ψυχή is used by Paul to refer to this present life in its totality (e.g. Rom. 11.3, 16.4; I Cor. 15.45; II Cor. 1.23; Phil. 2.30). But at least once (I Thess. 5.23), and possibly again (I Thess. 2.8), it is used in this more technical sense.

⁴II Cor. 4.16.

⁵Rom. 8.10-11, I Cor. 6.13-20, 7.14, 34, 9. 27, 13.3; etc.

⁶Usually σῶμα refers to life in its totality in its outward form of appearance, its 'aussere Erscheinungsform'. But in Rom. 8.10, 13 and II Cor. 5.6, 8 it takes on this narrower meaning.

⁷De Ebriet. 69; Leg All. iii. 161.

⁸Quod det. pot. insid. 82.

⁹Quod det. pot. insid. 83.

¹⁰De Gigant. 42.

and the earthy substance,¹ the life and personality ceasing where **שׁוֹפָר** and **נְשׂוּמָה** are separated,² and life recommencing where these are again joined.³ Hillel speaks of his soul as a "guest in the house" of his body,⁴ and the Beth Hillel and Beth Shammai distinguish the "two formations" of upper and lower elements in man and discuss the nature of man's body and soul in the next world.⁵ To an Israelite, life indeed meant both. But the aspects could be distinguished. The fact that such a distinction is made by both Philo and Paul is not indicative of the influence of Hellenism on either. Both have their roots in a similarly distinguishing Judaism. It is their views of the *ἕξω ἄνθρωπος*, not their recognition of such, that prove significant.

The material aspect in man as defiled. -- That matter as such is evil is an important concept in Greek dualistic philosophy.⁶ And because it is basic to so much of hellenised thought, we should expect to find evidence of this concept in Hellenistic Judaism and Paul if they be truly influenced by Hellenism. To many in the

¹Gen. 2.7.

²Gen. 35.18, where Rachel's **שׁוֹפָר** departs.

³I Kings 17.22, where life accompanies the return of the child's **שׁוֹפָר**

⁴Lev. R. 34.3.

⁵b. Sanh. 91a, 91b and Gen. R. 14.3 and 5 on Gen. 2.7.

⁶Epictetus' illustration of man as that of a snail in a shell (Dissertations I. 20. 17) is probably more apt than the modern characterisation of the Hellenic conception of man as "an angel in a slot machine" (as J. A. T. Robinson, The Body, p. 14).

nineteenth century, and to some in the twentieth, that is just what we find in Paul's usage of 'flesh'.¹ Important distinctions, however, must be made between Hellenism, Hellenistic Judaism and Paul.

It is a mistake to characterise Philo as regarding matter as evil 'per se'.² Philo is too good a Jew for that. Matter is a direct creation of God, and its intrinsic depravity would have serious implications for its Creator. No matter how opposite the flesh is to the soul, Philo can never regard it as the opposition of created good versus created evil.³ And yet he can verge exceedingly close to such a position in describing the σάρξ as being both corrupted and corrupting, both defiled and defiling.⁴ Evil, for Philo, is not just resident in the flesh and using the fleshly nature, but is rooted and finds its origin in the material body.⁵ While it might be desired to see in his usage only a reference to the fleshly appetites and urgings as being contaminated by sin, he leans more to the earthy substance as being both captive and culprit.

¹E.g., H. J. Schoeps' recent work, Paulus, pp. 3ff.

²H. A. A. Kennedy has rightly insisted that there is in Philo neither a "perfectly clear conception of Matter" nor evidence to show that he regarded matter 'per se' as evil (Philo's Contribution to Religion, p. 74).

³Cf. De Gigant. 42, where ψυχή and σῶμα are spoken of as being as opposite as night from day, light from darkness, odd from even, etc., and yet "because they have been the subject of creation, we do find fellowship and kinship of each with its opposite." Here Philo is being pulled between his Greek philosophy and his Hebrew theology.

⁴Quod Deus immut. 142.

⁵Quis rer. div. heres 268.

He comes very close to equating 'body' and 'flesh' with sin. So, too, the Qumran texts use 'flesh' in such a manner that "it becomes almost synonymous with evil."¹

For Paul, while the flesh is corrupted it is not of itself corrupting.² In the process of exonerating the Law as the corrupting element, Romans 7 also clears the material substance of man. Verse 18 does speak of nothing good in the flesh, but the following verses go on to insist that the flesh is not the culprit but that the enemy is sin which has found lodging and an avenue of expression in the flesh.³ "It is clear that Paul took over the Old Testament conception of 'basar' as being weak and prone to sin. His use of *σάρξ* does not imply that the physical element in man is of necessity evil as is implied in Hellenistic dualism."⁴ In fact, the teaching that the body is to be redeemed⁵ strongly suggests that it is not itself the culprit but under the influence of the culprit.

Because of Philo's view of the corrupting nature of the material body, he viewed communion with God to be a matter for the soul alone. The body might be indirectly purified by the initiated

¹K. G. Kuhn, "New Light on Temptation, Sin and Flesh in the New Testament," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, p. 101. See IQS 11.7-12 and IQM 4.3. Cf. W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," ibid., pp. 161-162.

²The opposition between flesh and spirit in passages as Rom. 8.1-9, Gal. 5.17-24, etc. is not that of material substance versus immaterial, but of fleshly nature versus spiritual.

³H. W. Robinson says: In Paul "the ultimate enemy of the Spirit of God is not flesh but the Sin of which the flesh has become the weak and corrupted instrument" (The Christian Doctrine of Man, p. 117). Cf. also A. S. Peake, The Quintessence of Paulinism, p. 11.

⁴W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 19. See also W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, Romans (I.C.C.), p. 181; J. G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, p. 276; W. D. Stacey, The Pauline View of Man, p. 161.

⁵Rom. 8.23.

and pure mind,¹ but it never enters directly into the fellowship with God. Therefore in the soul's spiritual exercise, one must make himself "a stranger . . . in judgment and purpose" to "the earthy matter that encompasses."² And regarding physical exercise, it is "as a menace to the soul" while the

pale, wasted and withered, so to speak, are the children of discipline. They have made over the bodily muscles to serve the powers of the soul and in fact are resolved into a single form, that of soul, and become unbodied minds. Naturally then the earthly element is destroyed and dissolved when the mind in all its powers has a fixed purpose to be well pleasing to God.³

True man, that is man in relation with God, is made up of *νοῦς καὶ λόγος*; "the living creature of two natures" cannot really be called man.⁴ In *De Ebrietate* 87, Philo gives us a very revealing glimpse of the relation of his views to those of his countrymen. He tells us that the priest in making sacrifice must recognise that the thousands of Jewish offerers believe the *σῶμα* to be secondary to the *ψυχή*, but still good. Thus the priest must not despise the ideas of the people by attempting to make a purely spiritual offering and neglecting the physical sacrifices. But when the priest goes into the inner altar, in the presence of God alone and away from the eyes of the people, he acts only for the *ψυχή*.⁵ Thus, the more the

¹De Somn. i. 177.

²De Migrat. Abr. 7 - 9.

³De Mutat. Nom. 33.

⁴Quod Det. pot. insid. 83.

⁵In this indication of his difference from the great majority of his fellow religionists, Philo offers some confirmation for Simpson's statement that "the major portion of the Jews in Egypt were probably never deeply influenced by Greek Philosophy, and many of them remained unaffected by the rising tide of Hellenism" (D. C. Simpson, *Ap. and Ps.*, Vol. I, p. 186). Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. II, pp. 298-299; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 12.

νοῦς "soars aloft" and is "initiated in the mysteries of the Lord," the more it "judges the σῶμα to be wicked and hostile,"¹ and the more it sees that "it is impossible for one who is possessed by love for all that is incorporeal and incorruptible to dwell together with one who leans towards the objects of sense-perception doomed to die."² And thus, Philo has no objection to the body of Moses being "stripped off him like a shell that has grown about the soul" and his soul as stripped naked set free to ascend to heaven.³

The attitude of the Qumran sectarians toward the resurrection of the body is as yet uncertain.⁴ But they did lay more emphasis than did Philo upon the spiritual cleansing and purification of the flesh.⁵ For them, the material aspect joined in the fellowship with God.⁶ Theirs was not an escape from the earthy in order to purify it.

Paul's view of the physical body is hinted at in his references to bodily exercise as an illustration of some aspect of the Christian

¹Leg. All. iii. 71.

²De Migrat. Abr. 13-15.

³W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, p. 137, n. 3, citing De Virt. 4.

⁴For summaries regarding Qumran and the resurrection, see M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 270-272, and A. Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes, p. 8. Probably the truth lies somewhere between Josephus' assertion that they believed in a soulish resurrection, as accepted by J. van der Ploeg (The Excavations at Qumran, pp. 108-112), and Hippolytus' claim that they believed in a bodily resurrection, as insisted upon by Dupont-Sommer. Burrows, in agreeing with Vermès, is probably more correct in saying that the Qumran community "expected the final judgement before the end of their own generation, and therefore were not concerned about the resurrection of the body. What they expected was neither the resurrection of the body nor the immortality of the soul alone, but the 'assumption' of the whole person in a purified body" (The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 270).

⁵1QS 3.6ff., 4.20. Cf. K. G. Kuhn, "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, p. 101, and W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," ibid., p. 162.

⁶1QH 3.20-21: "So walk I on uplands unbounded and know that there is hope for that which Thou didst mould out of dust to have consort with things eternal" (trans. T. H. Gaster, The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect).

life.¹ Like Hillel,² his interest in its care was quite different from that of Philo.³ Nor could he agree with Philo regarding the place of the body in communion with God. For him the body enters into the working of God's salvation by becoming a temple of the Holy Spirit⁴ and by being a medium through which one can glorify God.⁵ The exhortation is even given not to disassociate body and soul in the worship of God, but to present the body as "a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship."⁶ His prayer is that God would sanctify the Christian entirely --- πνεῦμα, ψυχῇ and σῶμα.⁷ His expectation is that in the soul's goal of conformity to Christ, the body shall fully enter in; it shall be redeemed,⁸ given life,⁹ and be changed to the likeness of His glorious body.¹⁰ Even his sighing with this body and longing to be out of such a body¹¹ was not that the soul might rise alone to God, but that it might the sooner gain its immortal body.¹² Hebraic Judaism had an intense dislike for

¹I Cor. 9.24-27; Gal. 2.2, 5.7; Phil. 3.14. As Hillel's reference to the monarch's statues (see following note) need not imply an approval of them, so Paul's references to the games need not indicate his approval of or previous attendance at such. T. R. Glover goes beyond the evidence in speaking of Paul as "this reprobate Jew, who had in his boyhood watched the Greek heathen at their sports, forgetful of old Jewish proprieties and Greek indecencies" (Paul of Tarsus, p. 11; cf. also p.12).

²In Lev. R. 34.1ff., Hillel is recorded as comparing the human body to the statues of the king. If they must be kept clean and cared for, so must the body which was created in the image of the Almighty.

³Paul's reference to the beating and subduing of his body (I Cor. 9.27) must be interpreted in the light of his analogy of an athletic training which recognises the value of the body. In fact, he severely denounces "self-abasement and severely to the body" as being "of no value in checking the indulgence of the flesh" (Col. 2.23). Even the Pauline statement which most resembles Philo (I Tim. 4.8) recognises value in bodily exercise; and rather than censoring such, it is putting it in its proper relation to godliness.

⁴I Cor. 3.16; 6.15, 19. ⁵Phil. 1.20; I Cor. 6.20. ⁶Rom. 12.1.

⁷I Thess. 5.23. ⁸Rom. 8.23. ⁹Rom. 8.10. ¹⁰Phil. 4.21.

¹¹I Cor. 5.4; Phil. 1.23. ¹²II Cor. 5.1-5.

being unclothed,¹ and Paul's thought lies along these lines rather than those of Hellenism or Hellenistic Judaism. "Paul was too good a Jew and too poor a Hellenist to describe the soul as being delivered from the clothing of the body so that it might ascend to heaven naked."²

Thus, Philo can view the material element in man as both defiled and defiling, and desire to escape from it that communion might be had with God. Qumran can agree with Philo regarding the nature of the body, but would not follow him regarding the need for soul-escape. Paul, however, can never brand the material flesh as the culprit. It is for him that neutral entity which has been taken captive by sin, but which can be used for God's glory and share in all of His blessings when it is presented unto Him. It does not seem that Sanday and Headlam, in the 1890's, have over-stated their conclusion:

The controversy may now be regarded as practically closed. Its result is summed up by Lipsius in these decisive words: 'The Pauline anthropology rests entirely on an Old Testament base; the elements in it which are supposed to be derived from Hellenistic dualism must simply be denied.'³

Natural Theology

Theistic inference. -- The fact that Paul gives validity to a natural theology in the opening chapters of Romans seems to imply an influence from Hellenism. Greek metaphysical thought was early dominated by Aristotle's methodology of arguing from effect to cause back through a succession of such causes and effects to "Some first principle," a "First" or "Final Clause."⁴ To Greek philosophy, this

¹Mish. Ber. 3.5; b. Shab. 150a.

²W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, p. 137.

³W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, Romans (I.C.C.), p. 181.

⁴Aristotle, The Metaphysics, Bk. II.

Final Cause, or Unmoved Mover, was separated from the obvious effects by a great series of causes and effects, with the obvious effects being the unconscious but necessary repercussions of that First Cause. In Paul's argument of Romans 1.19 and 20 and Philo's discussions of how Abraham came to recognise the true God,¹ it is certainly evident that this thought had either partially penetrated or been partially paralleled in Judaism.²

But Paul's agreement with Philo and their measure of agreement with Hellenism do not necessarily indicate that the apostle's roots were in a Hellenistic type of Judaism. The similar recognition of the validity of theistic speculation in such Hebraic passages as Gen. Rabbah 38.13 and 39.1 argues against this. The fact that Josephus³ and the sectarian Jubilees⁴ agree with the Gen. Rabbah passages and Philo in Abraham's coming to know of the existence of God through theistic inference, and that the possibly Palestinian 'Third Wisdom' approves of theistic argumentation,⁵ indicates that such thought was accepted in almost every branch of Judaism. Paul's agreement with Philo on the possibility of theistic speculation indicates only a common Jewish background.

¹De Abr. 13ff.; De Migrat. Abr. 32ff.; De Gigant. 13ff.

²"Partially," since, however much a Jewish thinker might evidence agreement with Greek theistic thought, the Greek metaphysical ascriptions of non-personal motivation and indirect causation could never be accepted. For both Paul and Philo, God's action in the creation and preservation of the world was personal and direct; for both there was the possibility of theistic induction only because God had Himself consciously implanted a revelation of Himself in the world (Rom. 1.19: "For God hath showed it unto them"; Quod det. pot. insid. 86: "He breathed ... from above of His own Deity. The invisible Deity stamped ... the impress of Itself.").

³Antiq. I. 7. 1. ⁴Jubilees 12.16ff.

⁵Wisdom, ch. 13. See S. Holmes, Ap. and Ps., Vol. I, pp. 518, 524-525 for a survey on the question of Wisdom's authorship. The Testament of Naphtali 3.2 also reflects Palestinian thought, though the question is whether it is a Jewish or a Christian Palestinianism.

But there is a definite and significant difference between Paul and Philo regarding the nature of theistic inference. Samuel Sandmel has pointed out that whereas all of the Palestinian references refer to the possibility of theistic inference from the created world of nature, Philo's insistence is that such is only inferred from the order and rule seen within man himself.¹ For Philo, the revelation in creation is planted by God in man, and it is only because man is in the world that such revelation is also in nature.² It is therefore to the order and rule in himself that man must look if he is to see God's revelation in creation; all beholding of nature is of "Bezalel class."³ On the other hand, Paul manifests that his roots are not sunk in the same soil as that of Philo. That this distinction regarding the nature of theistic inference separates Hellenistic Judaism from Hebraic seems from the evidence highly doubtful. Nor can we assume that it divides Palestinian from Diaspora Judaism. It could very easily be Philo's own divergence from Jewish thought. But at least it warns us to go slow in equating Paul with Philo, and thus with Hellenistic Judaism, on this point.

¹S. Sandmel, "Abraham's Knowledge of the Existence of God," H.T.R., Vol. XLIV, No. 3 (July, 1951), pp. 55-60. See De Abr. 72-74, De Gigant. 62-64.

²Quod det. pot. insid. 86: "The invisible Deity stamped on the invisible soul the impress of itself, to the end that not even the terrestrial region should be without a share of the image of God."

³Leg. All. iii. 102; De Abr. 77. Cf. J. Drummond, Philo Judaeus, Vol. II, pp. 5-6.

The conscience as an innate moral factor. -- Both Paul and Philo present the *συνείδησις* as being the innate possession of every man and a real moral factor in the awakening of a man to God.¹ And yet, in view of Judaism's acceptance of a limited and qualified natural theology, this agreement can carry no necessary implications either way regarding the Hellenistic affinities between Paul and Philo. The Background for both of them on this question need be no more than a Jewish heritage which has limitedly agreed with Hellenism.

Hellenistic Forms of Presentation

In Paul's writings there are many parallels to the terms, forms and styles of the hellenised world. Not only are the aforementioned terms *μυστήριον, γνώσις, ψυχή, πνευματικός, νοῦς*, etc. used, but also such others as *δόξα, τέλειος, σωτηρία, ψυχικός, φόβος* and *αὐτάρκτης*. In three passages there are four quotations from Greek literature.² The form of the Stoic diatribe seems evident in a number of places,³ and there are parallels to the hellenised 'Sapientia' in lines of argumentation, listing of vices and expressions.⁴ Many more parallels to Greek presentation could be cited, but these are usually the ones

¹Rom. 2.15. De Decal. 87; De Fuga 131, 203f., Quod det. pot. insid. 22f., Quod Deus immut. 134ff., De Jos. 47f. Cf. H. A. A. Kennedy, Philo's Contribution to Religion, pp. 111-115, and W. D. Stacey, The Pauline View of Man, p. 36.

²Acts 17.28, I Cor. 15.33, and Tit. 1.12.

³Rom. 9-11 and 2.1 - 3.20 are two of the longest where this form of familiar and lively interchange of question and answer, ironical apostrophe and personal appeal is used.

⁴The comparisons between Rom. 1.18-32 and The Wisdom of Solomon are well laid out by W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, Romans (I.C.C.), pp. 51-52.

taken to show that the schools and atmosphere of Tarsus significantly influenced Saul.¹

But the automatic assignment of Hellenistic forms and terms to the Diaspora assumes the old geographical dichotomy of a water-tight Palestine and a syncretistic Diaspora. That Palestine and even Jerusalem were not as invulnerable to Hellenism's penetration as some would like to think has been well pointed out by Emil Schürer, and expanded by others.² This penetration need not be explained as the irresistible power of intellectual influences scaling the immovable wall of Hebraic isolation. The deepest reason for a limited acceptance of Greek thought within Hebraicism lay in the very nature of Pharisaic theology.³ As an ethical

¹See, e.g., W. Ramsay, "Tarsus," H.D.B., Vol. IV, pp. 685-688; R. M. Pope, "The Greek Style of St. Paul," E.T., Vol. XLIX, No. 12 (Sept., 1938), pp. 535-536; C. H. Dodd, Romans (M.N.T.C.), pp. 30, 148-149.

²E. Schürer, Jewish People, Div. II, Vol. I, pp. 29-50. Cf., e.g., W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 5-8; W. D. Stacey, The Pauline View of Man, pp. 25-26. Some of the more pertinent evidence includes: (1) The statement of I Macc. 1.11-15 that certain of the people took on Grecian ways; (2) the Talmudic references to Greek clothing, ornaments, music, architecture, recreation (baths, games), municipal organisation, legislation, courts and coinage; (3) the fact that the name of the Jewish high court $\gamma\alpha\lambda\iota\lambda\alpha\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ is a transliteration of the Greek word $\sigmaυν\acute{\epsilon}\delta\rho\iota\omicron\nu$; (4) the over 1,100 Greek words that have been counted in the Talmudic literature; (5) the Mishnah's statement that certain temple vessels were marked with Greek letters (Sheka. 3.2); and (6) the use of Greek in the LXX, the exhortations given in the Synagogue and the permission to say the Shema in Greek.

³E. Schürer suggests this, though he then characterises that difference between Judaistic and Hellenistic religions to be that of legal action versus religious notions (Jewish People, Div. II, Vol. I, p. 350).

theology, Judaism was in no position to counter completely a pure philosophy and/or a philosophic theology. It was not able to fight fire with fire. Nor had it a desire to do so. Such alien philosophical thought must be definitely and staunchly resisted where it interfered with the tenets and ethics of Judaism; but it could be accepted and worked into that religious fabric where it was felt to express correctly an implicit truth. For Israel, "the significance of the borrowed ideas [lay] not in their pre-history or antecedents but in Israel's understanding of them and in the use to which it [could] put them in the service of its religion."¹ The situation is seen in bold relief in Alexandria where the people are characterised by III Maccabees as willing to suffer death rather than accept the mystery cults or the objectionable Greek practices,² yet could take on Greek thought as an aid to Hebrew theology.³ But so also in Palestine. The Hebraic oppositions to enforced hellenisation⁴ do not necessarily mean an absolute antagonism to every Greek religious term, form of expression or idea. The fact that the Talmud speaks of a second century Rabbinical

¹W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 18; though with a change in the tense of the sentence from 'lies' to 'lay' and 'has' to 'could'.

²Esp. III Macc. 2.27ff. It is true that this work is of the nature of propaganda. But certainly it contains some basis of fact.

³Philo is the great example.

⁴The cases of attempted hellenisation in Jerusalem itself are given in I Macc. 1.10-15, 41-53; II Macc. 4.7-20, 6.1-11. In the letter of Antiochus Eupator to Lysias (II Macc. 11.24), the Jewish historian explicitly gives the Jewish reaction.

training to have included the study of the wisdom of the Greeks is explicit evidence for this Jewish disposition.¹

It is probably best to agree with W. L. Knox that Hebraic Judaism was sufficiently permeated by Hellenism to account for all of the Hellenistic forms of presentation found in the Pauline literature.² Paul's knowledge of Greek literature, thought, forms of presentation and terminology could have been quite easily gained through his Rabbinic training in Jerusalem.³ That which he knew of real philosophic Hellenism was probably meagre.⁴ And all of that which he accepted from Hellenism was accepted because it could convey his meaning, and not with reference to what it really meant outside.⁵

¹b. Sot. 49b reports that R. Simeon b. Gamaliel II had in his house 500 youths learning the wisdom of the Jews and another 500 learning the wisdom of the Greeks. The numbers are probably distorted, but the establishment of such a dual curriculum need not be doubted.

²W. L. Knox, Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity, pp. 30-34; St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 126ff.; St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, p. 91. Cf. W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 7-8.

³Knox suggests that such knowledge could have been obtained through a Grecian anthology drawn up by the rabbis (Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity, p. 34; St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, p. 91).

⁴His four quotations are "conventional quotations," W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 115, n. 16; "the common property of popular philosophers," M. Dibelius, Paul, p. 31. Cf. also H. A. A. Kennedy St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, p. 118; H. J. Cadbury, The Book of Acts in History, p. 46; W. D. Stacey, The Pauline View of Man, pp. 36-38.

⁵This same phenomenon occurs repeatedly. The author has seen influential and intensely nationalistic Arabs living on the Jordan-Israel border who still make designs on their homes and in their little flower beds in the shape of the Israeli Star of David. Though they are aware of its Jewish connotations, they still continue to use the figure without reference to such. To them it is a Masonic emblem, a mystic symbol to guard against evil and/or just a pretty pattern.

He could use terms and forms of expression which were current in the Gentile world, but he was always using them in accordance with that which he had known and experienced in Judaism and Christianity.

"The elements in his thinking to which parallels have been found in non-Jewish literature, in Greek religion or in pagan mysteries, are obviously secondary. They belong to the surface rather than to the core of this thought and teaching."¹

The Objections from his Hermeneutics

The problem of the Pauline hermeneutics has not suffered from a lack of scholarly interest. Its study has followed in the wake of that former question regarding the terminological and conceptual affinities between Christianity and Hellenism, and the positions taken in that area have been followed also in this. In the renewed interest in Greek religion and philosophy, Paul's exegetical methodology and interpretive principles were seen rooted in a Judaism similar to that of Philo. Siegfried, while refusing to be decisive, at least implied a Pauline dependence upon such a Judaism.² To others, the hermeutical comparisons between Paul and Philo have seemed conclusive.

As in the previous sections, it is not our present purpose to attempt an exhaustive treatment of the relation of Paul's hermeneutics to Hellenistic or Hebraic thought. We need not be detained with the Pauline affinities to Philo which have at least as

¹C. A. A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, p. 10. Cf. J. S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, pp. 56-64.

²C. Siegfried, Philo von Alexandria, pp. 304-310.

many close parallels in Hebraic literature.¹ Nor need we refer to the correlations to Rabbinic methodology which have no parallel in Philo.² It is with those hermeneutical features in Paul which seem to correspond to what we find in Hellenistic writings but not in Hebraic that we are interested: allegorical exegesis and charismatic interpretation.

Allegorical Exegesis

In Gal. 4.21-27, the allegory of Hagar and Sarah, and I Cor. 9.9-10, the application of the Deuteronomic law of not muzzling the

¹E.g., I Cor. 10.4, the rock which followed in the wilderness, and Gal. 3.16, the distinction between *σπέρμα* and *σπέρματα*. Siegfried has early pointed out these instances as Philonic parallels (Philo von Alexandria, p. 305). But Paul's insistence that "that Rock was Christ" in I Cor. 10.4, is also paralleled by b. Ber. 5b, "It has been taught: And 'rock' is nothing else than the Holy One, blessed be He," and the Targum on Num. 21. See E. Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, pp. 66-70, for other Palestinian and Hebraic parallels. A slightly different designation, but with the same idea behind it, is found in CDC 6.3 (8.6): "The 'well' in question is the Law" (trans. T. H. Gaster, The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect). The essential idea to all Jews was that the divine presence, as represented by the gushing rock, was with the people in the wilderness. To Judaism, it was the Holy One and/or His instruction; to Paul it was that too, but more particularly was it Christ. Paul's use of the singular noun in Gal. 3.16 is paralleled by Philo's treatment of *τέχνον* in De Mutat. Nom. 145ff.; but also by b. Shab. 84b, in its distinction between 'seed' and 'seeds', and b. Sanh. 37a, where 'blood' and 'bloods' are differentiated.

²E.g., Paul's near equal quotation from the Torah, Nebim and Kethubim, and his method of threefold quotation (Rom. 11.8-9, 15.10-12). Cf. Gamaliel's use of threefold quotation in b. Sanh. 90b, and see W. O. E. Oesterley, "The Exegesis of the Old Testament," Record and Revelation, ed. H. W. Robinson, pp. 403-426, for further Rabbinic parallels.

ox to the sphere of apostolic rights, Paul comes the closest to Alexandrian exegesis. Michel insists that in Gal. 4 Paul has mis spoken in saying ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα, for here "Paulus denkt mehr typologisch als allegorisch im eigentlichen Sinne."¹ But accepting the definitions of typology as relating to "linkages between events, persons or things within the historical framework of revelation," and of allegory as "the search for a secondary and hidden meaning underlying the primary and obvious meaning of a narrative,"² we must reject the view that Hagar and Sarah are here treated merely typologically. Allegory has entered in. It is true that the apostle's statement begins by being rooted in the historical situation, but in verse 24 the historical is definitely gone beyond for the hidden and underlying meaning. Similarly, in I. Cor. 9.9-10, Paul leaves the literal and primary meaning of the words to insist that they were written for a reason that is not obvious in the passage itself. Here he quotes Deut. 25.4, which speaks of not muzzling the ox that treads out the grain, and then asks: "Is it for oxen that God is concerned? Does he not speak entirely (πάντως) for our sake? It was written for our sake."

Now it is true that there are many examples of allegory in the Talmudic literature,³ but all of those examples are to be distinguished from Philo's usage in that "bei allem Allegorisieren

¹O. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel, p. 110.

²K. J. Woollcombe, "The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology," Essays on Typology, p. 40.

³Cf. Str.-Bil., Vol. III, pp. 388-397.

behält der Wortsinn stets seine volle Geltung."¹ For Philo, "der buchstäbliche Sinn ist lediglich der Körper, der den allegorischen als die Seele umschliesst;"² it is "a symbol of the religious and moral development of the human soul."³ While in the Talmud, the rule is stated that "a verse cannot depart from its plain meaning."⁴ The exegesis of Qumran, as many have pointed out, "has no real parallel either in Rabbinic Judaism, or in Philonic Judaism."⁵ The commentaries to Micah 1 and Habbakkuk 1 and 2 seem to verge close to Philo, for there the prophetic history is all made applicable to the sect. Nevertheless the history is not abandoned, since, for Qumran, all of that which was written was meant for the community. It is strictly typological and never breaks down into allegory. It therefore has appeared to many that Paul is showing his roots to be with Philo's in leaving the historical situation in Gal. 4 and denying the literal meaning in I Cor. 9.

And yet while Paul is not quite in line with what we know of Hebraic thought at this point, he is not quite Philonic either. In the first place, it is not altogether inappropriate to point out that while there are two such parallels to Philonic exegesis in Paul's

¹Ibid., Vol. III, p. 397.

²O. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel, p. 106.

³C. Siegfried, "Philo Judaeus," J.E., Vol. X, p. 7. Cf. Philo von Alexandria, pp. 165-168, regarding the Philonic canon.

⁴b. Shab. 63a. Even Josephus speaks of the "worthless shifts" which the Greek allegorists employ (Contra Apion, II, 36).

⁵F. M. Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran, p. 163. Cf. also pp. 85-86.

letters, there are only two;¹ whereas allegory permeates Philo's thought. Secondly, it must be noticed that Paul's presentation does recognise the historicity of the event at the basis of the allegory, even though he later goes on to leave it. In his usage, the event and the use of that event are distinguished; and the historical nature of that event is not minimised by the following allegory. On the other hand, Philo ignores the historicity of the narrative. In all of his treatments of Hagar and Sarah,² as well as in his treatments of each separately, that which was historical to Paul is treated as a myth whose symbols --- Hagar and Sarah --- convey truth for the present situation. Thirdly, while Paul in I Cor. 9 does seem to leave the Rabbinic method of arguing "if, then, so and so is true about A, how much more must it be true about B,"³ his argumentation is not entirely non-Hebraic. The passage that is always pointed out in Philo as a parallel to I Cor. 9.9-10 is De Sacrific. 260:

You will discover that all this minuteness in reference to the animal shadows forth by means of symbols the improvement of your character. For the law does not exist for irrational creatures, but for those possessing mind and reason, so that its concern is not for sacrificial animals, to provide that they be without blemish, but for those who offer the sacrifices, that they be not disquieted by reason of any passion.

¹We reject Woolcombe's view that there are three, including I Cor. 5.6-8 ("The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology," Essays on Typology, p. 55). Cf. W. Barclay, The Mind of St. Paul, p. 16, where I Cor. 5.6-8 is ignored as an allegory but I Cor. 10.4 is accepted as such.

²Leg. All. iii. 244; De Cherub. 3-8; De Post. Cain. 130; De Congr. erud. grat. 1-23, 71-73, 121-122; and De Mutat. Nom. 255.

³C. G. Montefiore, A Rabbinic Anthology, Preface ix. Cf. b. Bab. Mez. 88b.

However, a comparison of the following passages from the Midrash points out that Philo's is not the only passage to be compared with Paul:

Gen. R. 44.1 -- "The precepts were given only in order that man might be refined by them. For what does the Holy One, blessed be He, care whether a man kills an animal by the throat or by the nape of its neck? Hence its purpose is to refine man."

Lev. R. 13.3 -- "This [Prov. 30.5 with Deut. 14.4] means the precepts were given for the express purpose of purifying mankind."¹

These statements are about 150 years later than Paul's time, yet it does seem that πάντα . . . δι' ἡμᾶς . . . ἐγράφη could be said by a Hebraic Jew as well as a Hellenistic one.

The problem thus narrows down primarily to the allegory of Gal. 4. But before Paul is relegated to the Hellenistic branch of Judaism on the basis of this one usage, more must be known regarding the pre-first century A.D. hermeneutical interaction between Palestine and Alexandria. Siegfried and Kennedy have shown that "there can be little question that Philo stood in a long succession of allegorical interpreters of the Old Testament. The practice had been reduced to a kind of science."² The question is, how much this succession of Alexandrian exegesis affected Palestinian methodology.

¹Both of these passages are attributed to R. Judah, but there is no reason for not dating this sentiment earlier also. Cf. Lev. R. 30.13, where R. Judah again, in regard to the command of Ex. 27.20 to "take a light", says: "It is only in order to make you worthy and to atone for your souls."

²H. A. A. Kennedy, Philo's Contribution to Religion, p. 32. See also pp. 32-34, and C. Siegfried, Philo von Alexandria, pp. 16-37.

We cannot assume complete isolation of Palestine from Alexandria. The fact that the Palestinian "sophists of literalness" rejected Philo's work,¹ and that Philo was possibly read by the community at Qumran,² at least shows a Palestinian awareness of the methodology of Alexandria. The Letter of Aristeas, with its one use of allegory comparable to that of I Cor. 9,³ could have been the carrier of a mild allegorism into even the most closed recesses of Judaism. Before we start drawing conclusions from Paul's limited use of allegory, we must give full weight to Michel's words: "Die vorphilonische und vorpaulinische Tradition und Methodik müssen noch Gagen lösen, die bisher ungeklärt blieben."⁴ There is the possibility that a very limited use of allegory was not frowned upon by a pre-destruction Hebraicism. It may be that such a very moderate allegorism was part of the Hebraic heritage and was just not incorporated into the Talmudic traditions. Or it may even be that there was a similar reaction to allegorism in Rabbinic Judaism as there was in the Antiochian versus Alexandrian schools of Christian interpretation, and thus a former moderate allegorism is not reflected in Judaism's

¹De Sonn. 16-17.

²R. de Vaux draws attention to the Middle Ages Karaite writer Quirquisani's reference to books of the "Alexandrian" being found in a cave of a Jewish sect which dwelt in caves ("A Propos des Manuscrits de la Mer Morte," R.B., Vol. LVII, 1950, pp. 421-425).

³Letter of Aristeas 150: "For the division of the hoof and the separation of the claws are intended to teach us that we must discriminate between our individual actions with a view to the practise of virtue."

⁴0. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel, p. 111.

literature. But at least, in view of Paul's limited use of allegory and our meagre knowledge of pre-Pauline interrelationship between Palestine and Alexandria, it is precarious to refute Paul's Hebraic biographical claims on this basis.

Charismatic Interpretation

The real point of contact between Paul and Philo is in their mutual agreement that αἱ γράφαί cannot be correctly interpreted by reference only to τὸ γράμμα. For both, Scripture is only the Word of God to the individual when its interpretive principle is τὸ πνεῦμα. Interpretation of Scripture must be a divine prophetic gift, not just a laborious and methodical investigation and presentation. In this Qumran voices its agreement. Scripture as the Word of God is both letter and Spirit. In the midst of all interpretation, the Spirit must pervade. This meant, for Philo, the letter of the Old Testament as interpreted through allegory; for Qumran, the letter as interpreted by The Right Teacher; for Paul, the letter as interpreted by Christ.¹ But Christian charismatic interpretation does not mean Hellenism.

Conclusion

We therefore conclude that the objections raised against the Pauline Hebraic biographical claims are not so convincing as to

¹Cf. the emphasis of O. Michel, ibid., and E. Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament.

discredit or nullify these claims.¹ His early Diaspora training, his persecution of the Church in his Judaistic days and his basic attitudes and temperament are not opposed to a predestruction Hebraic Pharisaism; while "many of the odysseys of scholars some decades ago over the deep waters of Hellenistic philosophy and religion were more fascinating than they were rewarding."² There is no reason to doubt that Saul was a Hebrew of the Hebrews and trained at the feet of Gamaliel in the city of Jerusalem. It is therefore legitimate to understand Hebraic Pharisaism in part from the Pauline references and Saul in part by Hebraicism's statements.

¹The doubt cast upon Saul's Jerusalem training and his persecution of Christians in Judaea because in Gal. 1.22 he said that he was "unknown by sight to the Churches of Judaea which are in Christ" (as, e.g., R. Bultman, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, p. 187) "is a naive assumption that the victims of the persecution must have known personally the man who was carrying it on" (M. Dibelius, Paul, p. 47; cf. A. D. Nock, St. Paul, p. 33; E. D. Burton, Galatians, I.C.C., p. 63). Further, if the persecution was directed primarily against the Hellenists and resulted in their expulsion (see Appendix), it is not too surprising that years later the persecutor should be "unknown by sight" to the remaining native Jewish Christians.

²K. Stendahl, "Introduction and Perspective," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, p. 5

CHAPTER II

SAUL AND LEGALITY

The background to the Pauline teaching and practice is not understood simply by designating the nature of Saul's Judaism. We must also analyse his religious experience in that Judaism. Admittedly such an endeavour is fraught with difficulties and uncertainties, but it is not at all "lost labour".¹ Reference can legitimately be made to two areas of investigation: (1) that aspect of Judaism of which Saul was a part, and (2) those reminiscences in his Christian writings of life in Judaism. It is true that at best we can but understand Saul in part through an analysis of Hebraic thought. Likewise it is always possible that his later reminiscences are coloured by his Christian convictions. But an investigation into the character of Hebraic Pharisaism and the implications of Saul's later reminiscences, keeping these two qualifications constantly in mind, can lead to valid conclusions. While such an inquiry can never produce decisive answers, it can point the way toward an understanding of 'Saul and Legality'.

The Spirituality of Hebraic Pharisaism

Judging from the very diverse opinions expressed, an analysis

¹P. Wernle calls such endeavour "lost labour," for, says he, "we are completely ignorant" regarding Saul's Judaistic thought (The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol.1, p. 225).

of pre-destruction Pharisaism's spirituality seems well-nigh impossible. On the one hand, the majority of Christian scholars have followed the position popularised by Emil Schürer; i.e., that Pharisaism's motivation lay in its "faith in Divine retribution,"¹ its "ethic and theology were swallowed up in jurisprudence,"² and the combined result was "a fearful burden which a spurious legalism had laid upon the shoulders of the people".³ Thus the many statements in Christian writings which equate Pharisaism with "legalistic Judaism" or "legalism,"⁴ and the direct assertions that the Pharisee lacked "inwardness, sense of relative values, unity and peace of his religious and moral life" while he lived in an atmosphere of "externalism, superficiality, casuistry and unsatisfactory religious fellowship."⁵ On the other hand, most Jewish and some Christian scholars have followed the emphasis of S. Schechter and I. Abrahams: "It is hardly an exaggeration to maintain that there is no noble manifestation of real religion, no expression of real piety, reverence, and devotion, to which Jewish literature

¹E. Schürer, Jewish People, Div.II, Vol.II, p.91

²Ibid., p.120.

³Ibid., p.124.

⁴E.g., R.H. Charles, Ap. and Ps., Vol.II, p.786; J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, pp.83-92; H.W. Robinson, "The Theology of the Old Testament: The characteristic Doctrines," Record and Revelation, ed. H.W. Robinson, p.348; E.Stauffer, New Testament Theology, pp.92-93.

⁵F.V. Filson, St. Paul's Conception of Recompense, p.7. C.H. Dodd's statement that "the Pharisaic God was for practical purposes an Absentee" (The Meaning of Paul for Today, p.37) is but another expression of this basic approach.

would not offer a fair parallel."¹ The work of these two Jewish scholars in particular has challenged some Christians to insist that "the Judaism of the Pharisees, from which Christianity tore itself away, was no obsolete formalism, but a religion having the power to satisfy the spiritual wants of those who were faithful to it."² The first group has traditionally laid stress on the Halakic portions of the Talmud and the practice of Pharisaism as recorded in the New Testament and Josephus. The second has stressed the Haggadic and the principles of Judaism. Neither group has failed to take into account all of the evidence, but their emphases have been different. To the first, it is the preponderance of dark elements in the literature and histories that is significant; to the other, the streaks of light in the shadows. And thus scholarship has divided to this present day.

The renewed attempt, which this section takes up, to understand the spiritual climate of the Pharisaism of early Roman times is not necessarily an endeavour to reconcile these two opposing views or to advocate either. As most previous investigators have endeavoured, so we seek to ascertain the spirituality of the Pharisaism of Saul's day on the basis of what we believe to be the valid sources³ and with an eye to both the principles of the system and its practice; to both its possibilities and its actualities.⁴ And in view of the indirect and

¹S. Schechter, Studies in Judaism, p.173. On the whole, the works of Abrahams are more balanced and better presented, and therefore more convincing, than Schechter's.

²R.T.Herford, Pharisaism, p.2. G.F.Moore, F.C.Burkitt and others express like sentiments.

³See supra, pp. 4-22.

⁴Cf. I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, p.87, and S. Schechter, Studies in Judaism, p. xxx, where aspects of methodology which Christian scholars often ignore in evaluating Judaism are stressed.

analogous evidence unearthed at Qumran, such a re-examination of Pharisaism's spirituality is pertinent at this time.

Externalism and Formalistic Piety

Probably everyone is more ready to see the flowers in his own garden¹ and the weeds in that of his neighbour. And yet it is poor gardening to dwell on either to the exclusion of the other. While we might desire to dwell on the flowers, we must first of all deal with the weeds. And weeds there were in pre-destruction Pharisaism.

The testimony of the Talmud. -- The legalistic externalism of the great proportion of the statements in the Mishnah and the quibbling casuistry of the major portion of the Gemaras have caused many interpreters to view all of the Jewish piety as formalistic.² And it is not difficult to see why, when even the earliest and noblest tractate contains such views as: "The rules about Bird-offerings and the onset of menstruation --- these are essentials of the Halakoth";³ or "Which is the straight way that a man should choose? That which is an honour to him and gets him honour from men."⁴ Both these statements, however, are credited to Rabbis later than our time of interest; the first to

¹Abrahams' sentiments could be just as fervently expressed by any religionist in favour of his own position: "Amidst the weeds of Pharisaism are flowers, amidst the Evangelic flowers are weeds. I cannot overcome my preference for the flowers. I am no gatherer of weeds" (Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, p. vii).

²E.g., P.P. Bläser cites as an example the fact that the short passages in the Pentateuch regarding the Sabbath rest (Exod. 16.23, 30; 31.12-17; 34.21; 35.1-3; Num. 15.32-36) are expanded to 39 articles and 1521 passages in the Mishnah (Das Gesetz bei Paulus, p. 39).

³Mish. Aboth 3.19.

⁴Mish. Aboth 2.1a.

R. Eleazar Hisma, from the beginning of the second century A.D., and the second to R. Judah, at the end of the same century. Therefore, in accordance with those sources we have designated as being valid in the understanding of the Judaism of Saul's day,¹ it is not our purpose to include them here as evidence. Neither shall we include the great amount of material of a similar nature in the later Talmudic writings.²

When we dismiss all of those writings which do not definitely have their roots in the pre-70 A.D. period, we are left with a pitifully small amount of direct Talmudic evidence. And of this remaining evidence, there are more statements showing inwardness than a mere externalism. Yet there are expressions of this pre-destruction type which reveal a purely commercial view of righteousness; e.g., the saying ascribed to antiquity: "A man should always regard himself as though he were half guilty and half meritorious: if he performs one precept, happy is he for weighting himself down in the scale of merit; if he commits one transgress, woe to him for weighting himself down in the scale of guilt."³ The words ascribed to R. Eleazar, who personally and through his teacher R. Johanan b. Zakkai had his roots in the period, also lean in this direction: "Know before whom thou toilest and who is thy task-master who shall pay thee reward of thy labour."⁴

¹See supra, pp. 4-22.

²Cf. C.G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, A Rabbinic Anthology, pp. 202-232, for quotes and comments on what Montefiore has elsewhere called "the cheap doctrine of tit for tat and measure for measure" ("The Old Testament and Judaism," Record and Revelation, ed. H.W. Robinson, p.447). All but one of the examples cited are later than our time of interest. Also note the many expressions of justification by works and labouring for reward attributed to R. Akiba and his disciples in Mish. Aboth 2.16, 3.2, 3.16-17, 4.10-11.

³b. Kid. 40b.

⁴Mish. Aboth 2.14.

The testimony of the Gospels and Josephus. -- The greater quantity of evidence revealing a formalistic piety in Pharisaism, and reflecting specifically the pre-destruction period, is contained in the Gospels and Josephus. Josephus' account of the Pharisee Ananias, who had been sent from Jerusalem and who hypocritically used the pretence of a religious fast to accomplish his political ambitions, indicates that at least one Pharisee's religion was but formal.¹ And the earlier indication in The Jewish War that the sacred feasts in Jerusalem were often used by the religious leaders for purposes of sedition and political advantage implies that Ananias' action might not have been an isolated incident.² Not all of the Pharisees held to the high ideals of the earlier Hasidim in leaving governments entirely alone as long as there was religious freedom.³ And Josephus' description of them as those "who were in a capacity of greatly opposing kings" is telling.⁴ Externalism is clearly evident in Josephus' insistence, which he implies is the accepted view within the Jewish nation, that "the purposing to do a thing, but not actually doing it, is not worthy of punishment."⁵ These words are spoken in connection with Antiochus Epiphanes' attempt to plunder the temple of Diana in Persia. But Josephus clears him of all guilt since, though he tried his best to get the treasure, Antiochus

¹Life, 56. Cf. Life 39.

²In recounting the Jewish opposition to Alexander Janneus, Josephus says: "The nation of the Jews made an insurrection against him at a festival, for at those feasts seditions are generally begun" (War I. 4. 3).

³As indicated in their rule over Queen Alexandra (War I. 5. 2) and their joining in the intrigues of Herod's court (Antiq. XVII. 2. 1ff).

⁴Antiq. XVII. 2. 4.

⁵Antiq. XII. 9. 1

didn't succeed. Now it is certainly true that Josephus is a poor spokesman of the theology of the day. Yet the fact that this same principle is restated by fairly early Gemaras¹ and by some modern Rabbis² makes it not so improbably that Josephus' expression had a wider acceptance than that of his own personal Pharisaism. Possibly of a similar nature is his representation of the Jewish view of retaliation: "Let him that is smitten be avenged immediately, by inflicting the same punishment on him that smote him."³

The Gospels recount many clashes of Jesus with the Pharisees over sabbath observance and ritual purity,⁴ and at least one parable portrays the "elder brother" of Judaism as missing the significance of the occasion in his pride and self-pity.⁵ But such accounts are primarily setting forth the Jewish failure to appreciate God's greater Revelation and working in their midst through His Son; though, of course, in the light of that failure the Gospels cannot view the Pharisaic righteousness as anything but externalism. The damning evidence from the Gospels against Pharisaic spirituality is contained in: (1) John the Baptist's denunciation of them as γεννηματα ἐξ ἰδων who take pride in the external matter of their descent from Abraham,⁶ (2) Jesus'

¹Note b. Kid. 40a: "Evil intention is not combined with deed"; which I. Epstein explains as: "There is no punishment for mere intention" (The Babylonian Talmud, Soncino, Seder Nashim VIII, p.198, n. 14). Cf. j. Peah 1.1

²Z.H. Chajes speaks of "the principle adopted for Israel that an evil thought is not to be viewed as an evil deed" (The Student's Guide through the Talmud, p. 169).

³Antiq. IV. 8. 33.

⁴Mk. 2.23-28, Matt. 12.1-8, Lk. 6.1-5; Mk. 3.1-5, Matt. 12.10-14, Lk. 6.6-11; Jn. 5; Jn. 9.

⁵This is certainly the import of the latter part of the Prodigal Son; cf. C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, p.16.

⁶Matt. 3.7-9; though here it is also directed to the Sadducees, and in Lk. 3.7 to the whole multitude.

same rebuke in characterising them as evil at heart while appearing good,¹ (3) the contrasts made in the Sermon on the Mount between the Pharisees' formalism and true righteousness,² (4) Christ's application of Isaiah 29.13 to the Pharisees,³ and (5) the long listing of woes pronounced upon the scribes and Pharisees - ὑποκριταί.⁴

A. Lukyn Williams has sought to soften the blow of the accusations in the Gospels by arguing that ὑποκριταί of Matthew 23 should be translated by the more innocent "play-actors" rather than transliterated by the harsher "hypocrites," which term has picked up many evil connotations.⁵ His case ultimately rests upon the distinction between the "habitual action" of pretence on the part of the hypocrite and the "for the occasion only" action of the play-actor. But the distinction is very thin when applied to the Gospels' portrayal.

By considering only part of the evidence, a case could be made for ὑποκριτοὶ and ὑποκριτής as having a broader meaning in this particular chapter than "hypocrite", or even Moffatt's "impious." Both forms of the word were used previous to and during the first century A.D. in Jewish literature to mean merely play-acting and actor.⁶ And the context of many passages in the Gospels would not demand that ὑποκριταί

¹Matt. 12.33-37.

²Matt. 5.20-6.18.

³Mk. 7.1-23; Matt. 15.1-20: "This people honour me with their lips but their heart is far from me."

⁴Matt. 23.1-35; Lk. 11.39-44.

⁵A.L. Williams, Talmudic Judaism and Christianity, pp. 63-78.

⁶Cf. the case of the noble Eleazer in facing persecution, and the appeal of his friends only to play the part in light of his advanced age (II Macc. 6.21, 24, 25; IV Macc. 6.15. 17).

be equated with anything more than "superficialists";¹ though that is a fairly severe charge in itself. The descriptions that are given in verse 16 and following of Matt. 23 are all of superficiality, and the two in verses 13-15 are not necessarily adverse to such an interpretation. If we possessed only this evidence and this chapter, we might agree that the term could be better translated by "play-actor" or "superficialist"; though how this would materially ease the accusation against the Pharisees is difficult to see, for in the context of Matt. 23 the action described is neither innocent pretence nor unconscious naïveté. Yet there are other passages which warn us to go slow in rejecting the rendering "hypocrisy." The statement in Luke 20.20 relating that the chief priests and scribes sent **ἐγκαθέτους ὑποκρινομένους** **ἑαυτοὺς δίκαιους εἶναι**,² the readings in Matt. 6.2, 5, and 16, where **οἱ ὑποκριταὶ** give alms **ὅπως δοξασθῶσιν** **ἔμπροσθέντων ἀνθρώπων** and pray and fast **ὅπως φανθῶσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις**; the association in Sirach 1.29 of **ὑποκριτοὺς** with a double heart, the assertion that the hypocrite is a deceitful beguiler in Psalms of Solomon 4.22-25, and the portrayal of the hypocrite in Job. 34.30 and 36.13 as both a curse to others and cursed himself --- all these passages give confirmation that we have not misread the text.³ There is

¹Cf. Lk. 12.56: **ὑποκριταὶ, τὸ πρόσωπον . . . οἴδατε σκοπεῖν**; also Mk. 7.6 and Lk. 13.15.

²Cf. also Mk. 12.15; Matt. 22.18.

³Cf. A.G. Hebert: "The word 'hypokrites' with the meaning of 'actor' belonged to the Greek drama, and so was alien to the Jewish tradition and the Aramaic language. The true meaning is deeper and more penetrating" ("Hypocrite," A Theological Word Book of the Bible, ed. A. Richardson, p. 109).

no need to say that this accusation was not voiced by Jesus but came from a later 'Lebensitz' of the Church, for the Talmudic literature itself speaks of similar hypocrisy within Pharisaism; and similarly condemns it.¹

It therefore does seem that even though we disregard the later foliage of Judaism, much of which undoubtedly had its roots if not its flower in the early period, there were still weeds in the Pharisaism of Christ's and Saul's day. But we must not linger over the weeds.

Inwardness and the Prophetic Spirit

The most difficult aspect of Pharisaism for Christian scholars to see is its prophetic element. And indeed, the Judaism of Saul's day was not all externalism.

The testimony of the Talmud.--- The teaching of Antigonus of Socho, "be not like slaves that minister to the master for the sake of receiving a bounty, but be like slaves that minister to the master not for the sake of receiving a bounty; and let the fear of Heaven be upon you,"² was carried on by at least Hillel, Zadok and Johanan b. Zakkai.³

¹See b. Sot. 22b, j. Ber. 9.14b and j. Sot. 5.20c. Also H. Loewe, "Pharisaism," Judaism and Christianity, Vol. I. ed. W.O.E. Oesterley, p. 186, where a summary of passages is given in support of the thesis that "the Pharisees were just as prone as Jesus to blame ostentation in religion."

²Mish. Aboth 1.3.

³Hillel: "He that makes worldly use of the crown (i.e. the Torah) shall perish" (Mish. Aboth 1.13, 4.5); Zadok: "Make them (i.e. the words of the Law) not a crown wherewith to magnify thyself or a spade wherewith to dig" (Mish. Aboth 4.5); Johanan: "If thou hast wrought much in the Law claim not merit for thyself, for to this end wast thou created" (Mish. Aboth 2.8). Cf. D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, p.395, regarding Zadok's date. Also b. Ab. Zar. 19a, where Antigonus' admonition is repeated in later literature, and Exod. R. 30.24, where merit is de-emphasised.

In the discussions of proselyte baptism, there is the significant statement by Johanan b. Zakkai insisting that one did not become really clean by the water of separation nor really unclean by a corpse but that the provisions regarding cleanliness must be kept since it was the will of God.¹ Inward motives and qualities are stressed. Johanan b. Zakkai highly commends the expression of Eleazar, one of his five disciples, that a good heart is the foundation of all good and an evil heart of all evil.²

More pertinent still is the evidence of a realisation in pre-destruction Judaism that one must start from the mercy and love of God, returning that love and manifesting it to one's fellow man, if religion was to be meaningful. Probably the most important single factor in impressing this upon the consciousness of the Jew in Saul's day was the daily recitation of the Shema. After the recital of the unity of God, and before the commands regarding obedience, the significant words of Deut. 6.5 were repeated: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." These same elements of (1) confession of God, (2) love from God to man and/or man to God, and (3) obedience to God's instruction, appear in the same order in the Shemoneh Esreh,³ the enumeration of the 613 command-

¹Num. R. 19.8 on Num. 19.2. Cf. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 107.

²Mish. Aboth 2.9. Cf. b. Shab. 63a and b. Ber. 6a, 13a, 20, where in the literature of a later time, intent is stressed as the basis of all action and that which God judges.

³The first words of The Shemoneh Esreh (The Eighteen "Benedictions," "Blessings," or "Prayers",) are regarding the Person and majesty of God, the first activity cited is that of His graciousness, while it is not until Benediction 5 that there is mention of service on the part of man. For a translation of the Benedictions, see E. Schürer, Jewish People, Div. II, Vol. II, pp. 85-87.

ments,¹ and were possibly included by many early Pharisees in the opening words of the 'Ten Commandments'.² There is abundant evidence that at least Hillel made much of the לְרַחֵם of God, both God's shown to man and the need for the man of God to manifest such to his fellow-men.³ In this aspect he was a true follower of the Hasidic movement.⁴ And, although a non-ritualistic emphasis was bound to arise with the enforced discontinuance of the sacrificial system, it is still significant that R. Johanan b. Zakkai took the words of Hosea 6.6 as his motto

¹The listing of the 613 commandments begins: (1) "To know that the Lord God exists"; (2) "To acknowledge His unity"; (3) "To love Him"; (4) "To fear Him." Though the list was finally compiled by Maimonides, there is reason to believe that its roots are very ancient. See I. Broyde, "The 613 Commandments," *J.E.*, Vol. IV. pp. 181-186, for Tannaitic and Palestinian Amoraic testimony to its antiquity and for a listing of the commandments.

²In New Testament times "it is possible that many experts even then considered the verse 'I am the Lord, which have brought thee out of the house of bondage' to be one of the ten portions forming the whole" (D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 249). Cf. b. Mak. 24a. The listings in *Antiq.* III. 5. 5. and the Targums could be interpreted either way. If this be true, then the ten laws began with: (1) a declaration of the Person of God, (2) an expression of God's gracious activity, and then (3) commands to obedience. This same emphasis on beginning with God and His mercy is continued in the later writings; e.g., *Mish. Ber.* 2.2, where Deut. 6.4-9 is so interpreted, and b. *Ber.* 63a, where a similar stress is found in *Prov.* 3.6.

³See N.N. Glatzer, "Hillel the Elder in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl, pp. 233-234, for an excellent treatment of Hillel on this point and a bringing together of the many Talmudic references. We shall not attempt to translate the term לְרַחֵם . It is more than mercy, piety, loyalty, steadfast love or even loving-kindness.

⁴Here is where Hillel and the Essenes came the closest to one another. The affinity is most easily explained by a common foundation in the Maccabean Hasidim. Cf. W.H. Brownlee, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," *B.A.S.O.R. - S.S.*, No. 10-12, Appendix B, pp. 48-49. See *infra*, pp.

after the destruction of the Temple: "I desire לֵב and not sacrifice."¹ This appears to be a re-emphasis of what was already accepted in at least some Hebraic circles before the fall of the Temple. Further, it must be pointed out that at least two of the Talmudic passages ascribed to antiquity --- b. Sot. 31a and b. Shab. 88b --- speak of the proper and best motivation in the religious life being that of the love of God.²

Even those who most hotly dispute the presence of inwardness as a real element in the Judaism of Saul's day would agree with Bacher that the "love of man was considered by Hillel as the kernel of the entire Jewish teaching."³ Those utterances ascribed to Hillel show him to have possessed a true spirituality, whatever characterisation might be given to the rest of Judaism.⁴ But the fact that one of R. Johanan

¹Aboth de R. Nathan, I. 4.

²b. Sot. 31a: "It has been taught: R. Meir says: It is declared of Job 'one that feared God,' and it is declared of Abraham 'thou fearest God'; just as 'fearing God' with Abraham indicates love, so 'fearing God' with Job indicates from love. Whence, however, have we it in connection with Abraham himself (that he was motivated by love)? As it is written, 'The seed of Abraham who loved me.'" The passage then goes on to contrast the motivation of love and that of fear; and concludes that while both engender righteousness, the motivation of love is greater.

b. Shab. 88b: "Our Rabbis taught: Those who are insulted but do not insult, hear themselves reviled without answering, act through love and rejoice in suffering, of them the Writ saith, 'But they who love Him are as the sun when he goeth forth in his might.'"

³W. Bacher, "Hillel," J.E., Vol. VI, p. 398.

⁴Hillel's famous statements are: (1) "What is hateful to thee, do not unto thy fellow man: this is the whole Law; the rest is mere commentary" (b. Shab. 31a); (2) "Be of the disciples of Aaron, loving peace and pursuing peace, loving mankind and bringing them nigh to the Law" (Mish. Aboth 1.12); and (3) "Trust not in thyself until the day of thy death, and judge not thy fellow until thou art come to his place" (Mish. Aboth 2.5).

b. Zakkai's students is credited with a similar expression of the Golden Rule as attributed to Hillel,¹ and that the same sentiment is contained in the Letter of Aristeas,² makes it not improbable that the idea of love and consideration for one's fellow-men had a broader acceptance in early Pharisaism than we sometimes imagine.

The Testimony of the Gospels and Josephus. -- Even though much is said to the contrary in the Gospels and Josephus, there is still the recognition within them of what might be called a more noble element in Palestinian Pharisaism. Mark recounts with approval the agreement of one scribe with Jesus that to love God and to love one's neighbour was of far greater importance than all external actions.³ And not all the Pharisees are presented as in bitter opposition to Jesus.⁴ Likewise, Josephus relates that Alexander Jannaeus still recognised a godly element in Pharisaism, even though he characterised the group as a whole as scoundrels.⁵

It therefore seems that we can recognise within pre-destruction Pharisaism not only an element of formalistic piety, but also a true inwardness of spirit. It appears that there were Pharisees who could insist that "doing is a deadly thing --- unless it is the result of heartfelt faith".⁶

¹Mish. Aboth 2.10: "R. Eliezer said: Let the honour of thy fellow be dear to thee as thine own."

²Letter of Aristeas 207: "As you wish that no evil should befall you, . . . so you should act on the same principle towards your subjects and offenders."

³Mk. 12.28-34.

⁴The certain Pharisees who warn Him to flee (Lk. 13.31), Joseph of Arimathea (Mk. 15.43), Nicodemus (Jn. 3.1, 19.39) and possibly the chief Pharisee who had Jesus to dinner (Lk. 14.1).

⁵Antiq. XIII. 15. 5.

⁶A.L. Williams' phraseology, Talmudic Judaism and Christianity, p.32.

The Correlation of the Two Elements

With the recognition of both a formalistic piety and a vital spirit in pre-destruction Pharisaism, the question arises as to how these two elements are to be viewed in the overall religious situation of the day. And it is at this point, in the interpretation of the data more than in the recognition of the elements, that divergence of opinion has arisen.

Past Perspectives. -- Various positions regarding the relation of these factors to the overall picture have been advocated; and in order to clarify the discussion, we list them as follows:

1.) Some Jewish scholars have taken the line of whimsically shrugging off the more base elements in the Talmudic literature, insisting that they are "only the expression of a momentary impulse, . . . or were meant simply as a piece of humorous by-play, calculated to enliven the interest of a languid audience."¹

¹S. Schechter, Studies in Judaism, p. 240. Schechter continues: "The greatest fault to be found with those who wrote down such passages as appear objectionable to us is, perhaps, that they did not observe the wise rule of Johnson, who said to Boswell on a certain occasion, 'Let us get serious, for there comes a fool.'"

C.G. Montefiore, A Rabbinic Anthology, p. xlvi, mentally resurrects a jovial ancient Rabbi and creates his apology as follows: "As you know, we Rabbis in those days loved to argue with one another. We liked to use the words of Holy Scripture to prove our various assertions, as they chanced to crop up in our minds. If one of us said A, the other loved to say B. It was such fun. We had not so many outlets for fun in those days. But you must not take our different and differing sayings so seriously. We never thought of them like that. They were just the outcome of the moment, and we did so enjoy the arguing."

On pain of being classed a humourless fool, this author cannot believe that the Rabbis ever "thought of them like that." It is true that there are light touches in the Talmud, but the work is a basically serious one. And it was meant to be taken seriously. Akiba was certainly not jesting regarding jesting when he said: "Jesting and levity accustom a man to lewdness" (Mish. Aboth 3.14).

2.) Other Jewish apologists would refer all of that which they believe to be base or exaggerated to the realm of the incidental "made in the heat of polemics and through zeal for the preservation of a national unity," and thus have never been a part of Judaism.¹

3.) Some Christian writers ignore the evidence from the Gospels and Josephus, either by excluding it as a source or explaining away such denunciations found therein, and minimise the objectionable features in the Talmud.² The result is thus a general agreement with the first two positions; some going so far as to insist that "the Rabbinic Judaism of 4 B.C. to A.D. 70 was . . . as bright and happy a religion as the world has seen."³

4.) A few have advocated that an individual Jew could, at one and the same time, believe that love was the only acceptable motive for service and yet that the motivation of desire to win God's favour was rewarded by God.⁴

5.) The vast majority of Christian scholars have minimised the evidences of prophetic spirit and insisted that "Judaism believed in salvation through the observance of the Torah; the deliverance by an

¹J.Z. Lauterbach, "Nomism," J.E., Vol. IX, p. 328.

²E.g., G.F. Moore, R.T. Herford, A.L. Williams.

³A.L. Williams, Talmudic Judaism and Christianity, p. 53.

⁴J. Parkes: "The motive for obedience to Torah could only be love towards God who had given it. But a Jew could at the same time believe that a righteous God would be pleased by such obedience to His own commands, and that it would win His favour" (Jesus, Paul and the Jews, p. 70)

act of God was not the foundation of Judaism, but only a devotional accessory.¹

The problem of religious orientation. -- In evaluating the spiritual climate of any religious group or system it is not enough simply to balance baser elements against nobler ones and accept the verdict of the weightier quantity. Theology is more than mathematics. In dealing with spirituality we are dealing primarily with motives, not just expressions; though, of course, any investigation regarding motives has only the expressions as factual evidence on which to base its judgments. And yet the investigator must always relise that he is dealing with religious outlooks and orientations, and must accept the fact that there can be differing religious orientations within a given religious group or community.

We find such differing religious orientations at variance within our own souls even before we see them manifested within a particular religious form of expression, but we can also view them at work in all the spiritual and ethical activities of man --- whether individual or formal and organised. These differing orientations can be grouped roughly into two classes or types. To borrow Deissmann's distinction in regard to mysticism, they are the "acting" religious orientation and the "reacting" religious orientation; that attitude

¹W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, p. 98. W. Barclay has said: "When Paul laid such stress on grace, he set out on a road of thought which was quite strange to the orthodox Jewish teaching of his day. It is true that in its highest and most devotional moments Jewish religion did rest in the mercy of God and in nothing else. . . . But that is not representative of the teaching of the orthodox Rabbis in the days of Paul" (The Mind of St. Paul, pp. 155-156). Cf. also H. St. J. Thackeray, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, p. 85; R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, p. 314; E. Stauffer, New Testament Theology, pp. 35-36.

which makes religion 'a means in order to' and that which sees it as 'an expression because of'. Deissmann's words regarding mysticism are also pertinent here:

In both cases an action takes place. But in the first type the action is spontaneous performance of the individual or of the community, intended to produce in response to it a performance on the part of the deity, effective through its own execution, effective as 'actio acta,' as 'opus operatum'. In the second, the reacting type, on the other hand, the action of the man is an action in response, a reaction. Here it is God himself who is really the 'Leitourgos', the 'Theourgos' in the highest sense; the individual or the community only says the amen.¹

In the constant demand for value judgments which Comparative Religion and Theology as a whole makes upon us, it is of the utmost importance to recognise the possibility of such differing orientations - indeed even of opposing outlooks. And yet we must be aware that positive identification and precise analysis become extremely difficult, if not impossible. Because such orientations cross all external lines and because the nature of our human knowledge is such that we can know nothing fully, much less the human spirit which defies the best of scientific analysis, we must constantly keep in mind our Lord's injunction to "judge not." But such an exhortation does not rule out necessary recognition, legitimate value judgments and an attempt to view the details in their total perspective. It is this we endeavour to do in understanding the spirituality of pre-destruction Pharisaism.

¹A. Deissmann, Paul, pp. 117-118; cf. The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, pp. 195ff.

Acting and reacting tendencies in Hebraicism. - All of our sources recognise differing religious orientations within Hebraic Pharisaism, though they express it differently. The Talmudic literature can distinguish between the "Reckoning Pharisee, who casts up his account of sins and virtues," and the "God-fearing Pharisee" and "God-loving Pharisee."¹ It speaks of both the תּוֹרַת הַלֵּל Hillel² and the good-hearted Johanan b. Zakkai,³ and warns regarding the bite and wounds of the mere formalists.⁴ The Gospels can speak of the Pharisees as hypocrites and lacking the love of God,⁵ and yet commend a Pharisaic scribe for realising that love of God and neighbour was basic to all spirituality. They can portray the Pharisees as agitating for Jesus' death,⁶ and yet present cases of Pharisaic sympathy and tolerance.⁷

¹b. Sot. 22b.

²Lev. R. 34.3: "A man of mercy [תּוֹרַת הַלֵּל] benefits himself (Prov. 11.17) --- this refers to Hillel the Elder."

³Mish. Aboth 2.9.

⁴Mish. Aboth 2.10b: "Warm thyself before the fire of the Sages, but be heedful of their glowing coals lest thou be burned, for their bite is the bite of a jackal and their sting the sting of a scorpion and their hiss the hiss of a serpent, and all their words are like coals of fire." Mish, Sot. 3.4 speaks in the same breath of "a woman that is a hypocrite and the wounds of the Pharisees."

⁵Jn. 5.42.

⁶The endeavour to disassociate the scribes from the Pharisees and to attribute the opposition to Jesus and the desire for His death only to Sadducean scribes (e.g., J. Bowman, "The Pharisees," E.Q., Vol. XX, No.1, April 1948, p. 133) is not convincing. L. Finkelstein's penetrating analysis of Pharisees and Sadducees, "The Pharisees: Their Origin and Their Philosophy," H.T.R., Vol. XXII, No.3 (July, 1929), pp. 185-261, well substantiates his opinion that "almost all of the scribes were of the Pharisaic persuasion" (p. 215). Cf. also G.F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I. p.66.

⁷Lk. 13.31; Mk. 15.43 and par.; Jn.3.1ff. and 19.39; Lk. 14.1.

Likewise Josephus distinguishes between the genuine and the formalistic among the Pharisees.¹

The distinction in these contrasts often falls between what we shall call an acting legalism and a reacting nomism;² i.e., an ordering of one's life in external and formal arrangement according to the Law in order to gain righteousness and/or appear righteous and the moulding of one's life in all its varying relations according to the Law in response to the love and grace of God. To both classes the Law was of great importance, but it was important for different reasons.³ To both "the joy of the commandment" was very real,⁴ but it sprang from a different source.

¹Antiq. XIII. 15. 5.

²The terms 'legalism' and 'nomism' are certainly synonymous in their primary and strict meaning; and are often so used interchangeably. And yet there is both a denotation and a connotation, an explication and a secondary meaning, to the terms. The primary meaning of both refers to the control of life in conformity to a rule or standard. But a secondary idea has arisen suggesting only a formal arrangement of the external aspects of life in order to gain righteousness and/or appear righteous. It is therefore necessary to distinguish between the denotation and the connotation. And this will be done throughout this work by allowing the term 'nomism' to refer solely to the primary meaning and 'legalism' to refer to the secondary idea.

³Josephus spoke for the whole of Judaism in saying: "We think it to be the most necessary business of our whole life to observe the laws that have been given us, and to keep those rules of piety that have been delivered down to us" (Contra Apion, I. 12). But within this unanimity, the concluding words of R. Safra's prayer are significant: "May it be Thy will, O Lord our God, to establish peace . . . among the disciples who occupy themselves with Thy Torah whether for its own sake or for other motives; and may it please Thee that all who do so for other motives may come to study it for its own sake!" (b. Ber. 17a).

⁴For discussions regarding "the joy of the commandment," see: H. Loewe, "Pharisaism," Judaism and Christianity, Vol. I, ed. W.O.E. Oesterley, p. 138; C.G. Montefiore, "The Old Testament and Judaism," Record and Revelation, ed. H.W. Robinson, pp. 448-449; R.T. Herford, "The Law and Pharisaism," Judaism and Christianity, Vol. III, ed. E.I.J. Rosenthal, pp. 117-118; C.G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, pp. 29-31.

In interpreting the elements of formalistic and prophetic piety in pre-destruction Hebraic Judaism as stemming from acting and reacting religious orientations, there is the intriguing temptation to go further and attempt to pinpoint individuals who portray each tendency and to determine the extent of the influence of each element over the Pharisaism of the day. The first line of inquiry can lead nowhere, for, as we have noted above, man's powers of analysis are at best inadequate in this area of motives and attitudes. Even if our sources were voluminous, unimpeachable and transparent, the best that could be done would be to point out a few individuals who seemed beyond doubt to possess a reacting faith. Regarding the second investigation, matters are just about as bad. But judging from the legalistic emphasis that followed the repulsion of the Seleucid attempt at Hellenisation,¹ it was probably the case that each oppression and disaster from that time through at least the pre-destruction period only strengthened the forces of legalism. It was no accident that the Oral Law centred around those elements which had been previously attacked --- Sabbath observance and ritual purity.² It might be suggested that the distinction between Shammai and Hillel corresponds to these tendencies; and it is true that the one could be said to be "precise" while the other "kindly." Yet both precision and kindness could spring from either motivation. These tendencies out across all external lines and temperaments. All that can be said with certainty is that there was within the Pharisaism of Saul's day a formalistic piety and a prophetic spirit; an acting legalism

¹Cf., E. Schürer, Jewish People, Div. II, Vol. I, pp. 51-56; though, of course, many Jews insist that such an emphasis began with Ezra (cf. A. Cohen, Everyman's Talmud, p. xvii).

²Cf., C.H. Dodd, History and the Gospel, p. 130.

and a reacting nomism. It remains to analyse more closely and to portray these tendencies.

The Religion of a Nomist

Much that has been written regarding pre-destruction Pharisaism has portrayed it as basically one in spirituality --- a bleak and striving legalism. And though legalism can have a beneficial effect upon morality,¹ its spirituality can be so described. But in recognising a distinction of motive and emphasis between legalism and nomism, as we have so defined the terms, we cannot continue to allow the one characterisation to apply to both orientations. This section therefore considers the religion of a nomist, allowing the standard characterisation to remain valid for that of the legalist.

The analogy of Qumran. -- Two common misrepresentations of a legal religion, such as Judaism, are: (1) that fidelity to Law is necessarily to be equated with legalism,² and (2) that a religion which stresses fidelity to Law is necessarily egocentric, not Theocentric.³ Both of these accusations are refuted by the analogous evidence to Pharisaism found at Qumran and by some of the previously known non-canonical writings, if not by the Talmudic literature itself.

¹The Jewish insistence is that Christian investigators have closed their eyes to the fact that "the constant reminder of God's presence such as the precepts supply can not fail to have a beneficial influence upon man's morality" (M. Friedländer, The Jewish Religion, p. 234).

²E.g., W.H.P. Hatch: "Indeed, fidelity to the divine law was the fundamental principle of Jewish religion, and hence Judaism stands forth as a leading representative of the legalistic type of religion" (The Pauline Idea of Faith, p. 14).

³E.g., C.H. Dodd: "A legal religion lays all the emphasis on what a man does, or wills to do. The power of the will, the self-assertive element in us, is brought into the foreground. In direct contrast to this is the religion which says that not what we do, but what God does, is the root of the matter" (The Meaning of Paul for Today, p. 122).

That the Qumran Community, an Essene group,¹ was more detailed in its legislation and more rigid in its observance than Pharisaic Judaism is beyond doubt. Josephus has long ago informed us of this fact,² and now it is evident in the literature. Yet, one of the most striking aspects of the evidence from Qumran is that of the coincidence of a nomism and a prophetic spirit. There is a scrupulous concern for ritual purity, but there is no indication of a merely mechanical, external observance. The emphasis is rather upon God's $\Gamma \Theta \Pi$, and from this basis spring true righteousness, true motivation and true strength to be pleasing unto Him in obedience to His commandments.³ A mere formalistic piety is strongly condemned.⁴ Though they possessed a great assurance of their own election and were convinced that the true revelation of the meaning of the Law and the Prophets had been given them, the Essenes were also acutely aware.

¹As F.M. Cross, Jr., rather ironically says: "If the people of the scrolls were not the Essenes, they were a similar sect, living in the same center, in the same era" (The Ancient Library of Qumran, p. 42). For an early identification, see W.H. Brownlee, "A Comparison of the Covenanters of the Dead Sea Scrolls with Pre-Christian Jewish Sects," B.A., Sept. 1950, pp. 50-72. Cf. M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 273-298, and J.T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, p. 56.

²War II. 8. 9: "They are stricter than any other of the Jews."

³IQH and the closing psalm (columns 10 and 11) of IQS are especially full of this theme, but traces are also found in other parts of this literature. The most obvious examples are: IQH 10.16, 11.18-19; IQS 11.2-5, 13b-15, 17.

⁴Cf. IQS 3.4-12, where the prerequisites to walking blamelessly in the commandments (10-11), being acceptable before God (11), and becoming accepted by the sect (12), are not "by mere ceremonies of atonement" or washings, sanctifications and purifications, but, rather, a spiritual apprehension of God's truth (6-7), the working of God's Holy Spirit (6-7), and an attitude of uprightness, humility and submission (8). Likewise, IQS 5.13 insists that ritual washings will not gain one the purity of a holy man, "for men cannot be purified except they repent their evil" (T.H. Gaster's trans., The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect). Their attitude toward the polluted sacrifices at Jerusalem is further evidence at this point; cf. J.M. Baumgarten, "Sacrifice and Worship Among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls," H.T.R., Vol. XLVI, No. 3 (July, 1953), pp. 141-159.

of their own sinfulness and possessed a real humility.¹ Theirs was the need to depend upon God alone for righteousness, wisdom and strength; and theirs was to be that attitude of seeking God "with all their heart and with all their soul."² To judge from the merely external criterion of the proportion of legal to prophetic biblical writings found to date at Qumran, the study and reading of the Essenes seems to have been balanced.³ W.D. Davies has well summed it up in saying: "The community is aware of itself as under 'the Law' and yet as a 'household of the spirit'; it reveals no sense of an essential incompatibility or essential tension between life under 'the Law' and life under 'the Spirit'."⁴

The significance of this evidence from Qumran for Pharisaism is not so much that here was a nomistic group with the spirit of prophetism which influenced Pharisaism for the better --- though that

¹Cf., M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 263-264. J.T. Milik says: "They realised . . . man's congenital inability to carry out his part in God's plan of salvation" (Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, p. 120).

²In the opening words of IQS (1.2), and before the command to obedience, there are the words לֹא שׁוֹרְרִי followed by a lacuna. The command "to seek God" is undoubtedly taken from II Chron. 15.12 (cf. W.H. Brownlee, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," B.A.S.O.R. - S.S., Nos. 10-12, p. 7, n. 5), where, likewise, a covenant is entered in to. Thus, whatever the lacuna in the text really be, the meaning of the phrase in II Chron. 15.12 was probably included in the verb

$\text{וּשְׁרַף} : \text{מִשְׁפָּטֵי-לְבָבִי} \text{ מִלְּבָבִי-לְבָבִי} . . . \text{וּשְׁרַף} .$

³The most popular books among the sectarians, to judge from the number of copies preserved in Cave IV, are Deuteronomy, 14 MSS.; Isaiah, 12 MSS.; and Psalms, 10 MSS. There are also eight copies of the Book of the Twelve Prophets. None is complete" (F.M. Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran, p. 34). Cf. J.T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, pp. 23-26. Milik further points out that Psalm 119 was a great favourite at Qumran (p.27).

⁴W.D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, pp. 180-181.

is not out of the question.¹ But rather:

1.) The Qumran literature shows that fidelity to the divine law does not necessarily imply for a Jewish group a legalistic and ego-centric piety.

2.) The men of Qumran and the men of Pharisaism very probably had their roots in a common subsoil, the Maccabean Hasidim;² and thus the basic elements of the one community would probably be more or less common to the other.

¹The extent of Essene influence in Palestine is very uncertain (cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes, pp. 147-148, for the extreme view that they had a great impact upon contemporary thought, and T.H. Gaster, The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect, pp. 44 and 110, n. 25, for an expression of the more moderate opinion of the majority of scholars). At any rate, Josephus clearly tells us that they were dispersed into every city (War II. 8. 4), and CDC provides for such urban members in 12.19-22 (15.1-3). The fact that there were laws designated for the camps implies that there were Essenes not living in camps; see CDC 7.6 (9.1), 12.22 (15.4), 13.20 (16.9), 14.3 (17.1). There is even the intriguing suggestion made by N.N. Glatzer, "Hillel the Elder in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, pp. 242-243, that there was personal contact between Hillel and the Essenes; a contact established through Hillel's continued friendship with Menahem, who preceded Shammai as a leading Pharisaic teacher but who later separated to become (possibly) the Essene Menahem.

²H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, spoke of the Pharisees (pp. 36-37) and the Essenes (pp. 40-41) as two shoots from the same Hasidic root. For excellent discussions advocating this position, see: J.T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, pp. 59, 80-81, 87-90; F.M. Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran, p. 107, n. 66; C.H. Dodd, History and the Gospel, pp. 117-118. The styling of the men of Qumran as "those who devote themselves" to the covenant, community, truth and/or holiness (IQS 5.1, 6, 8, 10, 21, 22; 6.13), has a striking parallel in the description of the Hasidim as those who "devote themselves to the Law" (I Macc. 2.42). The ἐκνοια-ζήσυρος of the one is parallel to the בְּיָדָם of the other. Cf. W.H. Brownlee, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," B.A.S.O.R. — S.S., Nos. 10-12, p. 7, n. 5.

This new evidence from the caves of the "separating" Hasidim necessitates that we revise many previous opinions regarding the spirituality of the nomistic "continuing" Hasidim.

Nomistic Pharisaism.—With the somewhat parallel evidence from Qumran, it now seems more probable than ever before that the religion of a nomistic Pharisee was truly spiritual and noble. While he insisted that faith was whole-hearted trust in God and fidelity to His instruction, his emphasis, as opposed to the legalist, was upon God and trust in Him. He agreed that "God demands obedience," but likewise insisted that such was "only as the proof and expression of something else; the intimate personal attitude of trust and love."¹ And yet he did not forget for a moment that such faith "is of value only in so far as it is productive of faithful action."² Thus

אמונתו was both "trust in" and "fidelity to"; reliance and faithfulness.³ The emphasis must always be upon the former, though without negating the importance of the latter. In this he was a true child of Old Testament piety.⁴ Through his endeavour "to make a hedge about the Torah," to create as it were "applied prophecy" so that a man might

¹W.F. Lofthouse, "The Old Testament and Christianity," Record and Revelation, ed. H.W. Robinson, pp. 473-474. For a brief and pertinent discussion characterising the Religion of Israel, Lofthouse's article is superb.

²I. Epstein, The Babylonian Talmud (Soncino), Seder Zere'im, Vol. I. p. xv.

³Cf. IQHab. 2.4, where the Essene definition of faith is to fear God and do His will, and the adjunct to IQS (entitled "A Formulary of Blessings" by Gaster), where the definition of a righteous man is one who fears God and does His will. Acceptance in the community meant trust in the mission and message of the teacher and fidelity to his instruction.

⁴In characterising Old Testament faith, H.W. Robinson has well said: "Just as the chief outer and visible mark of religion in the Old Testament is obedience, so the chief inner and invisible character is trust, a trust which depends at last on the hesed of Yahweh" ("The Theology of the Old Testament: The Characteristic Doctrines," Record and Revelation, ed. H.W. Robinson, p. 326). Cf. A.B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 280, and K. Kohler, "Faith," J.E.,

be saved from transgression before it was too late,¹ the nomistic spirituality was probably often hidden under a mass of legislation. From our Christian viewpoint, we cannot but disagree with their methods and means. The taut and precise ordinances still first met the eye of the worshipper. But behind the chancel-rails glowed the Shekinah. We see it in comparing the legislative writings with the psalms and hymns in Qumran, and there is no reason to doubt a similar phenomenon in Pharisaism.

Saul and the Law

The question of the spirituality of Saul's own religion must be viewed in the light of the opposing Pharisaic tendencies of legalism and nomism. But in seeking to designate the nature of his spirituality, reference must be made to his later letters and the account in Acts. We must therefore appeal to those biographical, or seemingly biographical, statements in the Pauline literature for our most direct evidence regarding Saul's relation to the Law in the complex of Pharisaism.

The Testimony of Romans 7

From the earliest times, debate regarding the nature of Saul's religious experience in Judaism has centred around Romans 7.7-25. Origen and most of the Greek Fathers viewed this passage as a reminiscence of life under the Law, and they have been followed by such names

¹R.T. Herford is quite correct in emphasising this motivation for nomistic Pharisaism (Pharisaism, pp. 26-27, 64-65; "The Law and Pharisaism," Judaism and Christianity, Vol. III, ed. E.I.J. Rosenthal, pp. 108-109); though, again, it is not entirely correct for legalistic Pharisaism. Cf. Letter of Aristeas 240: "If you know that God put the thoughts in the mind of the lawgivers for the sake of preserving the lives of men you will become a follower of them."

as Wesley, A. Deissmann, H. St. J. Thackeray, J. Moffatt, A. S. Peake, J. S. Stewart, and C. H. Dodd. In opposition, Augustine and the Latin Fathers interpreted the passage as reflecting the writer's post-conversion experience which finds analogy in the inner conflicts of every true Christian. And agreement has been voiced by Luther, Calvin, Calvinistic theology, and lately by A. Nygren.¹ A third group of scholars has arisen in denial of the biographical interpretations of both the pre - and post-conversion views. Such men as H. Lietzmann, H. Windisch, W.G. Kummel, G. Bornkamm, M. Dibelius and L. Mitton are representative figures. Most of those who oppose the biographical interpretation view the passage as depicting mankind in the general sense, some insist that it is mankind in general because it is mankind in Adam, while the Barthians prefer to speak of mankind in his non-historical and primal existent present.

The problem at this point centres around the question of the subject and the temporal reference of Romans 7.7-13. It is this section, with its questions, which is of pertinence in our understanding of Saul. The later verses from 14 to 25 are important for the Pauline teaching, and must be considered later. But we need not now be detained in their interpretation. The major question here is: Does Rom. 7.7-13 portray a pre-conversion autobiography? This can only be determined by an investigation of the subject and temporal reference in the text.

The subject of Rom. 7.7-13. -- Traditionally, the question of the subject in this passage has appeared to be more easily answered than that of the temporal reference. The 'prima facie' evidence from the

¹See W.G. Kummel, Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus, pp. 74-109, for the positions of the Fathers, the Reformers and German scholarship to 1929.

constant repetition of ~~ἐγώ~~ and the analogy of experience, as revealed in both biography and the soul of the Christian interpreter, have led most past commentators to view the subject as obviously Paul himself.

But there is evidence that Judaism did not always consider the reference to the first person singular to be strictly biographical. Kummel has cited three Talmudic passages where 'I' is used as a stylistic form, a 'Stilform':¹ Mish. Ber. 1.3, where R. Tarphon relates his dangerous experience of reciting the Shema lying down in the presence of robbers; Mish. Aboth 6.9, where R. Jose b. Kisma describes an encounter with a Gentile while out walking; and b. Ber. 3a, where R. Jose recounts a conversation with an appearance of Elijah. And it is true that these passages do present general teaching in the form of the first person. Yet their value as illustrative of a gnomic and general Pauline usage of 'I' in Romans 7 is lessened by two factors: (1) their late date, all being from the third generation Tannaitic dating approximately 120-140 A.D.; (2) their imaginative and conjured character. A more significant example of the 'Stilform' use is Philo's change from the first person plural to the first person singular in De Somn. i. 177. The context is regarding the relationship of mind and body; and in that short section, without the general nature of the thought being altered, the first person singular in the dative (locative) and the accusative cases is used.

Fresh evidence on this question has come from Qumran. And it is here that we have the most significant outside aid to the understanding of Romans 7. In columns 10 and 11 of IQS there is a recitation of the eternal possessions and privileges of those whom God has chosen.

¹Ibid., pp. 128-132.

In the midst of this description of the gifts of salvation --- knowledge, righteousness, strength and glory --- there is the sudden cry: "But I belong to wicked humanity and to the assembly of perverse flesh. My iniquities, my transgression, my sin (Together with the perversities of my heart) belong to the assembly of worms and of things that move in darkness."¹ In the dualism of Qumran, such a passage could easily be attributed to those who are of wickedness and darkness. Gaster's caption to columns 10 and 11, "The Hymn of the Initiants," might lead one to believe that these are the words of the initiate before his admittance into 'the elect of God'. But the context of the passage and the frequent cases of similar utterance in the hymns and psalms of the community² necessitate that we view these words as the expression of the believer fully conscious of his election by God and his acceptance in the community. The significance of this passage for Romans 7, as well as of the similar sections from 1 QH, could not be better expressed than Kuhn has stated it:

We have in this text the same 'I' as in Rom. 7; it is the same 'I' not only in regard to style, but especially in regard to theological connotations: 'I' is here, just as in Rom. 7, not meant individually or biographically; it is gnomic, descriptive of human existence. The 'I' in this Qumran passage, as in Rom. 7, signifies the existence of mankind, which is flesh.³

But we need not resort entirely to outside analogous writings.

¹IQS 11.9-10a, trans. W. H. Brownlee, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," B.A.S.O.R. -- S.S., Nos. 10-12, 1951.

²E.g., IQH 1.21-23, 3.24-36.

³K. G. Kuhn, "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, p. 102.

Despite the assertions to the opposite¹ and the volume of passages that could be cited where Paul's reference is clearly to himself, within the Pauline letters there are instances where the apostle's use of the first person singular is clearly gnomic and general.² Romans 3.7 falls into this class: "But if the truth of God ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ψεῦδοματι abounds to his glory, τί ἔτι καὶ ἕως ἀμαρτωλοῦς κρίνομαι;" Verse 8 definitely renounces this as a Pauline teaching; much less was it his personal practice. Though, of course, the abounding grace of God amidst human deceitfulness is the experience of all who truly know God --- Paul included. Likewise, the recognition of the inadequacy of all without love in verses 1 to 3 of I Cor. 13 is neither meant as a strictly personal experience nor a strictly personal realisation. It is gnomic, aphoristic, meant to be taken as a general maxim; though, of course, Paul would insist that the general has been experienced and realised in his own life. But he would deny that his use of the first person is strictly biographical. It is true that his awareness of this general truth came through personal experience and personal realisation, but his experience and realisation are but aspects of the general

¹C.H. Dodd has said: "It will in fact be found on examination that Paul rarely, if ever, says 'I' unless he is really speaking of himself personally, even if he means to generalize from the particular instance. Certainly, when he is describing religious experience, his 'I' passages bear the unmistakable note of autobiography" (Romans, M.N.T.C., p. 107). Such an insistence is evidently based upon only those passages where the first person pronoun is actually used, excluding passages where the person is designated in the verb. But it is doubtful whether such an assertion can be upheld even when admitting to evidence only those passages where the subject is designated by a pronoun. In our examples cited, b. Ber. 3a and I Cor. 6.15 designate the subject exclusively in the pronominal suffix of the verb; and almost all of the passages use this method to some extent. But also Mish. Ber. 1.3 (אֲנִי), Mish. Aboth 6.9 (אֲנִי), IQS 11.9-10a (אֲנִי), Rom. 3.7 (ἐγώ) and Gal. 2.18-21 (ἐγώ), use the first person singular in the nominative; I Cor. 13.1-3 (μου) and I Cor. 14.14-15 (μου) use it as a possessive genitive; De Somn. i. 177 (ἐμοί), and Rom. 3.7 (ἐμῷ) use it in the dative; and De Somn i. 177 (ἐμέ) has it also in the accusative.

²See W.G. Kimmel, Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus, pp. 121-123

situation. And it is of this general truth and situation that he speaks. So also the rhetorical question of I Cor. 6.15, *κοιήσω* the members of Christ the members of a harlot?, with its emphatic *μὴ γένοιτο*, is to be taken as a general maxim couched in the dramatic first person singular. Probably I Cor. 14.11, 14-15 and possibly Gal. 2.18-21 are similar cases. The indefinite "one" (*τις*) could as easily be used in all these cases, though with considerable loss to the power and graphic character of the passage.

With the analogies from Qumran and these examples of Pauline usage, the possibility becomes great that Paul is here using the first person singular in the gnomic and general sense. Whether this possibility is in reality a probability depends upon the further question of the temporal reference in the passage.

The temporal reference of Rom. 7.7-13. -- To some, the fact of Paul's reference to the tenth commandment makes it more than probable that not only is he speaking of himself but also that he is referring to his adolescent life when sexual passions began to assert themselves within him. It was in this area and at this time that "the shoe pinched for Paul".¹ But this is not a necessary inference from the apostle's reference. That one is "never safe from the snares of specially sexual temptation" is a theme of many Rabbis;² and preaching on this most inward prohibition, "thou shalt not covet" as the essence of the negative commands of the Decalogue, is not uncommon to the ancient or the modern

¹C.H. Dodd, Romans (M.N.T.C.), p. 110.

²C.G. Montefiore, A Rabbinic Anthology, p. xxxv.

preacher.¹ The temporal reference must be determined on other grounds than Paul's use of ἐπιθυμίας, for the term "includes every kind of illicit desire."²

The vital passage regarding the temporal reference of Rom. 7.7-13 is that of verses 9 to 11. We cannot go further until we come to a conclusion regarding Paul's meaning in ἔχων, χωρὶς νόμου κατέ, ἡ ἐντολή and ἀπέθανον, and until we understand his allusion in the use of ἐξηπάτησέν με.

The passage has often been approached from the viewpoint of Greek philosophy, modern psychology³ and Talmudic age requirements.⁴ Thus, Paul's use of ἐγὼ ἔχων is considered as "a vivid figurative expression, not of course with the full richness of meaning which he sometimes gives to it."⁵ The former time of being χωρὶς νόμου, and of οὐκ ἔγνων in verse 7, is referred to his days of childhood innocence --- that 'Unschuldsparadise seiner Kindheit'. The ἐντολή is that portion of the divine Torah, a negative precept, which first arrested his freedom and brought him to consciousness of sin. His use of ἐγὼ ἀπέθανον is again figurative for the awful consciousness of guilt which he felt as a result of the work of the Law in bringing home to him the consciousness of sin. The passage is therefore an autobiographical portion of

¹E.g., IV Macc. 2.1ff. and M. Luther, "A Treatise on Christian Liberty," Works of Martin Luther, Vol. II, trans. W.A. Lambert, p.317. In speaking of the commandments as teaching "a man to know himself, that through them he may recognise his inability to do good and may despair of his powers," Luther says: "For example: 'Thou shalt not covet' is a command which convicts us all of being sinners, . . . And as we fare with this one command, so we fare with all."

²W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, Romans (I.C.C.), p. 179 on Rom. 7.7.

³Cf. C.H. Dodd, Romans (M.N.T.C.), pp. 105-111, for a skilled blending of philosophy and psychology.

⁴E.g., A. Deissmann, Paul, pp. 92-93, and The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, pp. 231-232; W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 25-26.

⁵W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, Romans (I.C.C.), p. 180 on Rom. 7.9.

religion under the Law.¹

Nevertheless, there are weighty considerations against such an interpretation. Paul's use of *ἐξου* and *ἀνθρώπων*, while not designating physical life and death, certainly cannot easily be weakened to mean only untroubled childhood and a consciousness of guilt. His usual exalted use of *ζωή* and ominous references to *θάνατος* should cause us to hesitate before assigning so mild an interpretation to these terms in Romans 7 as the biographical interpretation necessitates. It is also very difficult to speak of a Jewish childhood as being lived apart from the demands of the Law. It is true that Philo can speak of the first seven years of a child as being without the conception of good or evil, and can, like Aristotle, divide man's life into four periods.² But his interest at this point is epistemology, not ethical theology; and his 'tabula rasa' theory has nothing to do with the Rabbinic doctrine of the two implanted 'yetzers' in man. His debt is clearly to Grecian thought. Such a philosophically orientated four-fold division in man seems to have made no impression on what we know of Palestinian Pharisaism. It is also true that at thirteen the Hebrew boy became a 'bar mizvah', a son of the commandments, and as such was obligated to their performance.³ Yet the same passage insists that at

¹Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Mind of Paul: A Psychological Approach pp. 10-13; Romans (M.N.T.C.), pp. 105-111; A.S. Peake, The Quintessence of Paulinism, pp. 16-17; W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, Romans (I.C.C.), pp. 179-189; W.L. Knox, St. Paul, p. 28; St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, p. 98; St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 108-110, n.9; W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 25-26; F.V. Filson, St. Paul's Conception of Recompense, p. 8, to name only a few of the many English speaking scholars and thus more fully round out Kümmel's listing at this point.

²Quis rer. div. heres 293-299.

³Mish. Aboth 5.21.

five years the boy is ready for the study of the Scripture, and at ten for the Mishnah. He is not without instruction in his early years, and it seems hard to imagine the disjunction of instruction and obedience at any stage in Jewish society.¹ Such a proposed separation between knowing the Law and doing the Law on the part of the Jewish boy has indeed appeared incongruous to many interpreters.²

In view of the difficulties of the usual biographical presentation, it is not presumptuous to suggest that a different approach could be employed. The need is for an approach which does not necessitate either the toning down of expressions and terms to make the presentation coherent or a primary dependence upon Greek philosophy, Christian biography and/or modern psychology. Such an all-purpose remedy seems to be too much to hope for. And yet there does seem to be such a solution and basis of interpretation. That all-important approach to the temporal problem of Romans 7.7-13 is found in the strictly Hebrew concepts of 'identification' and 'corporate community'. Such an approach has been often hinted, but it has not received its due recognition for this passage.

¹In like manner b. Kid. 40b speaks of the Torah as given to Israel at Sinai, "whereas liability to 'hallah' came into force forty years later, when they entered Palestine" (I. Epstein, footnote 9 to b. Kiddushin 40b). Here it is contrary to the records to insist that obedience was not demanded until full liability was reached.

²So much so to H. Lietzmann, that he translated Rom.7.9 as "Ich aber war lebendig einst, als kein Gesetz da war," instead of the usual "ohne Gesetz" (*Römerbrief*, H.N.T., p.35). Cf. W.G. Kümmel's excellent treatment of *ἡμεῖς νεκροί*, *Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus*, pp. 89-94. W. Manson has said: "But was there ever an actual time when Paul lived *ἡμεῖς νεκροί*? The difficulty of locating such a time in his historical experience, coupled with the hyperbolic nature of his expressions --- 'I died' (*ἀπέθανον*) and 'Sin deceived me' (*ἐξηπάτησέν με* , recalling the language used of the serpent by Eve in Gen. 3:13, LXX) --- suggests that here the Apostle is not speaking historically of himself, but theologically. He is seeing all human life, his own included, against the background of Gen. 3" ("Notes on the Argument of Romans (Chapters 1-8)" *New Testament Essays*, ed. A.J.B. Higgins, p. 161).

Using this approach, the passage in question presents a personal identification with the Genesis account of the Fall. Significant is the parallel of terminology between Romans 7 and Genesis 3 in the LXX:

Gen. 3.13 -- ὁ ὄφις ἠπάτησέν με.

Rom. 7.11 -- ἡ ἁμαρτία . . . ἐξηπάτησέν με.

Such a parallel use of (ἐξ)απατάω is not accidental, for Paul again uses the same term in connection with the Fall in II Cor. 11.3 and I Tim. 2.14. Whereas in Genesis it is the serpent as the instrument of sin which deceived through the appeal to the flesh, in Romans it is sin which deceives using the flesh as its seat of operations and the Law as an instrument. The expressions vary slightly, but the thought is basically the same. Here then is the first half of the contrast between Adam and Christ portrayed in Romans 5.12-21. Romans 7, with Romans 8, carries on that contrast between man's condition in Adam and his state in Christ.¹ Here, in the cry ἡ ἁμαρτία . . . ἐξηπάτησέν με we have the Adam of Romans 5 finding his voice.² But it is not just Adam. By the concept of identification and the realisation of corporate community, it is humanity in Adam --- and thus true of Paul

¹A further reference to and contrast with the Genesis account is possibly contained in Phil. 2.6-11, where "the noteworthy expression, 'did not snatch at equality with God,' contains a reminiscence of the First Adam, who, in disobedience to the Almighty, yielded to the temptation to 'be as God' (Gen. iii. 5)" (H.A.A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, p. 159; cf. A.M. Hunter, Paul and his Predecessors, p. 50).

²G. Bornkamm: "In dem ἐγώ von Röm. 7.7ff. bekommt Adam von Röm. 5.12ff. seinen Mund" (Das Ende des Gesetzes, p. 59).

himself. Paul is not allegorising,¹ he is identifying. For him the experience of Adam was historically real. And since he is identified with Adam, even though as a Christian also identified with Christ, the history of Adam is his irrevocable history. When Adam lived, I lived; when Adam coveted, I coveted; when Adam was deceived, I was deceived; when Adam died, I died.

Such an interpretation of Romans 7.7-13 has several factors in its favour: (1) the past tenses of verses 7 to 13 continue to be meaningful; (2) the full force of the expressions ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζω, χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ and ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον is retained; (3) the connection of thought between Romans 5.12-21 and Romans 7 and 8 is maintained; (4) the parallel usage of (ἐξ)απατάω in Gen. 3.13 and Rom. 7.11 is given its proper significance; and (5) the gnomic import of the passage is not relegated to the secondary sense of application.

The great objection to such an identification on the part of Paul is that it makes ἡ ἐντολή of Rom. 7.8-13 refer to a pre-Mosaic law while ὁ νόμος certainly refers elsewhere in the chapter to the Mosaic law. To

¹C.H. Dodd has argued that we must not too readily assume that Paul considered the Fall as a literal happening. "The subtler minds of his age (like Philo of Alexandria, and the Egyptian Greek who wrote the Hermetic tract Poimandres) treated it as a symbolic allegory, and Paul's too was a subtle mind" (Romans, M.N.T.C., p. 80; cf. pp. 105-106). Now it is true that Paul "is not really concerned about origins" (p.80) and that his emphasis is upon the grace of God. But this is not, as Dodd has conjectured, because he viewed the historicity of the Genesis account as unimportant. Rather, as Marmorstein has pointed out in regard to Rom. 5.12-21, "Paulus folgte hier einem Prinzip, welches sehr häufig in der altpalästinensischen Haggada angewandt worden ist" ("Paulus und die Rabbinen," Z.N.W., Vol. XXX, Heft 3/4, 1931, p. 271). That principle is regarding the interpreter's primary interest: "Es ist bei der Gabe der Gnade nicht so wie beim Fall" (p. 277). See also Str. - Bil., Vol. II, p. 230. There is no evidence that a Palestinian Pharisee would so allegorise the story of the Fall. Dodd has been led astray by Philo.

designate "the commandment" as that of Gen. 2.16-17 and "the law" as the Mosaic Law breaks the connection between the two and leaves the passage jumbled. But to identify both with the Mosaic Law, as is common in the usual biographical view, is as difficult for the biographical view as it is for the 'identification-gnomic' interpretation here presented. For the latter it certainly presents an anachronism, which could possibly be excused in the rush of the passage's fervent expression but which is none-the-less a real problem; for the former it involves the mitigating of some pregnant Pauline terms. There is, however, the real possibility that Paul is here thinking of $\delta \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$, in accordance with some Rabbinic thought, as that body of instruction (Torah) which was given to man from the first and which was later reiterated, amplified and clarified through Moses.¹ Not that he felt that the Law was eternal, but that in its basic standards and directions it was from the beginning of human history; i.e., the instruction of God given when man first had need of such instruction.² His reference to it must of necessity be in terms of that which he knew: the glorious

¹See G.F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, pp. 262-277, regarding the Jewish doctrine of pre-Mosaic (at least) Torah. What is pertinent here is the fact that "the Jews could no more conceive a world in the past without a revelation of God's will for man's life than in the present or the future. Accordingly they believed that certain laws for all mankind were given to Adam" (ibid., p. 274). Since religion was viewed as in no way an afterthought of God, it was impossible to conceive of man at any time without the instruction of God. It was this basic outlook which probably served as the foundation for the later Talmudic doctrine of the pre-existence and eternity of the Written and the Oral Law.

²Gal. 3.17 does not disagree. There need be no conflict in accepting the basic standards and directions of God as given at the beginning of human history and the amplifications of that law, with its particular national and ceremonial stress, given through Moses. R. Jose accepted the eternity of the Torah while still dating it at the time of Moses (b. Kid. 40b).

revelation through Moses. But his belief could still be that God's Torah in a pre-Mosaic prototype was from the beginning; a prototype of basic instruction minus the particular national and ceremonial features. In fact, is this not what he implies in Romans 5.13-14a? Here he says that sin is not counted, i.e. actions, thoughts, etc., are not reckoned sinful, in the absence of law; and yet insists that the judgment of sin came upon all men even from the very beginning: *ἀλλὰ ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως.* To a Jewish monotheist of the first century who viewed history as the activity of God, no time could be without the Divine Torah.¹

The other objections to this interpretation are relatively insignificant. The arguments that (1) the name of Adam is not mentioned, or (2) the passage represents man as in a world in which sin has already found entrance,² are not necessarily disastrous for a Pauline reference to the Genesis account. The story of the Fall is so prominent in Jewish literature that the recital of its characters is not absolutely necessary in every reference to it. Such an omission would be most likely when writing to a church with a sizeable Jewish contingency and/or in impassioned address --- both of which are possibly true here. Nor can the presence of sin already in the world be a major objection, for the Genesis account itself assumes the presence of dormant evil before the command of Gen. 2.17. The Devil was not invented to test the commandment,

¹R. Bultmann has insisted that "verse 13 is completely unintelligible: 'sin indeed was in the world before the law was given, but sin is not counted where there is no law.' What sort of sin was it if it did not originate as contradiction of the Law? And how can it have brought death after it if it was not 'counted'? These questions cannot be answered" (Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I. p. 252). But the difficulty of both Rom. 5.13-14a and 7.7-13 is cleared up if we interpret Paul as viewing the history of man as at no time without the law of God.

²As, e.g., G. Bornkamm, Das Ende des Gesetzes, pp. 58-59.

but the commandment was given in the presence of lurking evil.¹

We therefore conclude that Romans 7.7-13 is neither strictly autobiographical nor strictly gnomic; the temporal reference is neither that of Saul's youth nor to be taken in the non-specific sense of humanity in general. It is not just Paul, nor is it just humanity. Both of these views are grasping on to aspect of the truth; yet both fall short in representing Paul's meaning. It is both Paul and humanity, but only as and because it is humanity in Adam.²

The Significance of Romans 7 for Saul. -- We must leave the development of verses 14 to 25 to Chapter III of this work. Nevertheless, it is necessary at this point to say that we do not believe any of Romans 7 to be strictly biographical. In 7.7-13 Paul is identifying himself and humanity with Adam; in 7.14-25 is his realisation of that relationship. In harmony with his presentation of human estrangement from God as resulting from both the Fall³ and human perversity,⁴ man's inability to serve God stems from the interrelated facts that 'I am in Adam' and 'Adam is in me'. It is not a specific pre- or post-conversion instance of failure which is referred to, but an abiding realisation of the futility of human effort in itself; a general realisation, but one that takes specific form all too often in the life of even the most earnest.⁵ A realisation that $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \ \epsilon\gamma\omega$ am unable truly to serve

¹O.J. Baab's words, in a slightly different context, are pertinent: "The very presence of the Law presupposes lawlessness and sin --- and moral freedom" (The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 76).

²"Ich" is "die Menschheit in Adam, κατὰ ist die Zeit der paradisischen Unschuld und die ἐντολή εἰς ζωὴν ist Gen. 2.16-17" (H. Lietzmann, Römerbrief, H.N.T., p. 35 on Rom. 7.9ff.).

³Rom. 5.12-21.

⁴Rom. 1.18-3.23.

⁵E.F. Scott calls it "the great human cry" (Paul's Epistle to the Romans, p. 48).

God.¹

It is true that Romans 7 is a Christian utterance, but it need not be viewed as an exclusively Christian conviction. Many pre-Christian passages view man's predicament as resulting from both the Fall and personal wickedness.² The Talmud can speak of a man's will desiring to do God's will, but "the yeast in the dough" (i.e. the evil impulse) preventing him from performing that which he desires.³ Qumran can parallel Romans 7 and 8 in piety, though not in theology. The contrast at the end of column 4 in IQH is of that awful condition "when I called to mind all my guilty deeds and the perfidy of my sires" and the blessed realisation "when I remembered the strength of Thy hand and Thy multitudinous mercies."⁴

Romans 7 was written by the Christian apostle; but, minus the Christological emphasis of verse 25, it could also have been composed by a Jewish reacting nomist. It was the apostle's Christian conviction; to an extent, it could also have been his realisation in Judaism.⁵ But there is no evidence that it is a personal reflection of a life of legalism.

¹Rom. 8.25b. See infra, pp. 146-153 regarding the significance of ἀβρῶς ἐγώ.

²Cf. A. Marmorstein, "Paulus und die Rabbinen," Z.N.W., Vol. XXX. Heft 3/4 (1931), pp. 278-285, where many Talmudic passages and implications regarding original sin and the continued sinfulness of man are brought together and shown to be the basis of Paul's teaching. Christianity's emphasis on the Fall probably did lead to "a tendency to minimise it in rabbinical Judaism" (W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, pp. 94-95). Yet both factors are still present in the Talmud. Cf. IV Exra 7.118, Wisdom 2.23 and II Baruch 54.15, 19.

³b. Ber. 17a, attributed to R. Alexandri, Cf. IV Exra 7.72.

⁴T.H. Gaster's trans., The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect.

⁵See infra, pp. 150-153: "The character of this recognition."

Blameless according to the Righteousness in the Law

Following Romans 7, importance is usually attached by the psychological schools of Pauline interpretation to those biographical statements describing Paul's religious life as "strict" and "blameless".¹ The claims of Gal. 1.14 and Phil. 3.4-6, culminating in the shout of ἄμεμπτος, are taken to indicate a realisation of his previous legalistic pride.² And it is even asserted that "his constant emphasis in the earlier letters that he had no boast save in Christ indicates that this sort of pride was for him a realised danger."³

Yet the quality of ἀκριβεια⁴ or being ἀκριβής⁵ and the claim κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ γενόμενος ἄμεμπτος⁶ need not necessarily imply legalism in the sense in which we have defined it. We now know of a nomistic, even anti-legalistic, piety which existed amidst the strictness of Qumran. And that literature often speaks of being □□ in the keeping of the commandments of the Lord,⁷ yet without that 'blamelessness' or 'free from fault state' being interpreted as a mere legalism or externalism.⁸ For the covenantors of Qumran, it was only through a spiritual apprehension of God's truth, the working of His Holy Spirit, and an attitude of uprightness, humility and submission that one could

¹Acts 22.3, 26.5; Gal. 1.14; Phil. 3.4-6.

²E.g., F.V. Filson, St. Paul's Conception of Recompense, p. 12.

³A.D. Nock, St. Paul, p. 29.

⁴Acts 22.3.

⁵Acts 26.5.

⁶Phil. 3.6.

⁷E.g., IQS 1.9, 3.9-10; CDC 2.15f., 3.2.

⁸IQS 3.4-6, 5.13.

acceptably keep God's commandments and thus be accounted before Him as blameless.¹

Paul's designation of his religion as strict and of his life as blameless, therefore, need carry no legalistic implications. Abraham, his favourite example of a man of faith, was commanded to be $\square \square$; ² and the apostle interpreted his blamelessness as resulting from a faith which engendered obedience. Likewise, Paul exhorted his converts to be blameless (ἀμεμπτοι),³ prayed that God would establish their hearts unblamable (ἀμέμπτους) in holiness,⁴ and spoke of his own conduct towards them as being blameless (ἀμέμπτως).⁵

It is Hard to Kick Against the Goats

"The only phrase in the Book of Acts which suggests mental and spiritual struggle"⁶ of the type indicated by the psychological interpreters of Paul's pre-conversion experience is that of Acts 26.14:

σκληρὸν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν. By most it is taken to refer to his inner spiritual warfare in having to repress "all humaner tendencies in the interests of his legal absolutism,"⁷ his "sheer revulsion from his task" of persecuting,⁸ and his perplexity regarding Christianity.⁹

¹IQS 3.6-12.

²Gen. 17.1

³Phil. 2.15.

⁴I Thess. 3.13.

⁵I. Thess. 2.10.

⁶A.L. Williams, Talmudic Judaism and Christianity, p. 61.

⁷C.H. Dodd, The Mind of Paul: Change and Development, p. 36.

⁸C.H. Dodd, The Mind of Paul: A Psychological Approach, pp.12-13.

⁹E.g., J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, pp. 119-122; W.L. Knox, St. Paul, pp. 36-37.

Some view it as expressive of Saul's dissatisfaction within a basically satisfying Judaism;¹ others assign it only to his qualms in persecuting.² A recent entry into the field of suggestions has been that of J. Munck. He interprets this phrase as the natural Jewish revulsion against the inevitable Gentile mission.³ Our problem thus revolves around the question of how much this phrase implies a spiritual struggle in Saul.

It is well-known that *πρὸς κέντρα λατρίζειν* was common in the Greek world as a circumlocution for opposition to deity.⁴ Euripides' *πρὸς κέντρα λατρίζοιμι*⁵ and Aeschylus' *πρὸς κέντρα κῶλον ἔκτενεῖς*⁶ are the two chief examples of the phrase as being synonymous with "set against God." In Euripides' use, it was a conscious opposition to Dionysus' son by refusing to recognise his divinity. In Aeschylus', Prometheus consciously opposed the unjust Zeus, believing that he must do that which must be done even though it meant the displeasure of the tyrannical god and thus his own discomfort. In both cases, the opposition was determined and the ones in opposition had no qualms regarding their actions. In the one case, it was a conscious opposition to false claims of deity; in the other, to an unjust deity. But

¹C.G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, pp. 117-118, and J. Parkes, Judaism and Christianity, p. 75, are representative.

²A.L. Williams, Talmudic Judaism and Christianity, p. 61.

³J. Munck, Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte, pp. 15ff.

⁴Cf. W.G. Kümmel, Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus, pp. 155-157, and J. Munck, Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte, pp. 10-14, both of whom cite F. Smend, "Untersuchungen zu den Acta-Darstellungen von der Bekehrung des Paulus," ATTEAOΣ, Vol. I, 1925, pp. 34-45.

⁵Euripides, Bacchanals, lines 794-795.

⁶Aeschylus, Prometheus, lines 324-325.

in all likelihood, the precise context of the Greek usage of the phrase is irrelevant. It was probably known by Paul as no more than a catch-phrase, a 'Sprichwort', a saying.

Assuming that the apostle has been correctly quoted,¹ it is of great importance in understanding his meaning in the use of the expression to notice: (1) where he used it, and (2) how he used it. It is significant that it is only employed in the conversation with Agrippa; the general account of Paul's conversion in Acts 9 and the Pauline defence before the Jewish crowd in Acts 22 are devoid of the phrase.² Since Paul spoke Greek to Hellenists and Aramaic to Palestinian Jews,³ it seems probable that the words to Agrippa were spoken in Greek.⁴ It need not be assumed that the expression had become common in Palestine or translated into Aramaic.⁵ Seldom are such idioms meaningful in another language; and the apostle certainly had time and opportunity to pick it up outside of Palestine — in his boyhood or in his travels. It is also significant that it is used in the context of what appears to be an evangelistic sermon. The speech in Acts 26 is not strictly a defence. Paul's destination had been

¹If we assume otherwise, the expression in question is no longer a problem in the understanding of Paul.

²Though in the eighth century E, and some lesser texts, the phrase appears also in Acts 9.

³Cf. Acts 21.37ff., where Paul addressed the tribune in Greek and the crowd in Aramaic.

⁴Though Agrippa seems to have had a knowledge of Aramaic, his native tongue was Greek.

⁵As J. Munck, Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte, p.11. The use of a Greek idiom in a passage designated as τῆ Ἑβραϊκῇ διαλέκτῳ need not be contradictory when viewed in the light of the explanation given here.

already determined.¹ And it seems likely that he considered Agrippa's desire to hear his message to be more than merely judiciary, and that he accepted this occasion as an opportunity for judicious proselytising. With the hope of Agrippa's conversion, the sermon crescendos to the pitch of fervent expectancy. It is in this context that it seems the expression in question must be considered.

In view of the above it is not unreasonable to picture Paul as here giving a slight twist and extension to his conversion experience for the purpose of evangelising. Not that he is prevaricating for God's glory.² But that he is making explicit to Agrippa that which was implicit to him in the words "Saul, Saul, Why are you persecuting me?" And he is doing it judiciously by a phrase he knows will be known and understood to Agrippa. Lest he be misunderstood to have been in opposition to and now proclaiming only a Galilean prophet, he points out that which would be self-understood by any Jew: that a correction by a voice from heaven, a 'bat-kol', meant opposition to God Himself. This could have been Paul's usual technique before other Gentile audiences, but at least it seems to be the import of his usage before a well-informed Roman official and after extensive travels in the Greek world.

We therefore conclude that the expression σκληρὸν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λαχίζειν, when viewed as containing a Greek idiom and in the context of Acts 26, does not in itself carry the implication of either a conscious

¹Acts 25.12, 26.32.

²Paul renounces this in Rom. 3.7-8.

or unconscious internal spiritual conflict. It was indeed "hard" for him to persecute, especially so if he were a sensitive nomistic Pharisee. But there is no necessary indication in the phrase "to kick against the goads" that he had the slightest consciousness of being in opposition to the will of God. When approached from the perspective of form-criticism, the inclusion of this phrase in the Acts 26 account and its exclusion in Acts 9 and 22 are not in opposition. In the situation of Acts 22, and probably of Acts 9 also, the implication of the words in the vision would be quickly grasped. But in that of Acts 26, there was the need for that implication to be drawn out. Paul is no pedantic literalist. His task is to interpret the revelation which he has received --- and that in both its explicit form and in its implications. Thus he makes explicit to Agrippa what was implicit to him in the Aramaic words: "Saul, Saul, Why are you persecuting me?" And he does this through a Greek idiom.

Zealously Persecuting

The quality of zeal cannot be restricted to either a Jewish nomist or a Jewish legalist, but the association of zeal with persecuting in all of the chief biographical passages¹ has seemed conclusive to many that a pre-conversion legalism and dissatisfaction is being portrayed. C.H. Dodd has been most expressive:

Now when a severe conflict exists within the self, one way of relief is to externalize the conflict by indentifying that which one detests in oneself with some other person or body of persons. . . . Now Paul found relief in persecuting the Nazarenes. In doing so, he was gratifying his desire to excel in the service of the Law. . . . We may be sure that the principal reason why he could embrace this grim task was that here were enemies of the Law whom he could smite as he was failing to

¹Acts 22.3-4, 26.4-12; Gal. 1.13-14; Phil. 3.6.

smite the enemies of the Law in his own breast. . . . The repressed passions of his nature found a consecrated outlet here: the 'threatenings and slaughter' which he breathed out promised to cleanse his bosom of much 'perilous' stuff.¹

Dodd goes on to point out that in the Psalms of the canonical Psalter and of 'Solomon' we find Saul's attitude of both loving God's law and hating them that hate Him depicted. His implication is that here are parallel psychological situations.

Is it not, however, just as possible to explain Saul by a nomistic interpretation of the Psalms as the Psalms by a psychological interpretation of Saul? Saul certainly could validate the necessity for his action by such nomistic precedents as Numbers 25.8ff.² and the original action of Mattathias and the Hasidim in rooting out apostasy among their own people.³ The commendation of the zealous Phinehas⁴ together with the exhortation of II Maccabees 6.13⁵ and the swelling Jewish Messianic expectancy⁶ could be sufficient motivation for Saul's action.

That a nomistic reacting piety could be blended with a zeal for holy war is again illustrated by the Qumran texts. IQM assuredly emphasises the latter aspect, but does not neglect the former.⁷ IQS 9.22 defines the righteous man as one who "is to bear unremitting hatred towards all men of ill repute."⁸ And the two separate columns which

¹C.H. Dodd, The Mind of Paul: A Psychological Approach, p. 12.

²The example of Phinehas. Cf. M. Dibelius, Paul, p. 52.

³I Macc. 2.23-28, 42-48.

⁴Num. 25.11-13.

⁵"For indeed it is a mark of great kindness when the impious are not let alone for a long time, but punished at once."

⁶See J. Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel, pp. 427-429, where three pre-Hadrian Talmudic passages are discussed (b. Sanh. 97b-98a, b. Bab. Bath. 10a and b. Yom. 86b) which deal with the idea of repentance and the keeping of the commandments as prerequisite to the Messianic Age.

⁷IQM 11.1-6.

⁸T.H. Gaster's trans., The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect.

probably form the introduction to IQS mention holy war against the Gentiles. The fourteenth column of the hymns of the community significantly associates holy war zeal with a reacting nomism:

The nearer I draw to Thee, the more am I filled with zeal against all that do wickedness and against all men of deceit. For they that draw near to Thee cannot see Thy commandments defied, and they that have knowledge of thee can brook no change of Thy words, seeing that Thou art the essence of right, and all Thine elect are the proof of Thy truth.¹

Saul's attitude could have been very similar to that of the Essenes. He also could have felt that in the light of the Messianic expectations the nation must be found faithful in its obedience² and kept from going astray.³ So, too, the grisly task of uprooting apostasy could not be left or delegated to the insensitive but must be undertaken by a blameless one whom God stirred up.⁴ And in his task, he could have expected to realise the divine presence and blessing.⁵ Much as we might recoil at the thought of so-called 'righteous crusades' and 'holy wars', we cannot deny that Judaism has many examples of a holy war zeal within a nomistic piety.

A zeal to persecute is of itself neither an indication of legalism nor of nomism. The motivation is important. And the only inward glimpse we have into Saul's persecution is contained in the two words

¹IQH 14.13-15; T.H. Gaster's trans., ibid.

²IQS 9.20-21.

³IQS 9.3-4 speaks of unswerving allegiance to God and His ordinances as providing a sound foundation for the Holy Spirit, truth and Israel's hope.

⁴IQM 7.5: "They shall all be volunteers for war, blameless in spirit and flesh." IQM 10.5 again speaks of "willing volunteers" (T.H. Gaster's trans.). This same idea crops up in Gal. 6.1 where Paul speaks of οἱ ἠρεσκοντες who are to restore from apostasy.

⁵IQM 10.2-5 promises God's presence and blessing upon those willing and blameless volunteers for holy war, using the words of Deut. 20.3-4.

ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα.¹ We must therefore conclude that, while Saul's persecution could have been the result of his inner turmoil and dissatisfaction with legalism, it could have been, with at least as much plausibility, the result of his supreme satisfaction with and solid commitment to the splendour that came through Moses.

A Pauline Evaluation of the Old Covenant

It is significant that in II Cor. 3.7-18 Paul's contrast between the Old and the New dispensations is not that of a crushing legalism and a new prophetism. Rather, it is between that which was δόξα and that which is τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης δόξης and μᾶλλον . . . ἐν δόξῃ.² It is true that he speaks of the Old Covenant as ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου³ and ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως,⁴ but he also insists that it ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ⁵ or δια δόξης⁶ by the same God of the New Covenant⁷ and that men found life through faith while being under it.⁸ It was indeed a bondage,⁹ a slavery,¹⁰ but such is only presented in its relation to the liberty

¹I Tim. 1.13; assuming these words to be Paul's own.

²II Cor. 3.10-11.

³II Cor. 3.7.

⁴II Cor. 3.9.

⁵II Cor. 3.7.

⁶II Cor. 3.11.

⁷Acts 24.14.

⁸The Patriarch Abraham certainly did not exhaust Paul's list of the men of faith in the Old Covenant.

⁹Gal. 4.1-7.

¹⁰Gal. 4.21-31.

that is found in Christ. And even then the bondage of the Old Covenant is not necessarily equated with a crushing legalism,¹ though it was certainly that to a legalist. A God-ordained and supervising nomism is all that need be implied.

As we need not suppose that every minor and every servant is suffering from an intense inward frustration and chafing at the bit under the rule of his superiors, so we need not visualise every Jew under the Old Covenant as so oppressed. There is such a thing as a loving and rejoicing nomism as well as a burdened and biting legalism. And strange as it may seem, in the sphere of family relations the attitude of the minor and the servant takes on the character of the former in direct relation as the authority over him is viewed as loving, benevolent, just and trustworthy. It is usually the more noble and discerning who respond in willing obedience to their trusted superiors in the family relationship, while the more blunt of perception feel the awful burden of resentment. Yet both the loving son and the resentful son await the day when they shall stand on their own in full legal and, it is to be hoped, emotional maturity.

In view of the lack of conclusive evidence for his dissatisfaction within Judaism, his hesitancy to associate the Jewish religion before the coming of Christ with legalism and his insistence that the Old Covenant was of God, need we posit any less for Saul? His could

¹J. Weiss was certainly wrong in insisting that "all his previous life must have seemed to him a hideous mistake" (The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. I, p. 194; cf. also p. 185, and P. Wernle, The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. I. p. 225).

have been a longing for the realisation of the hope of Israel, and yet a thrill to the present revelation of God and a reacting obedience to it.

The Tension of Saul's Religion

For most of those who take up the study of Saul's religious experience, the object is to understand why Saul left Judaism for Christianity. The question revolves around the quest for the unresolved tension in the life of the Rabbi Saul which was resolved in his Christian experience; the search for the inadequacy which he felt was satisfied in Jesus Christ. For most of the Jewish writers, the tension was purely Saul's alone and does not reflect upon real Judaism. It was the product of either his unorthodox Judaism or his pernicious state of mind, or both. For most Christian writers, the tension of Saul sprang from the tension of Judaism. With this latter position we are in general agreement. And yet, a major proportion of Christian scholars have implied that this tension was that of the relation between externalism and inward piety; mere formalism and the prophetic spirit. With this specific position we have disagreed.

In Chapter I, the argument was that Saul's Judaism was not unorthodox. But in the present chapter we have insisted that neither pre-Christian Judaism in its principles and noble representatives nor Saul as he is known in his later biographical reflections need be viewed as legalistic. We have made a distinction between the words legalism and nomism, and suggested that it is the latter and not the former which best fits a certain element in pre-destruction Pharisaism and probably also the religion of Saul. The change in Saul's conversion was not

necessarily in the abandonment of an acting religion for a reacting faith, not necessarily the change from outward to inward piety or even new views of the nature of Messianic activity. The primary tension of Judaism, which dominates all Old Testament and Jewish thought, is that of promise and fulfilment. And it was this which Saul found resolved in Christ.

From the "Prayer for the Coming of the Messiah" in the Shemoneh Esreh¹ through the whole body of the Talmudic literature,² the theme of recalled promise and anticipation is present. The cry **בְּיָמֵינוּ** is neither accidental nor incidental in the Talmud.³ The Targums⁴ and non-canonical literature⁵ but underline the longing of Judaism. And the Qumran community lived solely for the Messianic consummation.⁶ Here was the real tension of Saul's Judaism.

¹Benedictions Nos. 14 and 15.

²See Str.-Bil., Vol. I, pp. 6-11, on Matt. 1.1b, "Christus," and Vol. IV, "Exkurs 29," pp. 799-976. Also K. Kohler, "Eschatology," J.E., Vol. V, pp. 209-218; M. Bittenwieser, "Messiah," J.E., Vol. VIII, pp. 510-511; J. Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel, p. 396.

³See Str.-Bil., Vol. II, p. 589 on Acts 1.7.

⁴See S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, pp. 282-284, which section begins: "In particular, the Targums provide evidence of the important place given to the Messianic idea in leading religious circles," and then goes on to cite many references.

⁵See M. Bittenwieser, "Messiah," J.E., Vol. VIII, p. 508 for extensive citation.

⁶K. Stendahl says quite simply: "The sect is an anticipation" ("Introduction and Perspective," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, p. 10).

W.F. Lofthouse has well characterised nomistic Judaism as well as the Religion of Israel in saying: "The religion of every part of the Old Testament is the religion of promise. . . . When the Hebrew . . . looks within his own heart he knows the blessedness of trust in Jahweh; but fightings are without as fears are within; it is when he awakes that he will be satisfied."¹ For Saul, he had awakened to life in Christ Jesus.

¹W.F. Lofthouse, "The Old Testament and Christianity," Record and Revelation, ed. H.W. Robinson, p. 460.

CHAPTER III

PAUL AND LEGALITY

It is probably the hope of every investigator of Pauline thought "to find the proper way to a theological understanding of the apostle's teaching about the law, which, in spite of much labour, has not yet been adequately dealt with."¹ And that is the hope of this chapter also. But in approaching the subject, we propose to deviate slightly from the well-trodden path of 'Paul and the Law' for the more general topic of 'Paul and Legality'. It is, of course, obvious that all of the questions which arise in the first approach must be dealt with in the second as well. But the second seems to afford the opportunity of a more penetrating analysis into the apostle's thought and to allow us to strike at the root of the matter more quickly. This chapter will therefore treat four considerations: (1) The nature of man as unable in itself to do the will of God; (2) The purpose and function of the Law in the Old Covenant; (3) The end of the Law in Christ; and (4) The nature of righteousness in the New Covenant.

Mankind's Inability

Since Paul's teaching is that the Law "was weak through the flesh,"² it will not be without profit to begin our study on the lines of Pauline anthropology before moving on to those of soteriology.

¹E. Stauffer, New Testament Theology, p. 90.

²Rom. 8.3.

While scattered references and inferences regarding the nature of man abound in the apostle's letters, there is one fairly long passage where the dominant theme is that of man as he is in himself before God. That passage is Rom. 7.7-25. It is here we must start in order to understand Paul's teaching regarding legality and law.

The Presentation of Rom. 7.7-25

As was noted in Chapter II of this work, from the earliest times interpreters of Rom. 7.7-25 have taken their stand in one or the other of two basic schools of thought. To the one, the passage has primary reference to Paul's pre-conversion days under the Law; to the other, the apostle is here describing that struggle which goes on within the dual nature of every Christian between what he was and is in Adam and what he is and shall become in Christ. The arguments for each position are almost equally convincing. The advocates of the pre-conversion view stress: (1) the past tense of the verbs in vvs. 7-13; (2) the definite contrast between chapters 7 and 8, which is signalled by the emphatic "now" of 8.1 and is seen in the absence of Christian expressions up to 7.25 while chapter 8 is abundant in references to Christ Jesus, the Spirit and the Christian life; (3) the expressions of chapter 7 which are definitely contrary to Paul's presentation of the Christian life, e.g. "sold under sin" in v. 14 and "wretched man" in v. 24; (4) the logical argument that redemption by Christ is no redemption at all if this is a picture of the Christian life; (5) the experiential argument that such a pre-conversion struggle has not been uncommon to many in either the past or the present day; and (6) the pragmatic argument that a threefold division

of the apostle's life --- childhood innocence, struggle under the Law, freedom in Christ --- "fits like a glove" what we know of Judaism, Paul's life and this passage. On the other hand, those who accept the post-conversion interpretation stress: (1) the present tense of the verbs in vvs. 14-24; (2) the fact that Rom. 7 is set in the context of Rom. 5, 6 and 8, which chapters speak of the Christian life; (3) that a pre-conversion interpretation of the passage is not consistent with what Paul later says of his former life in Phil. 3.6; (4) that an interpretation of the passage as the tension that exists in the life of the Christian between the old and the new creation is consistent with that similar tension presented in Rom. 8.23 and Gal. 5.17; and (5) that such an interpretation is consistent with what we know of the Christian life in past or present day as it is lived between the old and the new aeons. Judging from the near balance of arguments pro and con, it would seem that the interpretation of Rom. 7 has arrived at a stalemate. And yet, perhaps, the answer "may be found to lie, where so often it does, at the very point where the problem appears most intractable."¹

The problem of vs. 25b. -- The great textual problem for every interpreter of whatever persuasion is that presented in vs. 25b: "Ἀρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοί δουλεῖω νόμῳ θεοῦ, τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας .
Whether the deliverance pictured in Rom. 7 is seen as that from law

¹C. L. Mitton, "Romans vii. Reconsidered -- III," E.T., Vol. LXV, No. 5 (Feb., 1954), p. 133.

to Christ in the conversion experience or that from the old man to the new in the daily experience of the Christian, most commentators agree that "it is scarcely conceivable that, after giving thanks to God for deliverance, Paul should describe himself as being in exactly the same position as before."¹ Thus, though all of the MSS. locate this portion immediately after vs. 25a, the vast majority of interpreters of every view would insist that vs. 25b is logically out of position. J. Moffatt and C. H. Dodd, representing that position which sees in Rom. 7 Paul's reminiscence of his conscious inward conflict under the Law, locate this portion immediately before vs. 24-25a and attribute its present displacement to a scribal insertion of a marginal note or a confusion on the part of Paul's amanuensis.² They argue that "we do seem to have here one of the cases ... where a primitive corruption of the text has affected all our surviving MSS., and we cannot avoid trusting our own judgment against their evidence."³ R. Bultmann, agreeing with the previous view that Paul is presenting the pre-conversion experience of man under law but insisting that such was known and presented "only from the standpoint of faith,"⁴ says of vs. 25b: "This sentence is very likely a gloss, which, in addition, has landed in the text at the

¹C. H. Dodd, Romans (M.N.T.C.), pp. 114-115.

²Ibid., pp. 114-115; J. Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament (3rd. ed. rev.), p. 143.

³C. H. Dodd, Romans (M.N.T.C.), p. 115.

⁴R. Bultmann, "Christ the End of the Law," Essays, p. 40.

wrong place; it belongs to vs. 23."¹ Likewise, those who advocate a post-conversion interpretation of the chapter either transpose the verse to an earlier position or omit any serious consideration of it. A. Nygren, for example, can say after treating vs. 25a that "Paul has reached the conclusion of his discussion."² Even those who see in the chapter more of a general situation than do either the pre- or post-conversion proponents argue, as does Lietzmann, that vs. 25b is either an interpolation or an error through dictation.³ Some would go a step further and suggest that not only is vs. 25b to find its rightful place only when it precedes vvs. 24-25a, but that Rom. 8.2 must also be transposed to follow immediately after Rom. 7.25a.⁴

The αὐτὸς ἐγώ of vs. 25b as the key to Rom. 7. -- But in 1954, C. L. Mitton asked whether in disregarding the position of vs. 25b and the import of the two Greek pronouns αὐτὸς ἐγώ we were not in reality setting aside the key to the passage; and he answered his question in the affirmative.⁵ He pointed out that the two pronouns are "exceedingly emphatic" and argued that they were used to sum up emphatically all the previous occurrences of ἐγώ in the chapter. Thus he insisted that the second part of vs. 25 is not out of place

¹R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, p. 212, n.

²A. Nygren, Commentary on Romans, p. 302.

³H. Lietzmann, Römerbrief (H.N.T.), p. 39.

⁴E.g., F. Müller, "Zwei Marginalien im Brief Paulus an die Römer," Z.N.W., Vol. XL, (1941), pp. 249-254.

⁵C. L. Mitton, "Romans vii. Reconsidered -- III," E.T., Vol. LXV, No. 5 (Feb., 1954), pp. 132-135.

but is to be regarded as the summary of the whole chapter, and that the true contrast between chapters 7 and 8 is to be found in that of the *αὐτὸς ἐγώ* of 7.25b and the *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* of 8.1.

It is certainly true that *αὐτὸς ἐγώ* carries more of an emphasis than is indicated by Luther's "Ich" or the "I myself" of the A.V. Moffatt's "left to myself" and Phillips' "in my own nature" more faithfully render the expression, though they might imply to some a hypothetical deism. Probably the best equivalent is the "I of myself" of the A.S.V. and R.S.V., understood as "I of my own resources." And Mitton's observation concerning the centrality of this neglected verse in the passage has much to commend it.

When *αὐτὸς ἐγώ* is used as the key to the passage, what do we find? Firstly, as was pointed out in Chapter II, we discover that this 'I' has its irrevocable history in Adam and has suffered the consequences. Paul too could cry out: "O thou Adam, what hast thou done! For though it was thou that sinned, the fall was not thine alone, but ours also who are thy descendants!"¹ The passage thus begins in vs. 7-13 by asserting that when we speak of what "I of myself" am, we must remember that our history begins with the fact that "I am in Adam." Secondly, we find the passage pointing out the dreadful realisation that "I of myself" am unable to attain to the law of God which I know to be right and which I desire. Certainly

¹IV Ezra 7.118. Cf. also 3.7 and II Baruch 48.42-43: "O Adam, what hast thou done to all those who are born from thee? etc." Also see Str.-Bil., Vol. III, 227-229 for Talmudic expressions regarding Adam's sin.

the Law is prominent in the chapter, and true it is that the conclusion to the matter is only to be found "in Christ Jesus," but the dominant theme of vvs. 14-24 is neither law nor victory but the recognition that "I of myself" am unable to measure up to that law of God or gain victory. And so the terrible truths strike home:

- 1.) "I am carnal" (vs. 14).
- 2.) "I am . . . sold under sin" (vs. 14).
- 3.) "I do not understand my own actions" (vs. 15).
- 4.) "I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate" (vs. 15).
- 5.) "I know that nothing good dwells within me, that is, in my flesh" (vs. 18).
- 6.) "I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do" (vvs. 18-19).
- 7.) "I am so completely under the thralldom of sin that I sin against my wish" (vvs. 17, 20).¹

Thus Paul concludes this second section of vvs. 14-24 with the confession of all humanity: εὐρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον πῶς θέλοντι ἔμοι ποιεῖν τὸ καλὸν, ὅτι ἔμοι τὸ κακὸν παράκειται (vs. 21), and with the universal cry of man as he is in himself: Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος (vs. 24). It is not only that "I am in Adam," but I find that "Adam is in me." Thirdly, the χάρις πῶς θεῶ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν of vs. 25a must be considered an anticipatory exclamation arising out of the cry of despair. The apostle cannot think of the inability of man without immediately rejoicing in the ability of God "through Jesus Christ

¹C. H. Dodd's words are pertinent in the interpretation of vvs. 17 and 20: "Paul is not meaning to shuffle out of responsibility for his actions by ascribing them to the alien power. What he wishes to show is how completely he is under 'the thralldom of sin' --- so completely that he sins against his wish" (Romans, M.N.T.C., p. 114).

our Lord." But these words are not the main theme at this point and must be taken as an interjected parenthesis. Fourthly, he concludes the whole treatment by saying in vs. 25b: "Ἄρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ --- τῷ μὲν νοῦ δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ, τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας ."

Mitton has paraphrased vs. 25b thus:

This then is the conclusion to which I have been leading: when I rely on my own resources, and cease to depend on God, then this is what happens --- I continue to acknowledge with my judgement the authority of God's commands, but in my thoughts and actions it is the authority of sin which holds away.¹

Sanday and Headlam have phrased it as follows:

Without His intervention --- so long as I am left to my own unaided self --- the state that I have been describing may be briefly summarized. In this twofold capacity of mine I serve two masters: with my conscience I serve the Law of God; with my bodily organism the Law of Sin.²

Or in other words, I of myself am unable before God. The passage is therefore composed of four elements: (1) historically, "I am in Adam," vvs. 7-13; (2) existentially, "Adam is in me," vvs. 14-24; (3) an anticipatory interjection of God's ability, vs. 25a; and (4) the summary and conclusion of the matter, "I of myself" am unable before God.

Thus Rom. 7.7-25 is not specifically either Paul's or mankind's pre-conversion state or post-conversion experience. Nor is it the cry of only "the man under the law" or "the Christian who

¹C. L. Mitton, "Romans vii. Reconsidered --- III," E.T., Vol. LXV, No. 5 (Feb., 1954), p. 134.

²W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, Romans (I.C.C.), p. 178.

slips back into a legalistic attitude to God."¹ It is Paul "clearly drawing on his own experience" and through it uttering "the great human cry."² It is Paul's and humanity's realisation that in our history and experience we have become so bound up with and by sin that there can be deliverance and victory only through God. This is not the recognition of the legalist; it is the abiding realisation of the sensitive and is most felt by those who are the closest to God.

Here, then, is Paul's basic answer to those who would gain righteousness through legalism; the same answer as given in Gal. 5.17: we are so bound up with that which is antagonistic to God that we are unable to do His will.³ Thus, "it depends not upon man's will or exertion but upon God's mercy."⁴ Windisch is right in noting that Rom. 7 is the expression of man's inability to obey the will of God, but he is wrong in claiming it to be unique to the rest of the New Testament.⁵ It is unique only in that it is the longest explicit passage to this effect.

The character of this recognition. -- At least one further point needs to be dealt with in the interpretation of Rom. 7 before

¹As A. M. Hunter interprets it, The Epistle to the Romans, p. 74. Both Hunter and W. Manson ("Notes on the Argument of Romans (Chapters 1-8)," New Testament Essays, ed. A. J. B. Higgins, p. 162) recognise the significance of αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ as the summary of Rom. 7.7ff., but they still speak of the dominant theme in the passage being that of man under law rather than that of man unable of himself.

²E. F. Scott, Paul's Epistle to the Romans, p. 48.

³Cf. Rom. 8.6-8. ⁴Rom. 9.16. Note also 9.11.

⁵H. Windisch, The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount, p. 122.

leaving the passage. We have said that this recognition of mankind's inability before God "is the abiding realisation of the sensitive and is most felt by those who are the closest to God." Does this mean that it is only realised by the Christian? R. Bultmann argues that the presentation in Rom. 7 is that which is apparent "only from the standpoint of faith, and which the Jew himself does not perceive at all";¹ the cry of Rom. 7 is put "into the mouth of the Jew and thereby exposes the situation of the Jew which is not visible to himself";² "the man without Christ is not described as he sees himself, but as he is seen from the standpoint of faith";³ "the Christian is aware of a split in himself which the Jew had not as yet known."⁴ Similarly A. Nygren, though differing with Bultmann on the interpretation of the passage, agrees that this is solely the realisation of the Christian.⁵

Now it is true that the Christian, knowing God's ability more intimately and personally than any could have in the Old Covenant, is in a position to realise to a greater measure his own inability than could any under the Old Covenant; but that does not mean that a spiritually sensitive Jew in the Old Covenant could not have at

¹R. Bultmann, "Christ the End of the Law," Essays, p. 40.

²R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, p. 266.

³R. Bultmann, "Christ the End of the Law," Essays, p. 50.

⁴Ibid., p. 53.

⁵A. Nygren, Commentary on Romans, pp. 292-303.

least been aware of the inability of ἀνθρώπος ἐγώ before God. It is true that Rom. 7 presents in an anticipatory ejaculation and Rom. 8 in a connected presentation, the Christian answer; i.e., that mankind's inability is met by God's ability "through Jesus Christ our Lord" and "in Christ Jesus." But that does not mean that human inability was never met by divine ability --- and realised so by men --- in the Old Covenant. Paul is writing approximately a quarter-century after his conversion, and all of his words bear the Christian stamp. But this does not necessitate us to view all of his expressions as exclusively Christian. The great insistence in the Qumran literature on the inability of all flesh of itself before God¹ strikingly reveals that "the point at which the very roots of Paul's theology and that of the Dead Sea Scrolls are intertwined is the experience of moral frustration, with the resulting conviction of man's hopeless sinfulness."² The writer of IV Ezra shares this same conviction of the total inadequacy of mankind in itself before God,³ though his solution differs from that of Paul's.

Rom. 7 cannot therefore be considered an exclusively Christian conviction. It is the human cry, drawn from mankind's history and experience, of the spiritually sensitive. Though Paul's intimate and personal knowledge of the power of God as it is in Jesus Christ has resulted in a more intense realisation and expression of this inability, we cannot assume that he was entirely unaware of that

¹Esp. 1QH 1.21-23, 3.24-36, 4.5-40 and 1QS 11.9-10.

²M. Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 119.

³Esp. IV Ezra 8.31-36.

inadequacy in his Judaistic days. Qumran stands as a warning against such an assumption. What can be said for a 'legalistic' Pharisaism cannot necessarily be attributed to a 'nomistic' Pharisaism; and it may be that Paul's Christian presentation in Rom. 7 differs from his pre-conversion position only in the intensity of his realisation and expression.

The Problem of Rom. 2.6ff.

There is, however, another passage in this same letter to the Romans which has often been claimed to be diametrically opposed to any thought in Paul of the moral inability of man and to be the true basis for all of the Pauline doctrine. That passage is Rom. 2.6ff.¹ The following four clauses in this section have been cited as specifically indicating that man is able of himself to "work" and to "do" that which is well-pleasing before God, and that God responds on the basis of such action:

vs. 6 --- ἀποδώσει ἕκαστω κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ .

vs. 7 --- τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσιν ζωὴν αἰώνιον .

vs. 10 --- δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν .

vs. 13b --- οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιωθῆσονται .

On the basis of these statements, many commentators have insisted that while Paul rejected a righteousness consisting of statutory

¹Even interpreters who view Paul's message as opposed to the doctrine of the moral ability of man have said of Rom. 2.6ff. that "the passage is somewhat inconsistent with the main trend of St. Paul's teaching, since it implies that both Jews and Gentiles could really attain to righteousness by following the light of conscience and obeying the essential principles of morality contained in the Law (cf. especially the statement in v. 13 that a doer of the Law may be justified)" (W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 351, n.10).

rules he did accept and teach that true righteousness before God is to be attained through the following of true ethical principles.

Representative of older commentators taking this position are H. P. Liddon and Charles Gore. Liddon interpreted Rom. 2.6 as teaching that "God's award to every man hereafter will be in accordance with his conduct, and not, as the Jews thought, with his theocratic position."¹ Gore insisted that Paul was presenting in these verses a "natural religion," i.e. "the religion that appeals straight off to the conscience of almost all honest and civilized men" and that believes "that God will judge men with absolute power and insight and impartiality according to their conduct and their characters."² It is conduct and character that the apostle makes basic, "and whatever is true about free grace and justification by faith only, is true because, and only because, this free grace and this justifying faith are necessary means or steps towards the realisation of actual righteousness."³ Thackeray also viewed Rom. 2 as reaching "the possibility and merit" of man fulfilling "the ethical side" of the Law.⁴ He recognised an inconsistency between such an interpretation and the argument of Galatians, but he explained it as due to the exaggerated depreciation of the Law and human ability in Galatians, which is naturally to be expected "in the heat of the controversy for Gentile liberty."⁵ In more modern

¹H. P. Liddon, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, p. 43.

²C. Gore, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, Vol. I, p. 106.

³Ibid., p. 107.

⁴H. St. J. Thackeray, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, pp. 59, 78.

⁵Ibid., p. 78.

times E. Burton,¹ E. F. Scott,² and a host of others,³ have been advocates of this position, viewing man's ability to follow ethical principles as the fundamental prerequisite of true religion.

Difficulties of the 'ethical ability' interpretation. -- The difficulties of such an interpretation lie at its exegetical foundations. Basic to this view are two distinctions and an omission: (1) the distinction between δ νόμος (the Mosaic law) and νόμος (law in general), (2) the distinction between the ceremonial and the ethical portions of the Law, and (3) the failure to consider seriously the context of Rom. 2.6ff.

In the latter half of the 19th. century, Lightfoot and Gifford in Britain and Volkmar and Holsten on the Continent argued that Paul used δ νόμος with the individualising force of 'the Law of Moses' but that when he used νόμος without the article he had in mind the qualitative idea of law --- exemplified often in the Mosaic law but much wider than that in its application.⁴ And it is this distinction which has served as the basis for most of the ethical ability interpretation of Rom. 2; i.e., in viewing δ νόμος as finished in Christ but νόμος as remaining the way of man's approach to God.⁵ In 1893, however, Eduard Grafe, in his work Die paulinische

¹E. Burton, Galatians (I.C.C.), pp. 451-454.

²E. F. Scott, Paul's Epistle to the Romans, p. 35.

³E.g., W. M. MacGregor, Christian Freedom; F. V. Filson, St. Paul's Conception of Recompense.

⁴J. B. Lightfoot, Epistle to the Galatians, p. 118 on Gal. 2.19; E. H. Gifford, The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, pp. 41-48; A. Volkmar, Paulus Römerbrief, pp. 78-79.

⁵Cf. esp. E. Burton's treatment, Galatians (I.C.C.), pp. 449-460.

Lehre vom Gesetz, took to task this position that Paul distinguished between "einem Allgemeinbegriff des Gesetzes und dem Einzelbegriff des mosaischen Gesetzes."¹ He pointed out that in the over 110 uses of ὁ νόμος and νόμος in the 'Hauptbriefen' (primarily in Romans and Galatians), such a distinction was just not present in the apostle's use of the term.² Grafe certainly went too far in asserting that Paul never distinguished between the law of God in general and the law of God in terms of the Mosaic law, for the discussions of the Gentile and the divine law in Rom. 1.18-32 and 2.14-16 point out just such a distinction.³ But his main point that ὁ νόμος and νόμος are not meant to signal such a distinction is well taken. Significant in this regard is Paul's statement in Gal. 3.23 that before Christ ἵνα νόμον ἐφρουροῦμεθα ; which state he goes on to speak of in vs. 24, beginning with the words ὥστε ὁ νόμος --- thus equating νόμος and ὁ νόμος . Likewise are the terms constantly interchanged in Rom. 2.23-27, even to the ascribing of ὁ νόμος to Gentile observance and νόμος to that which was broken by the Jew. Thus Paul can speak of Christ as the end of νόμου in Rom. 10.4, not just of τοῦ νόμου , and of love as the fulfilling of νόμου in Rom. 13.10. It is not sufficient to argue that the apostle made a distinction between ὁ νόμος and νόμος, but that in some cases "the distinction has been somewhat carelessly applied by Paul or his amanuenses."⁴ When there are clear cases of

¹E. Grafe, Die paulinische Lehre vom Gesetz, p. 4.

²Ibid., pp. 2-11.

³Likewise has Grafe gone beyond his evidence in his conclusion as to the positive content of Paul's message.

⁴W. M. MacGregor, Christian Freedom, p. 248, n. 1.

equating and even interchanging the terms, it seems best to admit that he did not make any real distinction in his use of νόμος with or without the article.¹

Often associated with the question of ὁ νόμος and νόμος, though not necessarily so, is the distinction many have believed Paul to be making between the ceremonial and the ethical aspects of the Law. Or, to put it more bluntly, between the "ethischem Kern und rituellem Beiwerk."² The position is taken that he spoke in Galatians of Christ as the end of the ceremonial law, but in Rom. 2 reasserted that the general moral requirements of the Law are still the basis for righteousness. In its basic position that the apostle distinguished between a valid and an invalid part of the Mosaic law, denouncing the ceremonial but advocating the basic principles of the ethical, this view well fits in with the insistence of the Jewish writers and advocates that "Paul, who ought to have known better, perpetuated the same mischievous error" of the LXX in using νόμος for תּוֹרָה, thus narrowing the Jewish concept of 'Torah' down to

¹Cf. W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, Romans (I.C.C.), p. 80, where this distinction is called in question, and P. P. Bläser, Das Gesetz bei Paulus, pp. 1-30, where Grafe's argument is reproduced. Bläser's work, however, suffers from a serious weakness in his argument from Paul's figurative usage of νόμος in asserting the absurdity of the distinction between the noun with and without the article. E.g., Bläser argues that only confusion results when we apply this supposed distinction to τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἀμαρτίας of Rom. 7.23 and νόμῳ θεοῦ of Rom. 7.25. But such examples need be no more than figurative uses of the noun, and cannot rightfully be used in argument against the distinction in question.

²E. Grafe, Die paulinische Lehre vom Gesetz, p. 11.

the narrowly legalistic and ritualistic.¹ But there is no real reason for believing that Paul differed from contemporary Judaism on this point and that he viewed the ethical and ceremonial aspects of the Law as anything but one indivisible whole.² To those who insist that his substitution of νόμος for תּוֹרָה indicates a narrower concept of the Mosaic law and served as the point of departure for such a cleavage between ceremonial and ethical aspects, we can only repeat T. R. Glover's fitting reply: "Such purism is hard to understand; whatever 'Torah' and νόμος first meant, two hundred years of equation is not irrelevant in the history of words."³ To those who argue that such a distinction was present in his mind from the fact that he stressed with disapproval the ceremonial aspects of the Law in Galatians but spoke in approval of the ethical standard of God in Romans, we must point out that there is a vast difference between stressing one or the other aspect of an indivisible law --- and also in using νόμος somewhat figuratively⁴ --- and separating that law into two unequally valid parts. Further, it will be pointed out later in this chapter that in actuality Paul spoke of the ceremonial aspect of the Law in Galatians and the ethical aspect in Rom. 2 in two different contexts, so that his disapproval

¹R. T. Herford, The Pharisees, p. 54. Cf. S. Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, p. 117; G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, p. 263; H. J. Schoeps, Paulus, p. 18.

²Cf. E. Grafe, Die paulinische Lehre vom Gesetz, pp. 11-25; P. P. Bläser, Das Gesetz bei Paulus, pp. 38-44, 63-71.

³T. R. Glover, Paul of Tarsus, p. 35, n. 1.

⁴E.g., Rom. 3.27; 7.21, 23, 25b; 8.2.

in the one case and approval in the other cannot simply be contrasted. This whole question of the significance of the Mosaic law, its extent and the degree to which it has been fulfilled and abrogated by Christ must be dealt with throughout this chapter, so that positive evidence for Paul's view of the indivisibility of the Mosaic law is better left for those points where they are more pertinent. But it should at least be noted here that his insistence in Gal. 3.10 and 5.3, that anyone who takes upon himself the outward physical sign of obligation to the Law with the intention of bringing upon himself the benefits of that law is under obligation to the whole Law, is in conformity with Jewish thought¹ and stands as a warning to those who would see Paul narrowly defining the Mosaic law or separating it into unequally valid parts.

It must also be pointed out that the advocates of this position have failed to consider seriously the context in which these verses are set. The section begins with a strong declaration of the wrath of God upon the Gentile, it goes on to proclaim that this same wrath stands over the Jew, and it concludes by stating that no human being will be justified before God ἐξ ἔργων νόμου.² In opposition to the optimistic view of man's ability proposed by some commentators, the résumé of this section declares that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God."³ In declaring that mankind has proved itself unable, the passage is in full agreement

¹Cf. Tos. Dem. 2.3-5, where an 'Am-Haarez' who has imposed upon himself the obligations of a 'Haber' and a proselyte who has imposed upon himself the obligations of the Law are not accepted unless they perform all of the Law without exception.

²Rom. 3.20. ³Rom. 3.23.

with the assertion in Gal. 2.16 and 3.11 that man is not justified before God ἐξ ἔργων νόμου or ἐν νόμῳ. Whatever the import of Rom. 2.6ff., it does not seem to be that of the ethical ability of man before God.

The two strands of Law and Gospel. -- But in declaring that the 'ethical ability' view of Rom. 2.6ff. is in error, we are still left with the problem of the correct interpretation of the passage. And in noting some of the other positions taken regarding these verses, we have to admit that many are just as unreliable exegetically.

The main alternative that has been proposed is one which sees Paul as here referring to the works that follow justification. Calvin speaks of the 'works' mentioned here as the good works of the elect and faithful who aspire to their Lord,¹ while others would go so far as to compare them to the "fruits of the Spirit."² But certainly the context rules out any such view of Paul at this point exhorting Christians to express their faith in good works. Lietzmann approaches the Pauline point of view in saying that here "stellt Paulus hypothetisch das Princip des Endgerichtes dar, wie es kommen würde wenn 1) das Evangelium nicht da wäre und 2) es möglich wäre, das Gesetz zu erfüllen."³ His emphasis upon the hypothetical nature of Paul's words, however, is misleading. The apostle is not presenting that which would be if the Gospel were not present, but that which is the command of God contemporaneous with the Gospel.

¹J. Calvin, Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, on Rom. 2.6-7.

²A. M. Hunter, The Epistle to the Romans, p. 36 on Rom. 2.6.

³H. Lietzmann, Römerbrief (H.N.T.), p. 13.

He viewed two strands running throughout the Old Testament and the New: (1) the law of God, which promised life but because of man's sin and inability brought only judgement and death, and (2) righteousness based on faith.¹ These two are both viewed as of God, both are according to His purpose, and both have and shall run in adjoining paths throughout the course of human history.² We must deal with their relationship more definitely at a later point in this chapter. But suffice it here to say that the contrast which we see between Rom. 2.6ff. and Rom. 3.21ff. is the same as that between Law and Gospel.³ In Rom. 2.6ff. the apostle cites the Law,⁴ which promises life and would bring life if the factor of human sin and inability were not present. But the point is that it is still valid as the standard and judgment of God in spite of the 'if'.⁵ Thus Paul, in

¹Note esp. the contrasts in Gal. 3.11-12 and Rom. 10.5ff.

²Cf. Luther's recognition of these 'two strands' in his "A Treatise on Christian Liberty," beginning with the words: "Here we must point out that all the Scriptures of God are divided into two parts --- commands and promises" (Works of Martin Luther, Vol. II, trans. W. A. Lambert, p. 317).

³Cf. E. Gaugler, Der Römerbrief, pp. 61-62.

⁴Vs. 6 is a word for word quotation of Ps. 62.12 (cf. Prov. 24.12 and Jer. 32.19). Vs. 13 has a significant parallel in Mish. Aboth 1.17, attributed to the Simeon who was either the father or the son of the teacher of Paul, Gamaliel I: "Not the expounding (of the law) is the chief thing but the doing (of it)." Parallels to vs. 13 are also found in James 1.22 and Matt. 7.24, 26. It seems that the Jews of Paul's day considered this saying to be an explicit expression of that which was implied in the written Torah.

⁵Leitzmann has correctly seen the hypothetical life-giving character of the Law, but in stressing the hypothetical nature of the Law in this aspect he has also implied a similar hypothetical character for the Law as the standard and judgment of God. It is this latter implication which is misleading.

accordance with the principle that "all who have sinned under the law will be judged by the law,"¹ cites that law in order to point out the judgment which the Jew is under.² And rather than arguing for the ethical ability of man, he is presenting the valid standard of God in order to show how far man has gone in proving himself unable.

The Law in the Old Covenant

The question as to Paul's teaching regarding the purpose of the Law in the Old Covenant has been often anticipated in the previous chapter and in the preceding section of this chapter, and at times a partial answer has been proposed. But it is not without profit at this point to bring together the apostle's scattered hints and statements in order to form some type of organised presentation. It is needful to understand Paul on this issue, for here he undoubtedly differed from a vast number of his brethren 'according to

¹Rom. 2.12.

²W. Manson has pertinently remarked: "If in the preceding section [i.e., Rom. 1.18-32] the Apostle had Wisdom 13 in mind, here he is thinking of Wisdom 15 where the Jewish writer turns from the heathen with the comforting reflection: 'But Thou, our God, art gracious, true, long-suffering . . . Even if we sin, we are Thine, etc.' This delusion of the Jew lies behind the Apostle's taunt in 2.3-4. While acknowledging the magnificent privilege of the Diaspora Jew (2:17-20), he presses the rigour of God's ethical demand. The Jew has in the Law 'the very embodiment of religious knowledge and divine truth', but the Gentile also has an inward law, the sanctions of which he recognizes in conscience, philosophy, and life. Thus Jew and Gentile stand alike before the one tribunal of God's inexorable holiness, and this, according to the Apostle's gospel, is the judgment-seat of Christ (2:16)" ("Notes on the Argument of Romans (Chapters 1-8)," New Testament Essays, ed. A. J. B. Higgins, p. 155).

the flesh'.¹ But it is also essential to understand aright this thought if we are to appreciate his teaching regarding 'nomism's end' and 'righteousness in the New Covenant'.

Law as the Standard and Judgment of God

To those Jews who argued that the Law was given to Israel as the means for righteousness before God, Paul answered that though it promised life² it would never give life because of man's sin and inability.³ In fact, it was never meant to supersede the divinely ordered plan of righteousness by faith.⁴ Thus, since (1) the Scriptures declare plainly that the righteous shall live *ἐκ πίστεως*,⁵ (2) the promises were made "four hundred and thirty years" before the Mosaic law,⁶ and (3) "no one annuls even a man's will, or adds

¹C. G. Montefiore has expressed at least the majority opinion of Judaism in Paul's day and this: "That Law cannot redeem is, so far as the Law and the Rabbis and Judaism are concerned, inaccurate" ("The Old Testament and Judaism," Record and Revelation, ed. H. W. Robinson, p. 443, n.)

²Rom. 7.10. ³Gal. 5.17; Rom. 7.7-25, 8.3, 8.

⁴Rom. ch. 4; Gal. 3.15-22.

⁵Hab. 2.4; cf. Rom. 1.17, Gal. 3.11. The context of Gal. 3.11 indicates that Paul interpreted Hab. 2.4 as human trust and reliance, not as human faithfulness or even the divine faithfulness of the LXX rendering (*ἐκ πίστεώς μου*).

⁶Gal. 3.16 - 17. This type of argument was respected in Rabbinic circles; cf. b. Kid. 40b, where R. Jose is reported as saying: "Great is learning, since it preceded 'hallah' by forty years, 'terumoth' and tithes by fifty-four years, 'shemittin' by sixty-one, and jubilees by one hundred and three." I.e., since the Torah was given and studied forty years before its precepts for the land of Palestine could be carried out, etc., the study and learning of Torah is greater than the actual doing. Such an injunction to value study over action was not typical of the Judaism of Paul's day. This emphasis was only felt to be necessary in the post-destruction period when much of the performance of the Law in its details was no longer possible but when the study of the Law was viewed as essential to the national survival. But the temporal argumentation seems to have been an accepted Rabbinic method.

to it, once it has been ratified,"¹ "if it is the adherents of the law who are to be the heirs, faith is null and the promise is void."²

But though the Law is contrary to faith and the promises when taken as the means for righteousness, it is not contrary to either when considered rightly --- not at all, *μη γένοιτο*.³ "The law is good, if one makes use of it rightly (*νομίμως*)."⁴ And one major aspect of its purpose was and is to bring to consciousness in sin-deadened humanity⁵ the realisation of the judgment of God, by (1) showing sin to be what it is before God and (2) revealing the depths of rebellion in the human heart. Not only does the Law reveal sin and sinful action to be *ὑπερβολῆς ἀμαρτωλός*,⁶ but, on the principle that forbidden fruits are sweetest, it provokes within man a reaction against its prohibitions. And, by thus increasing trespasses, it increases man's understanding of the extent of his own rebellion against God.⁷ Paul saw both of these facets of its purpose as divinely ordained; i.e., as the standard and judgment of God it was given *ἵνα γένηται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἀμαρτωλός ἡ ἀμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς* and *ἵνα κλεονόσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα*.⁸ Thus he speaks of the Law as given to "the lawless and disobedient"⁹ "because of transgressions"¹⁰ in order to

¹Gal. 3.15-18. ²Rom. 4.14. ³Gal. 3.21. ⁴I Tim. 1.8.

⁵Rom. 7.15: "I know not my own actions."

⁶Rom. 7.13; cf. Rom. 3.19-20.

⁷Rom. 5.20; cf. Rom. 7.5, 7ff. Augustine's experience is the classic example (Conf. II. 4-6), but our own hearts yield primary confirmation of the validity of this principle.

⁸Rom. 7.13 and 5.20. ⁹I Tim. 1.8. ¹⁰Gal. 3.19.

quicken the consciousness and activity of sin¹ to the end that man might "through law" come to death, and out of death find life by faith in God.² It truly "brings wrath,"³ and all who are submissive to no higher allegiance are "under a curse."⁴ It can be spoken of as "the dispensation of death,"⁵ "the dispensation of condemnation,"⁶ and "the strength of sin."⁷ But Paul never taught that the Law was "a dismal failure"⁸ or "was all very bad and did exceedingly ill."⁹ Rather, though the promise of life in the Law was brought to nought by man's sin, "it is still God's grace that the Law factually led 'to death,' because by this route man is led to God, the 'God who gives life to the dead'."¹⁰ Though it is God's 'strange work' as compared to His 'proper work', it is never to be disassociated from that proper work in either ultimate origin or ultimate purpose.

Law as Contractual Obligation

But there is another aspect to the purpose of the Law in the Old Covenant. We have argued in Chapter II that in the Old Testament and Judaism the concept of 'faith' carried the twofold designation of 'trust in' and 'fidelity to'; reliance upon and faithfulness.¹¹ And we proposed that the distinction between a 'reacting nomist' and an 'acting legalist' is that of each's starting-point and emphasis

¹Rom. 5.20, 7.7ff. ²Gal. 2.19; Rom. 7.5, 3.19. ³Rom. 4.15.

⁴Gal. 3.10, 13. ⁵II Cor. 3.7. ⁶II Cor. 3.9. ⁷I Cor. 15.56.

⁸As W. H. P. Hatch characterises the apostle's thought regarding the Law, The Pauline Idea of Faith, p. 59.

⁹As C. G. Montefiore interprets Paul to say, Judaism and St. Paul, p. 106.

¹⁰R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, p. 268.

¹¹Supra, pp. 113-114.

in this two element conception; i.e., whereas the nomist began with what God has done and/or does and laid emphasis upon trust in God, the legalist began with what he was able to do and/or had done and stressed personal fidelity. But both viewpoints recognised that there was the element of contractual obligation in their relationship with God: a prescribed form of religious expression and ethical guidance which was to be faithfully followed by man in fulfilment of the contract. The canonical prophets and post-canonical pneumatics of Judaism never attempted to destroy this sense of contractual obligation.¹ Theirs was not to annul the required fidelity, but to insist that trust must precede and a loving response must be the basis of any acceptable faithfulness.

In the letters of Paul, this aspect of the Law is assumed. He says that "before the coming of τὴν πίστιν we were kept ὑπὸ νόμον";²

¹K. Lake is one of many who have grossly misrepresented the prophets in claiming that they made "a fundamental attack" on "the whole sacrificial system" (Paul: His Heritage and Legacy, p. 27). His insistence is that their message "was wholly different" from that of any of their predecessors. "God, they said, does not care for presents or compliments. He merely wishes men to behave well to one another" (ibid., p. 25). Thus Lake advocates that "the logical end of their teachings would be the abolition of all cultus" (ibid., p. 26). H. H. Rowley, however, has convincingly reminded us that while the prophets undoubtedly differed from the mere ceremonialists, it was not a fundamental conflict but a difference of emphasis. The prophets did not condemn the ritual as such, but its abuse in mere externalism ("The Unity of the Old Testament," Bulletin of The John Rylands Library, Vol. XXIX, 1945-1946, pp. 326-358).

²Gal. 3.23. Not just before the coming of 'faith', for Paul has just previously argued that faith was before 'contractual obligation', but 'faith' in the New Covenant sense of the term --- Christian faith, the faith of which he has been speaking.

and he goes on to compare this aspect of the Law's purpose to the function of a παιδαγωγός over a child.¹ It is this concept of contract in the Old Covenant which seems to lie at the background of his thought in Gal. 3.20: "Now a mediator implies more than one; but God is one." The verse is truly "one of notorious difficulty,"² but Lightfoot's exposition probably best brings out the contrast in the apostle's mind:

The very idea of mediation supposes two persons at least, between whom the mediation is carried on. The law then is of the nature of a contract between two parties, God on the one hand, and the Jewish people on the other . . . Unlike the law, the promise is absolute and unconditional. It depends on the sole decree of God. There are not two contracting parties.³

The contractual aspect of the Law is also implied in Paul's continued use of ὑπὸ νόμον in reference to the piety of the Old Covenant.⁴ And his reference to New Covenant piety as being χωρὶς νόμου implies that formerly piety was associated in some manner with law.⁵

¹Gal. 3.24ff. In Plato's *Lysis*, 208-210, there is a good description of that which Paul probably had in mind in the use of this term. Here the boy *Lysis* is held in restraint by a superior slave; and when he is asked by Socrates who it is that rules him, he answers: "My pedagogue." There is much he would like to do, but his father keeps him in check until he is ready for manhood. Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 148-149; H. A. A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, pp. 43-44; C. H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, pp. 85-86.

²H. St. J. Thackeray, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, p. 67.

³J. B. Lightfoot, Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 146-147.

⁴I Cor. 9.20; Gal. 4.21, 5.18. Even Christ is spoken of as being "born 'under law' in order to redeem those who were 'under law'" (Gal. 4.4-5). Similarly Josephus speaks of Moses' institution of the Law as the standard and rule ἢ ὡσαύτῃ ὑπὸ πατρὶ τοῦτῃ καὶ δεσπότῃ ζῶντες (Contra Apion II. 17). Cf. also b. Sanh. 97a and b (and with a few differences b. Ab. Zar. 9a) where the history of the world is divided into three periods by the post-Hadrian "school of Elijah": Chaos, under the Law and the Messianic Age.

⁵Rom. 3.21, 28.

Again at this point great care must be taken; for not only does the association of law with piety in the Old Covenant not necessarily imply legalism in the sense in which we are using that term, but it also does not necessarily imply that law is equal with faith in the quest for righteousness. Paul might recognise that fidelity to the Law was associated with righteousness in the Old Covenant, but he insisted that it never was the basis for righteousness nor even equal with trust in God as a basis for righteousness. His statements imply that he regarded the Law in the Old Covenant as the prescribed expression of a more basic and more vital relationship with God, and never more than that; "das formale Kriterium des Gerichtes,"¹ but not the fundamental factor. As such it remained secondary, though, of course, essential under the terms of contract. In this recognition of the essential yet secondary nature of the Law in the Old Covenant, Paul was in agreement with Jewish reacting nomism as portrayed in our previous chapter.

Nomism's End

In that which has preceded we have noted many similarities between Paul's thought and that of Jewish nomism. But now we come to the place where all possible agreement between the two ends. At the heart of the apostle's teaching regarding legality is his conviction that the Law in its contractual aspect --- and that means

¹P. P. Bläser, Das Gesetz bei Paulus, p. 72.

especially Jewish nomism --- has come to its full completion and terminus in Christ. It is not that "St. Paul's arguments are only thought out in order to justify a step to which he was irrevocably committed."¹ His thought has a vital core other than just the reasonable and practical, and it is from this core that his teaching regarding law and legality stems as one of "the logical implications of his doctrine."² But before we deal directly with his statements, it is well to note the background to and sources of that thought.

The Background to and Sources of Paul's Thought

In evaluating the influences that were at work in the formulation of the Pauline doctrine of law, four areas must be considered: (1) Judaism's expectation regarding the status of the Law in the future, (2) the early church's impact upon Paul, (3) Jesus' attitude toward the Law, and (4) Paul's own conversion experience.

The expectation of Judaism. -- It must be realised in taking up a survey of the Jewish expectation as to the status of the Law in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come that the two concepts of 'the abrogation of the Law' and 'the establishment of a new law' are not necessarily mutually dependent. It is often supposed that to demonstrate from the Jewish literature that Judaism expected some type of new lawgiver and law in the time to come is to make it

¹As W. L. Knox insists, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 28, n. 65.

²A. Schweitzer, Paul and his Interpreters, p. 246. While the school of 'consistent eschatology' has rightly viewed Paul's teaching regarding law as the logical implication of his doctrinal core, it has obscured that core in its over-emphasis upon the eschatological.

'a priori' certain that the old law was expected to be nullified; and, conversely, that to note scattered references which indicate an expected cessation of certain laws is necessarily to view Judaism as expecting a new law and lawgiver. Such argumentation is fallacious. While the two questions lie tangent to one another and often complement each other, they are not so necessarily interrelated that such deductions can be made. We must therefore treat them as separate questions; this section dealing with Judaism's expectation of the Law's duration, with the further question of a new lawgiver and Torah considered in Chapter IV.

The great Jewish objection to Paul's teaching is that "the Law gives no indication of its own transitoriness. Its enactments are to be 'statues for ever throughout your generations.'"¹ Some have attempted to answer this objection by insisting that Paul viewed this 'for ever' as an enigmatic presentation meant to obscure the Law's real transitoriness lest the people should become self-assertive or discouraged, or even forgetful.² Others would argue that this 'for ever' must be taken in the sense of I Macc. 14.41: "And the Jews and the priests were well pleased that Simon should be their leader and high-priest for ever, until a faithful prophet should arise (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἕως τοῦ ἀναστῆναι προφήτην πιστόν)." But both Strack-Billerbeck³

¹C. G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, p. 170.

²E.g., A. Nissiotis, "Paul as Interpreter of the Old Testament," Paulus-Hellas-Oikumene, pp. 156-157.

³Str.-Bil., Vol. I, pp. 244-249, and Vol. IV, Exkurs 29.

and G. F. Moore¹ have made it clear that at least post-destruction Judaism expected that "the law should not only be in force in the messianic age, but should be better studied and better observed than ever before; and this was indubitably the common belief."² Even the individual commandments, like the Law as a whole, were said to be eternal.³ In fact, "das rabbin. Schrifttum setzt die ewige Gültigkeit der Tora als selbstverständlich überall voraus."⁴ That there is polemic intention in at least two Talmudic passages regarding the kindred subject of a new Torah is evident,⁵ and the possibility remains that such an interest was the motivation for at least some of those passages cited by Strack-Billerbeck and Moore. And yet the fact that Philo,⁶ Josephus,⁷ some of the apocryphal works⁸ and portions of the sectarian literature⁹ are in basic agreement with the later

¹G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, pp. 269ff.

²Ibid., p. 271.

³Cf. Str.-Bil., Vol. I, pp. 244-249.

⁴Ibid., p. 245.

⁵Deut. R. 8.6 and b. Shab. 104a; see *infra*, pp.

⁶De Vita Mos. 11.44: In the Messianic Age "each nation would abandon its peculiar ways and throwing overboard their ancestral customs, turn to honouring our laws alone."

⁷Contra Apion II. 39: "though we be deprived of our wealth, of our cities, or of the other advantages we have, our law continues immortal."

⁸Baruch 4.1, IV Ezra 9.37, and, possibly, Wisdom 18.4. Cf. R. Marcus, Law in the Apocrypha, p. 53.

⁹Qumran's "A Formulary of Blessings" twice presents this idea, as also probably Apoc. of Baruch 48.47 and 77.15.

Talmudists at this point indicates that belief in the eternality of the Law was characteristic even of pre-destruction Judaism.¹

But there is also another aspect to this question. In a well-balanced presentation W. D. Davies has shown that "despite the 'doctrine' of the immutability of Torah, there were also occasional expressions of expectations that Torah would suffer modification in the Messianic Age. There were some Halakoth which would cease to be applicable in that Age; others, by contrast, would acquire a new relevance."² Among the passages quoted by Davies, the following are significant: Lev. R. 9.7, which, though of late date, speaks of all sacrifices being annulled but that of Thanksgiving in "the time to come";³ Yalqut on Prov. 9.2, which, dated c. 80-120 A.D., speaks of all the festivals but Purim (R. Eleazar adding also The Day of Atonement) ceasing; Midrash Tehillim 146.7, where distinctions between clean and unclean animals are spoken of as abrogated in the Messianic Age; b. Shab. 151b, where R. Simeon b. Eleazar (165-200 A.D.) argues that "the Torah no longer holds in the Messianic Age, so that questions of reward for observing it and guilt or punishment for refusing to do so do not arise";⁴ and possibly b. Nid. 61b, where

¹While it is anticipating a later point, yet it must be noted that Matt. 5.17ff. offers further evidence to this first century Jewish expectation both in the need for Jesus to allay the fears of His hearers and in His words.

²W. D. Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come, p. 66.

³While "the time to come" has a rather flexible meaning, Davies has pointed out that in view of the context of this passage its meaning here is to be equated with "the Messianic Age" (ibid., p. 55)

⁴Davies' free interpretive paraphrase (ibid., p. 65).

freedom from ceremonial laws is noted as a characteristic of "the time to come." Especially pertinent is the passage found in both b. Sanh. 97b and b. Ab. Zar. 9b:

The Tanna debe Eliyyahu taught: The world is to exist six thousand years: the first two thousand years are to be void; the next two thousand years are the period of the Torah; and the following two thousand years are the period of the Messiah.

Freedman is quite right in pointing out that the passage "does not mean that the Torah shall cease" in the third period,¹ but it does imply that the period of the Messiah was not expected to be characterised or dominated by the Torah but by the Messiah.

Klausner has acknowledged that such passages as these seem to argue against his presentation that Judaism expected the absolute eternal validity and dominance of the Law. But he argues that such contradictions are all of late date and have been influenced by Christian thought, and, thus, are of no importance in understanding real Judaism of the 1st. century.² Lateness of date, however, is not determinative if there is no evidence of outside influence. And it is hard to imagine that Judaism would so easily agree with such a prominent and vexing doctrine of its main adversary if that doctrine had not already been a part of its heritage. Moore accepts these expressions as being truly Jewish and as teaching that "the greater part of the laws in the Pentateuch would have no application

¹The Babylonian Talmud (Soncino Edition), Tractate Sanhedrin, Vol. II, p. 657, n. 9.

²J. Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel, pp. 446-449.

or relation to anything actual,"¹ but he insists that the period of time they had in mind was not that of the Messianic Age but of the Age to come.² But such a definite distinction between the two ages on the part of the Jewish teachers is difficult to maintain. It is probable that these terms were both used to designate "the ideal future of Jewish expectation"³ and were not so sharply differentiated in the pre-destruction period as they were by the later Rabbis.⁴ Even Klausner, while arguing that the ideas of the two ages were always differentiated, admits that the terms were often interchanged.⁵ It seems that the future was not so definitely bisected by the earlier Rabbis as Moore would ask us to believe; nor was it accepted by early Christianity as so neatly departmentalised. Thus many Jewish scholars have accepted these Talmudic statements as expressions of a facet of Judaism's Messianic expectations, which expectations Jesus and Christianity capitalised upon.⁶ Their only doubt, of course, is that Christianity could legitimately claim their fulfilment to be found in Jesus Christ. Further evidence as to this Jewish expectation has come from Qumran, for that literature speaks frankly

¹G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, p. 272.

²Ibid., pp. 269-274.

³W. D. Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come, p. 1, n. 1.

⁴Cf. Str.-Bil., Vol. IV, Exkurs 29, pp. 815ff.

⁵J. Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel, pp. 408-419.

⁶E.g., H. Loewe, "Pharisaism," Judaism and Christianity, Vol. I, ed. W. O. E. Oesterley, pp. 175-177; K. Kohler, "Nomism," J.E., Vol. IX, p. 326.

of enacting laws which were to be in force only until the coming of the Messiah(s).¹

It therefore seems best to agree with W. D. Davies and Jakob Jocz² that while Judaism expected the Law to continue in the days of the Messiah as the expression of the eternal will of God, it also realised that some abrogation and/or alteration would take place within that law as a result of the Messiah's presence. Strack-Billerbeck "probably errs on the side of caution"³ in stressing the Law's immutability and only mentioning the thought of some type of change. It seems that both elements are present: the affirmation of the Torah on one level and the recognition of some type of abrogation and/or alteration on another.

The impact of the early church. -- While we must consider more fully the interaction between Paul and the early Jerusalem Church in Chapter V, one point of that relationship is pertinent here: the impact of the early church on the formation of the apostle's thought regarding the abrogation of the Law.

There have been many who have seen the seeds for Paul's teaching regarding the Law lying in the subsoil of the early church.

¹E.g., LQS 2.19, 8.9, 9.10-11; CDC 14.18-19. J. T. Milik says regarding the community's thought concerning "the End of Days," which they believed began with the Teacher of Righteousness: "During this period which precedes the End of Times, the laws observed have only a provisional and temporary value (LQS IX. 10f.; CD XIV. 18f.). Later on, they will be replaced by a new and final Law, proclaimed by the eschatological figure called 'the Interpreter of the Law'" (Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, p. 114; cf. pp. 126-127).

²J. Jocz, The Jewish People and Jesus Christ, pp. 155-156.

³W. D. Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come, p. 85.

Some have insisted that the conviction of the non-essential character of the Law for righteousness was implanted within his soul even in his Judaistic days through "the logical force"¹ of the Christian apologetic and/or the tranquillity of the early Christian martyrs.² And yet, it is probable that Paul had taken up his task of persecution with full knowledge of both the stamina of the martyr and the pathos he would necessarily inflict. Fanaticism was not so foreign to the Palestine of his day as to cause him to be unaware of these factors, and it is not impossible that he was well prepared for the emotional strain in persecuting those he believed to be misguided but dangerous foes. Nor need we suppose that the logic of the Christian preachers greatly affected him.³ His later references

¹G. J. Inglis, "The Problem of St. Paul's Conversion," E.T., Vol. XL, No. 5 (Feb., 1929), p. 229.

²E.g., J. Weiss, Paul and Jesus, pp. 32-37, and The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. I, p. 189; A. S. Peake, The Quintessence of Paulinism, pp. 16-17; T. R. Glover, Paul of Tarsus, pp. 59-60.

³Stephen has often been viewed as anticipating the Pauline position, and even going beyond it. Such scholars as F. C. Baur (Paul, His Life and Works, Vol. I, pp. 47-49, 59-60) and W. L. Knox, (St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 39-47 and 54, n. 24) have viewed him as almost a pre-Marcionite; while, on the other hand, H.-J. Schoeps (Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums, pp. 233-242, though Schoeps believes 'Stephen' to be only "eine Deckfigur des Lukas für Jakobus") and M. Simon (St. Stephen and the Hellenists, esp. pp. 113-116) interpret him as the predecessor of the Ebionites. But both of these interpretations seem to be extreme. While Stephen is more outspoken than the early disciples, is more ready to attribute Israel's rejection of the Christ to a perpetual callousness of heart (whereas Peter and Paul credit it to ignorance), and is ready to give up the strict observance of the Law (see Appendix), it seems that his desire was to raise a prophetic voice within a Jewish Christianity still holding to the basic observance of the national customs rather than to proclaim a law-free Gospel. It seems that Harnack is right in saying that "when Stephen was stoned, he died, like Huss, for a cause whose issues he probably did not foresee" (The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, Vol. I, p. 50). Cf. J. Jocz's treatment of Stephen, The Jewish People and Jesus Christ, p. 156.

to the scandal of the cross indicate that this was the stumbling-block for him, which no amount of logic or verbal proof could remove.¹ Only the Damascus experience was powerful enough to cause him to reconsider the death of Christ. Humanly speaking, it could indeed be said that he was "immune to the Gospel."² Nor can we assume that Paul's thought at this point was greatly influenced by the early church after his conversion. While it is certain that he learned and adopted much from his Christian predecessors,³ his strong denial that his distinctive message was gained from them⁴ --- coupled with the early uncertainty of the first leaders of both the Jerusalem and Antioch churches on this matter⁵ --- indicate that he was not in their debt for his treatment of the Law.

Cullmann has raised a pertinent point in suggesting that possibly the Hellenists of Acts 6.1 and 9.29 (and in some texts 11.20) were "in some way in contact with the kind of Judaism we find

¹I Cor. 1.23, Gal. 5.11. Note Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, 32 and 89, for the Hebraic Jews' reaction to a death on the cross; though a Hellenistic Jew might not have been so offended by such a death, judging from Philo's interpretation of Deut. 21.23: "Cursed is the man who clings to corruptible matter instead of to God" (De Post. Cain. 8 and 17). Klausner's view of the teaching and attitude of Jesus as undermining the national existence and thus frustrating the basis for a Messianic hope may well be taken to express the reaction of Saul to the message of Jesus and the apologetic of His followers (cf. Jesus of Nazareth, p. 390).

²J. Munck, Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte, p. 5.

³Cf. esp. A. M. Hunter, Paul and his Predecessors.

⁴Gal. 1.11-12; cf. Eph. 3.3. ⁵Gal. 2.11-13.

in the Qumran texts" --- not that they were former Essenes "but that they come from a kind of Judaism close to this group"¹ --- and that through them Paul had been influenced by an Essene type of mentality.² He goes even further in asking whether Paul could have met and been influenced by members of the Qumran community itself while he and they were residing in Damascus. To this latter question of direct contact, as Cullmann himself recognises, a factual answer is impossible; not only because we are uncertain when the Essenes were at Damascus, but also because "we do not know, as a matter of fact, that they were ever at Damascus."³ To the former suggestion of indirect contact and influence, we must, while recognising a possibility of such influence along other lines, insist that this Essene type of influence upon Paul's doctrine of the Law was negligible; for two reasons:

1.) Because "whatever formal elements the church may or may not have derived from the Qumran sect, if any, it is abundantly clear that they were made subservient to a new and quite different faith, in which Christ had a supreme, unique place to which nothing in the

¹O. Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, p. 29.

²Ibid., pp. 18-32.

³M. Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 119. On pp. 219-227, Burrows gives an excellent summary of the four views regarding the passages in CDC which suggest a migration to "the land of Damascus": (1) that the passages refer to the exiles of Israel in Assyria and Babylonia; (2) that they refer to an actual migration to Damascus; (3) that there was an actual migration to "the land of Damascus," by which term is meant the Nabatean kingdom of which Wadi Qumran was a part; and (4) that "the land of Damascus" was the prophetic name for the Qumran retreat. He concludes by saying: "I am still more attracted to the view that what is meant by the migration to the land of Damascus is the movement of the group to Qumran itself" (ibid., p. 227); thus agreeing with T. H. Gaster, as does F. M. Cross, Jr., in his revised opinion (The Ancient Library of Qumran, pp. 59-60).

Judaism of Qumran is comparable."¹

2.) Because however much the Qumran group opposed the defilement of the Temple and considered their own "more pure lustrations" to be more acceptable, they were not in principle opposed to the sacrifices or the worship of the Temple² and were much more insistent upon the rigorous observance of the Law than were even the Pharisees. Cullmann has been misled by Philo and misleads in saying that the "essential and characteristic point common simultaneously to the Qumran sect, the Hellenists, and the Fourth Gospel" is that of "the opposition to Temple worship."³

The fact that Paul opposes such a mentality as that of Qumran's in Colossians⁴ speaks volumes against any positive Essene influence, even though indirect, on the formulation of his doctrine. For while

¹M. Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 118.

²Note esp. J. M. Baumgarten, "Sacrifice and Worship Among the Jewish Sectarrians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls," H.T.R., Vol. XLVI, No. 3 (July, 1953), pp. 141-159; F. M. Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran, pp. 74-77; and R. H. Charles, Ap. and Ps., Vol. II, p. 799, n. 3.

³O. Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, pp. 27-28. H. Lietzmann has also replied too heavily upon Philo in characterising the Essene attitude toward sacrifice, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 42.

⁴This "obscure theosophy" (H. A. A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, p. 153) and "hybrid blend of doctrines" (ibid., pp. 155-156) has been seen of late, with the knowledge from Qumran pouring in, to be more compatible to an Essene type of mentality than to any other. Older commentators were at a disadvantage in not possessing this newer material from the Dead Sea, yet some did recognise the Essene flavour of the heresy at Colosse; e.g., H. A. A. Kennedy, ibid., p. 156, and especially J. B. Lightfoot, Epistle to the Colossians, pp. 73ff., and Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 326-327.

Qumran did view the keeping of the forms of the Law to be secondary to the inward orientation, the community considered prescribed performance of the Law to be essential for righteousness. And it was at this point that the apostle differed from the best of Jewish nomism --- including Qumran.

There are also three incidents in the life of the Jerusalem Church which could be cited as possible precedents to the Pauline teaching: (1) The conversion of Cornelius and its reception among the Jewish Christians;¹ (2) The ministry to the Samaritans, with its possible omission of any reference to the temple worship of either Jerusalem or Gerizim;² and (3) The official acceptance by the Jerusalem Church of their more liberal brethren in the church at Antioch.³ But, in view of our lack of information regarding their early impact upon Paul and the apostle's own assertions of independence, one must go beyond the evidence to view these incidents as anything more than merely confirmatory to the Pauline teaching. They cannot be considered the basis of that thought.

Christ and the Law. -- The question of Jesus and the Law is of no significance to the study of Pauline thought only if we assume that Paul knew little and cared less regarding the attitude of Jesus toward the Law.⁴ But such was not the case. It has been shown

¹Acts 10.1 - 11.18. ²Acts 8.4-25. ³Acts 11.20ff.

⁴As, e.g., W. Wrede, Paulus; A. Schweitzer, Paul and his Interpreters; D. K. F. Nösgen, Deissmann's "Paulus" für Theologen und Laien beleuchtet.

quite conclusively that the apostle knew much concerning the teaching, activity and Person of the historical Jesus¹ --- even to those areas wherein the Lord had not expressed Himself.² Whether or not he had ever seen Jesus in His earthly ministry must always remain a question.³ Certainly he had a vivid impression of Jesus' characteristics and claims even before his conversion, as gathered from Jewish reports and Christian witnesses and as seen through Pharisaic eyes. But without doubt the greatest amount of information

¹Cf., e.g., F. C. Baur, Paul, His Life and Works, Vol. I, p. 91; J. Weiss, Paul and Jesus, pp. 18-22; H. A. A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, pp. 102ff.; J. S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, pp. 286-291; A. M. Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel, pp. 56-58, and Paul and his Predecessors, pp. 9-12, passim; and C. F. D. Moule, "The Use of Parables and Sayings as Illustrative Material in Early Christian Catechesis," J.T.S., Vol. III, Pt. I (Apr., 1952), pp. 75-79.

²I Cor. 7.25.

³Scholarship has been almost equally divided on the question of whether II Cor. 5.16 can be used as evidence that Paul had seen and possibly heard Jesus during one of His visits to Jerusalem. In the affirmative have been such scholars as J. Weiss (Paul and Jesus, pp. 40-56), H. Lietzmann (II Corinthians, H.N.T., p. 125) and C. A. A. Scott, (Christianity According to St. Paul, pp. 11-12). In the negative, H. A. A. Kennedy (The Theology of the Epistles, p. 49) and A. Deissmann (The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, pp. 186-187) are representative. The issue is over the interpretation of ; does it refer to a fleshly kind of Christ or a fleshly kind of knowledge? Deissmann's argument still seems to carry conviction and give the preference to the latter view: "If we would refer the words to personal acquaintance with the historical Jesus, the following conclusion, 'now we know Him no more,' would be trivial" (ibid., p. 187). Of course to interpret this passage as having no real relevance to the question at hand does not settle the issue in the negative. It still would certainly have been possible for Paul to have seen Jesus. And yet it must also be insisted that it would have been possible for both to have been in the city without Paul's ever having met Jesus. Christ's visits were few, and, except for the last, somewhat unspectacular. And an earnest young Rabbi in the time of 'Messianic travail' preceding the advent of the Messiah (b. Shab. 118a, b. Sanh. 98b, 1QH 3.3-18) was solely to "engage in study and benevolence" (b. Sanh. 98b. cf. 1QS 9.3-4).

regarding the historical Jesus came to him through the testimony of his Christian predecessors. The first-hand accounts of men like Peter and John Mark, the information of Ananias and Barnabas¹ and the investigations of Luke were all at his disposal. And indeed,

why should the risen Christ give to His apostle detailed information which could be obtained perfectly well by ordinary inquiry from the eyewitnesses? Such revelation would be unlike the other miracles of the Bible. God does not rend the heaven to reveal what can be learned just as well by ordinary word of mouth.²

Nor is it impossible for Paul to have had at hand a written 'Sayings of Jesus' book.³ Though he longed to know the power, presence and Person of the resurrected Christ,⁴ he was not uninterested in His

¹Barnabas too may have been an eye-witness; cf. W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 20, n. 37 and pp. 363-371.

²J. G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, p. 148; cf. also pp. 71, 76 and 137-148.

³The great problem with Rendel Harris' thesis that there existed "two lost documents of the early Christian propaganda . . . the first is the 'Collection of the Sayings of Jesus' (Book of Sayings), the second is the 'Book of Testimonies' from the Old Testament" (Testimonies, p. 54) is his methodology. In his approach there is "das falsche Zurücktragen späterer Verhältnisse in frühere Zeiten" (O. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel, p. 52); i.e., all of his evidence necessarily comes from sub-apostolic and patristic writers, and the results are made valid for the earlier apostolic era. Thus his evidence cannot really support his conclusions. And yet his conclusions are none the less possible. There is no real reason why there could not have been at least a written "Sayings of Jesus" book antedating the Gospels. Oriental and Rabbinically trained memories were indeed retentive, and yet that same type of mind at Qumran found the need to write down the particular interpretation of the community's (possibly) historical originator and teacher. The early church possessed men in the "great company of priests" (Essenes?) and the "Pharisees who believed" whose interests and abilities would lie in just such a collection. And Paul's expectation that his reference to the commands of the Lord regarding marriage (I Cor. 7.10-11) and material support for Christian preachers (I Cor. 9.14) would settle the matters in question seems to imply that even the Corinthians were quite knowledgeable regarding the content of Christ's teaching.

⁴Phil. 3.10.

earthly ministry and work. Or, to put it in more modern terminology, while he thrilled to the existential, he did not depreciate the historical. J. S. Stewart's words regarding the early Christians are true of Paul as well:

If they were not always looking towards the past or dwelling in the memory of the Galilean and Judean days, it was not because the earthly ministry of Jesus meant little to them: it was because He had become a vivid and abiding presence But this does not mean that the knowledge of the historic facts ceased to be a treasured possession.¹

Paul undoubtedly learned much regarding Jesus and the Law through the witness of the early church - the same church which was the source for at least our present Synoptics. And four factors regarding this relation are pertinent here.

Firstly, that Jesus came not to abolish the Law but to establish it. Some have argued that Matt. 5.17-19 is a later expression of the followers of James desiring to discount the position of Paul by inventing or misquoting words of Jesus in support of their position.² But the fact that Matt. 5.17 has no parallel in the other Synoptics is no necessary indication of its strictly Judaic character. The agreement of Lk. 16.17 with Matt. 5.18 regarding the Law's immutability shows that this thought need not be assigned only to a record which has been 'Judaistically influenced', while the agreement of Matt. 11.13 with Lk. 16.16 that the Law and the prophets

¹J. S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, p. 284.

²E.g., A. S. Peake, "Law," H.D.C.G., Vol. II, p. 15; B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp. 254-257.

were until John indicates that this 'Jewish gospel' is not quite so permeated with such a Judaic intention as has been supposed.¹ And, though anticipating a later discussion, we must insist that the expression of these verses is not in reality opposed to the Pauline teaching at all.² In Matt. 5.17-19, Jesus begins by allaying any fears that His purpose is to abolish the Law. And throughout the couplets presented He is seeking to establish that law by sweeping away such notions as may have been heard and by bringing His hearers back to what was really meant in the ancient expression of the will of God. Bultmann has pointed out that Christ's words were not new in Jewish thought,³ and indeed, despite Windisch's insistence to the contrary,⁴ we need not suppose that either Jesus or Matthew thought they were. It seems that what Christ is saying in Matt. 5 is this: Amidst the welter of conflicting interpretations of the Law which you have heard, I, authoritatively, say unto you that this is the correct meaning and interpretation of the will of God.⁵ Part of His intention was to bring the Law out of the realm of externalism and casuistry, and thereby to establish its true meaning. And in this it is probable

¹Cf. J. Jocz, The Jewish People and Jesus Christ, p. 25.

²In opposition to the assertion of K. Lake and F. J. Rakes Jackson that Matt. 5.17-20 "cannot be reconciled with the teaching of Paul" (Beginnings, Vol. I, p. 316).

³R. Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, p. 89.

⁴H. Windisch, The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount, p. 54.

⁵Cf. W. G. Kümmel, "Jesus und der jüdische Traditions-gedanke," ZNW., Vol. XXXIII, Heft 2/3 (1934), pp. 105-130; D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 55-62.

that some of the Pharisees could have commended Him - at least in principle.¹

Secondly, that Jesus came to fulfil the Law. The witness of all the Gospels, not only Matthew's, and of the earliest Christian preaching² is that Jesus fulfilled the Torah of God in its broadest definition. And there is no reason to doubt that this was the position of the Church from the earliest times. The Gospels present Jesus Himself as instigating this conviction: He spoke of His own presence,³ ministry,⁴ passion and death⁵ as the fulfilment of the Scriptures; He considered it needful to "fulfil all righteousness";⁶ and He declared that His purpose in coming was to fulfil the Law.⁷ Matt. 5.17 is the most pertinent single passage at this point. Strack-Billerbeck tell us that "Jesus wird statt κληροῦν קַיְיֶם gesagt haben."⁸ And Jakob Jocz agrees, adding that "'kayyem' was and still is in universal usage, and always associated with the fulfilment of the 'mizwot'."⁹ Then, significantly, Jocz says: "But if this be the case, then the attitude of Jesus towards the Law is

¹ - Gemara tells of Moses himself being unable to follow an interpretation of his own law in R. Akiba's school, so remote was it from Moses' intent (b. Men. 29b); and R. Joshua b. Hananiah (late 1st. century A.D.) exclaims on a ruling regarding the ceremonial cleanliness of tools: "The Scribes have invented a new thing, and I cannot make answer" (Mish. Kel. 13.7. Mish. Teb. Yom. 4.6).

²E.g., Acts 3.18. ³Lk. 4.21. ⁴Mk. 1.15, Lk. 24.44.

⁵Matt. 26.54, Mk. 14.49. ⁶Matt. 3.15. ⁷Matt. 5.17.

⁸Str.-Bil., Vol. I, p. 241; cf. D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 60-61.

⁹J. Jocz, The Jewish People and Jesus Christ, p. 26.

that of humble submission."¹ And that is just the witness of the earliest church: "He humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."² He came to fulfil the Law in humble submission.

And yet, thirdly, while the Gospels present Jesus as establishing and fulfilling the Law, they also insist that He set Himself and His purpose as being of more importance than the Law. He recognised the legitimate authority of the Rabbinic succession,³ and yet did not seek Rabbinic ordination for His ministry but claimed to have a higher authority than that contained in the Law --- "from heaven."⁴ While he violated no specific precept of the written Torah, he refused to allow the Pharisaic principle of separation or the scribal interpretations of ceremonial defilement and the eating of untithed foods to impede His ministry to sinners

¹Ibid., p. 26.

²Phil. 2.8. Phil. 2.6-11 is in all likelihood "one of the first confessions of faith composed for the worship of the primitive community" and taken over by Paul from the community (O. Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions, p. 22).

³Matt. 23.2-3a. In this, Jesus was in accordance with the Law (cf. Deut. 17.8-13). Cf. the idea of Rabbinic succession in Mish. Aboth 1.1.

⁴Matt. 21.23-27, Mk. 11.27-33, Lk. 20.1-8. Cf. D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 217-219, for an excellent treatment of Rabbinic ordination and Jesus' claims.

and Samaritans.¹ And, on the principle that the more important sets aside the obligations of the lesser,² He asserted that His presence and ministry overrode the sabbatical laws³ and the fasts.⁴ As

T. W. Manson says:

For Jesus the thing of first importance, the only thing of any importance, is His own Ministry For Him that is the only thing in the world that comes with an absolute and unqualified claim. Not even the Law can compare with this supreme obligation. That is not to say that Jesus rejected the Law or that He lightly disregarded any of its commands and prohibitions. It does mean that He did not hesitate to break through its restrictions in the interest of His own task.⁵

¹Note Jesus' ministry to those at Levi's feast (Mk. 2.15, par.), to the sinful woman who shocked the Pharisaic sense of ceremonial propriety in her anointing of Jesus (Lk. 7.37ff.), to the tax collectors and sinners drawing near to and possibly eating with Him (Lk. 15.1), to Zacchaeus (Lk. 19.5ff.) and to the Samaritans (Jn. 5). Such actions quite naturally raised in Pharisaic minds the objection: He befriends the 'Am-haarez'! (Mk. 2.16. par.; Matt. 11.19, Lk. 7.34; Lk. 7.39; Lk. 15.2; Lk. 19.7). In all of these contacts "Jesus probably ate no prohibited foods --- custom and ordinary courtesy to a great religious teacher would take care of that --- but he did run the constant risk of ceremonial defilement and of eating untithed foods" (B. H. Branscomb, Jesus and the Law of Moses, p. 135). Thus, He ignored the Pharisaic principle that "one does not stay as guest with an Am-Haarez" (Mish. Dem. 2.2-3, Tos. Dem. 2.2) and probably broke the Rabbinic rulings in eating of untithed food in the house of an Am-haarez (Tos. Dem. 2.2), allowing His disciples to buy food in a Samaritan village (Mish. Dem. 2.3), and, since "the daughters of the Samaritans are menstruants from their cradle" (Mish. Nid. 4.1), talking with the Samaritan woman and drinking from her vessel (Mish. Kel. 1.1ff.). Cf. D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 373-374.

²E.g., the Sabbath may be broken for the rite of circumcision, "as the essence of the covenant lay in the performance of the ceremony on the eighth day" (H. Loewe, "Pharisaism," Judaism and Christianity, Vol. I, ed. W. O. E. Oesterley, p. 169); and defensive warfare takes precedence over the observance of the Sabbath (Antiq. XII. 6. 2; XIII. 1. 3; XIV. 4. 2-3; War I. 7. 3).

³Note Jesus' healings on the Sabbath (Mk. 3.1-6, par.; Lk. 13. 10-17; Lk. 14.1-6; Jn. 5.1ff.; Jn. 7.23; Jn. 9.1ff.) and the plucking of the grain (Mk. 2.23-28, par.).

⁴Mk. 2.18-20, par.

⁵T. W. Manson, "Jesus, Paul, and the Law," Judaism and Christianity, Vol. III, ed. E. I. J. Rosenthal, p. 129.

Still there is a fourth point to be noted, for in setting Himself over the Law Jesus anticipated its change. While His interest and action in reaching the sinner hinted at some type of alteration, His speech likewise foreshadowed a change. Mk. 7.14-23 is the clearest example of an enigmatic statement which was only later understood. Here Jesus is recorded as saying: "There is nothing from without the man that going into him can defile him; but the things which proceed out of the man are those that defile the man." The account then tells how the disciples at the time were perplexed at such a saying. The fact that it was only later understood by the early church and considered to be a strong anticipatory hint regarding the abrogation of the food laws is indicated by the interjection of the Gospel writer: καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα --- "making clean all foods."¹ There is a new spirit in Jesus' teaching which suggests something entirely new. "He bids men come to Him, learn of Him, listen to Him, obey Him, as if all other authority was at an end."² "He speaks of His own approaching death as if it had some strange and unique importance in the dealings of God with men."³ He

¹Mk. 7.19. There is no real reason, apart from theological grounds, for considering this exclamation as a gloss or a mis-translation. Cf. B. H. Branscomb, Jesus and the Law of Moses, p. 90, n. 36, for a sane evaluation of the problem.

²W. F. Lofthouse, "The Old Testament and Christianity," Record and Revelation, ed. H. W. Robinson, p. 467.

³Ibid., p. 466.

speaks of new cloth being quite incompatible with old,¹ new wine being unable to be contained by old skins,² "the law and the prophets" being until John the Baptist,³ the new covenant in His blood,⁴ "my yoke"⁵ and "my words."⁶ Thus, though Jesus Himself spoke of His purpose as being to establish the Law and to fulfil it, He none the less considered His Person and work to be of a more vital nature than the Law --- and on this basis anticipated its alteration.

This, then, is what Paul learned of Jesus and the Law through the accounts mediated by the early church: that Jesus established the Law, fulfilled it and --- almost paradoxically it might seem --- anticipated its change.

The Damascus encounter. --- But it was not the Jewish expectation or any contemplation of the Jesus of history which was the vital and formative element in Paul's thought regarding the Law. The expectation of Judaism was indeed a pre-stage to and the

¹Mk. 2.21, par.

²Mk. 2.22, par. W. L. Knox says of these two verses: "The thought of the Gospel as a revolutionary novelty appears to belong to the earliest stratum of the N.T." (St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles," p. 98).

³Matt. 11.13, Lk. 16.16.

⁴Accepting the majority reading in Lk. 22.20 and that of D and C in Matt. 26.28. Cf. Paul's understanding of Jesus' words at this point in I Cor. 11.25; also James Denney's defence of the phrase "new covenant" as being on the lips of Jesus, The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation, p. 140.

⁵Matt. 11.29-30, thus implying "a special 'yoke' in contrast to that of the Law as understood" (A. D. Nock, St. Paul, p. 39, n. 1). See, e.g., Ps. Sol. 7.8 and Baruch 41.3 for the phrase "yoke of the law" in its Jewish context.

⁶Mk. 13.31, par.

anticipation of Jesus was instructive for that thought, but the "conversion experience was far and away the most vital and formative influence of Paul's life."¹ "Das paulinische Nein zum Gesetz entstammt seinem Ja zu dem in Jesus Christus Geschehenen, nicht einer rationalen Kritik oder missionarischen Taktik."² Like the first disciples, who began from their Easter experience and whose thought was both a recollection and an anticipation from the standpoint of that historical and existential occasion, Paul looked back on his former hopes and the ministry of Jesus in the light of the Christ-encounter. While it is so that portions of his thought have a Rabbinic tone, a prophetic ring and/or carry overtones of the teaching of Jesus and the early church, yet the creative element of his doctrine was born beside the Damascus road. For him, 'futuristic eschatology' had become to a large extent 'realised eschatology',³ the straining of the ancient faith had suddenly given way to fulfilment, 'D-Day' had arrived with its assured promise of 'V-Day'.⁴ While previous and received ideas helped him to clarify and express his thought, the vital element in his Christian thinking must be acknowledged to be "through revelation of Jesus Christ."⁵

¹J. S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, p. 82.

²W. Gutbrod, "νόμος," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel, Vol. IV, p. 1067.

³C. H. Dodd's terminology; see The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments, p. 85 and passim.

⁴O. Cullmann's analogy; see Christ and Time, pp. 84-85, passim.

⁵Gal. 1.12.

A. Schweitzer has accused those who take the Damascus encounter as formative in Paul's life and thought of claiming "a specially favourable position" and escaping the tasks of careful scholarship by retreating into an area "which of course eludes analysis."¹ And yet, whether we explain that experience as a purely psychological experience through which God worked² or a prophetic revelation comparable to that of the prophets of old,³ we must admit that Paul himself believed that he had truly seen the Lord⁴ and that he believed this experience to have been the determinative factor in his whole life. If we are to understand the apostle, we must at least seriously consider that which he explicitly states was formative in his experience before casting it aside for an alternative. While the thought of a revelational quality in the meeting of the Christ with His apostle somewhat irks our modern naturalistic orientation, the advocates of Greek influence as dominant in Paul, the school of psychological interpretation, and the school of 'consistent eschatology' have failed to advance a convincing alternative.⁵ We

¹A. Schweitzer, Paul and his Interpreters, p. 71.

²As, e.g., J. Weiss, Paul and Jesus, pp. 28-37; W. L. Knox, St. Paul, pp. 37-38.

³As, e.g., J. G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, pp. 60-68; J. Munck, Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte, pp. 22-25.

⁴I Cor. 9.1. Cf. James Denney, I Corinthians (E.G.T.), Vol. II, p. 845, on the use of ἐδραμα.

⁵In regard to 'the psychological school', note W. G. Kümmel's insistence that in view of its inadequacies we must take Paul's statements seriously (Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus, pp. 139-160); regarding 'the consistent eschatology' view, note the criticism of J. Weiss by O. Michel (Paulus und seine Bibel, pp. 31-33) and that of Schweitzer by O. Cullmann (Christ and Time, p. 85) and W. D. Davies (Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 290).

are brought back to Paul's assertion, and must take it seriously if we are to understand his thought aright.

Christ the End of the Law

Paul's teaching regarding the Law is concisely expressed in Rom. 10.4: τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστὸς εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι . In this statement, the apostle is not thinking primarily of the general qualitative idea of law or even of the principle of legality; though, of course, such concepts are never unrelated to the main point of his thought at this point. Rather, the context shows that here he is specifically considering the Mosaic law and declaring that it has been completed and, thus, abrogated by Christ on a specific level. It is with that thought of the Law's completion and abrogation on a specific level that we must deal in the following pages.

The abrogation of the Law εἰς δικαιοσύνην . -- There is one phrase in this passage which has been grossly ignored. Since it has not fitted in with theology's misconception that Paul made a distinction between the moral and the ceremonial aspects of the Law, viewing the latter as fulfilled and ended but the former as continuing, it has been treated as though it were of no real pertinence in understanding the apostle's doctrine of law. But in reality, the expression εἰς δικαιοσύνην serves to unlock Paul's thought. While he could speak of the moral and ceremonial aspects of the Law separately, there is no suggestion that he viewed them as possessing separate validity or able to be actually separated. There is no reason to doubt that he, as did Judaism, viewed the Law as one

indivisible whole. And yet there are many indications that he did distinguish between the two purposes of the Law in the Old Covenant; i.e. between the Law as the standard and judgment of God and the Law as contractual obligation.¹ It is this latter purpose that the apostle has in mind when he says: Christ is the end of the Law "unto righteousness" (A.S.V.) or "for righteousness" (A.V.).²

Paul makes much of the change that has taken place in the purpose of the Law with the coming of Christ in such contrasts as "before" (πρὸ δέ) and "but now" (νυνὶ δέ).³ Before, Israel had been "kept under" the contractual obligation of the Law; "but now" we are discharged from that contractual obligation which held us captive⁴ for righteousness is "no longer" (οὐκέτι) to be associated with works⁵ in that God has done something new in manifesting His righteousness "apart from the law" (χωρὶς νόμου).⁶ Formerly such righteousness had

¹C. A. A. Scott has noted this same distinction of purpose in Paul's view of the Law by the terms "the contents of the Law" and "the Law as a system" (Christianity According to St. Paul, p. 42), the latter being terminated in Christ. His opening words on this subject are pertinent: "It is . . . important to observe in what sense Paul understood that Christ was the end of the Law, and of law --- in what sense it had ceased to function in the case of believers. It is mainly on a misapprehension of this that the charges of inconsistency rest which have been freely and frequently levelled at the Apostle" (ibid., p. 41).

²Or, as H. A. A. Kennedy translates it, "with a view to righteousness" (The Theology of the Epistles, p. 129). In shuffling this phrase to the end of the sentence, R.S.V. and Moffatt's translation have broken the connection between νόμου and εἰς δικαιοσύνην and thus lost the significance of Paul's statement.

³E.g., Gal. 3.23, πρὸ δέ; Rom. 3.21, 7.6, νυνὶ δέ; and Rom. 16.26, Col. 1.26, δὲ νῦν and νῦν δέ.

⁴Rom. 7.6. ⁵Rom. 11.6. ⁶Rom. 3.21.

been kept hidden, "but now" it has been disclosed to His saints.¹ The apostle pictures that which was preparatory as being completed by that which was anticipated,² that which was meant to be temporary being set aside for that which is lasting,³ that which was mediated being resolved into that which is immediate.⁴ The Law in its contractual obligation --- i.e. as εἰς δικαιοσύνην --- has been abrogated.

¹Rom. 16.26, Col. 1.26, Eph. 3.5.

²Gal. 3.23-25: ὥστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν, ἐλθοῦσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν ἔσμεν (vvs. 24, 25); cf. Gal. 4.1-7.

³Gal. 3.19a: "It was added, until (προστέθη, ἄχρις)." Note also Paul's contrast between the fading and the permanent in II Cor. 3.7-13.

⁴Gal. 3.19b: διαταγὴς δι' ἀγγέλων, ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. In Deut. 33.2 (LXX), Ps. 68.17, Antiq. XV. 5. 3, Jubilees 1,27ff., Acts 7.38, 53, Heb. 2.2 and many Talmudic passages, the presence of angels in the giving of the Law is regarded as an indication of the Law's excellence (cf. H. St. J. Thackeray, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, pp. 161-163, J. B. Lightfoot, Epistle to the Galatians, p. 145, Str.-Bil., Vol. III, p. 556). But in the light of God's immediate revelation in Jesus Christ, Paul uses this tradition of angelic mediation to depreciate the Law; cf. Gal. 4.1-11 and Col. 2.8-23. Whatever opposition to the mediation of the Law by angels appears in the Talmud must be explained as a later reaction to this Pauline depreciation (cf. D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 325-326; W. D. Davies, "A Note on Josephus, Antiquities 15:136," H.T.R., Vol. XLVII, No. 3, July 1954, p. 140, n.).

It has died,¹ been "torn down."² Not because it has evolved into something new,³ but because God has established a new covenant⁴ wherein "commandments" and "ordinances" (τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν) are ended⁵ and that distinction between Israel under contract and the Gentiles without the covenant is abrogated.⁶ It is because

¹Most commentators on Rom. 7.1-6 have argued that "the illustration is not happy, for the law does not die," but that Paul's general message of Christian freedom from the Law is clear in any case (W. Manson, "Notes on the Argument of Romans (Chapters 1-8)," New Testament Essays, ed. A. J. B. Higgins, pp. 160-161). The confusion has been attributed to the apostle's lack of "the gift for sustained illustration of ideas through concrete images" (C. H. Dodd, Romans, M.N.T.C., p. 103) or a verbal confusion that has entered as a result of Paul's dictation (C. Gore, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, Vol. I, p. 240). Bo Reicke, however, has pointed out that instead of Paul having one idea in mind which he blunderingly expresses in two ways, "two different motifs become blended in the argument": the Law that has died to the Christian and the Christian who has died to the Law ("The Law and this World according to Paul," J.B.L., Vol. LXX, Pt. IV, Dec. 1951, p. 267). Reicke adds: "When the Law in the first figure is said to be dead, it is, in the context of the history of redemption, precisely the same as that the sinful body is dead" (ibid., p. 267). Luther saw this dual insistence in Paul, and exclaimed: "The law therefore is bound, dead and crucified unto me, and I again am bound, dead and crucified unto it" (Galatians, p. 167 on Gal. 2.20).

²Gal. 2.18. Luther said regarding the Mosaic law: "For Christ, toward whom this law was directed, has clean abolished it by His Passion and Resurrection; He slew it and buried it forever, rent the veil of the Temple in twain, and then broke and destroyed Jerusalem, with priesthood, principedom, law, and everything. ("On the Councils and the Churches," Works of Martin Luther, Vol. V, trans. C. M. Jacobs, p. 184).

³R. Bultmann: "The modern theory of evolution is far from his thoughts" ("Christ the End of the Law," Essays, p. 36). A. Harnack: For Paul, "no part of the law has been depreciated in value by any noiseless, disintegrating influence of time or circumstance; on the contrary, the law remained valid and operative in all its provisions. It could not be abrogated save by him who had ordained it --- i.e., by God himself. Nor could even God abolish it save by affirming at the same time its rights --- i.e., he must abolish it just by providing for its fulfilment. And this was what actually took place. By the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, God's Son, upon the cross, the law was at once fulfilled and abolished" (The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, Vol. I, p. 54).

⁴I Cor. 11.25, II Cor. 3.6. ⁵Eph. 2.15. ⁶Eph. 2.11-18.

Christ in His Person and work has terminated the contractual purpose of the Law that Paul expected his placarding (προγράψω) of Christ Jesus to settle once and for all this question of whether righteousness in the New Covenant is διὰ νόμου or ἐν Χριστῷ.¹ "It is finished"² is just as much a cry of Paul as of Christ.

And yet, we must be careful to note, in all of the Pauline expressions there is no hint that the Law as the standard and judgment of God is also ended. In fact, his use of the Law in that manner in Rom. 2 argues against such a view. It is on a specific level, i.e., as the expression of the contractual obligation instituted in the Old Covenant and thus in its direct association with righteousness, that the Law had come to its complete fulfilment and terminus. Not that it has ceased as the judgment of God to reveal sin and human rebellion to the ungodly and to the Christian who would presume upon his privileged position; nor that its obligations have been met, and thus ended for any, except by Christ and for those who are His. It is as Luther has expressed it:

Not that the law is utterly taken away: nay, it remaineth, liveth, and reigneth still in the wicked. But the godly man is dead unto the law like as he is dead unto sin, the devil, death, and hell: which notwithstanding do still remain, and the world with all the wicked shall still abide in them.³

¹Gal. 3.1.

²Jn. 19.30. Cf. Jn. 4.34, 17.4; Rom. 10.4; Gal. 3.13.

³M. Luther, Galatians, p. 159 on Gal. 2.19. G. Bornkamm argues that as there is a new creation in Christ without the old passing away, so there is a new law in Christ freeing us from the old law without the old passing away; thus, "wie es für die Schöpfung gilt, so auch für das Gesetz" (Gesetz und Schöpfung im Neuen Testament, p. 26).

The abrogation of the Law because fulfilled by Christ. --

Basic to Paul's teaching regarding the abrogation of the Law in its contractual purpose, and thus in its association with righteousness, is his realisation that the antagonism between God and man has been removed and the contractual obligation of the Law has been fulfilled by Christ. Jesus Christ in His death and in His life, in His sacrifice and in His obedience, has taken both the curse and the requirements of the Law unto Himself; and in so doing, He has abrogated both by His act and His faithfulness.

Certainly the sacrifice of Christ as redeeming from the curse of the Law and as reconciling to the Father is prominent in the apostle's thoughts.¹ In Galatians, it is that Christ Himself came under (ὑπό) the Law² in order to redeem those who were under (ὑπό) the Law³ --- and thus under (ὑπό) a curse⁴ --- from (ἐκ) the curse of the Law⁵ by becoming a curse for (ὑπέρ) us.⁶ In Colossians, Christ has "cancelled the bond which stood against us . . . nailing it to the cross"⁷ and has reconciled the believer to God "in the body of his flesh through death."⁸ And the other Pauline letters contain

¹Cf. J. Denney's excellent treatment of the centrality of the sacrifice of Christ in the Gospel message, The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation, pp. 233-285.

²Gal. 4.4. ³Gal. 4.5. ⁴Gal. 3.10. ⁵Gal. 3.13.

⁶Gal. 3.13. Cf. F. C. Baur, Paul, His Life and Works, Vol. II, pp. 153-156, for an early emphasis upon the centrality of the sacrifice of Christ stressing especially the preposition ὑπέρ.

⁷Col. 2.14. ⁸Col. 1.22.

similar expressions.¹ But the act of Calvary is not the whole story. Paul does not proclaim a salvation that only wipes out the curse of the Law, presenting the individual to God as neutral. He insists that Christ has also fulfilled the legal demands of the contractual obligation established in the Old Covenant, thus presenting before the Father a positive righteousness for all of those who are 'in Him'.

The thought of the obedience of Christ, while included in that of the sacrifice of Christ,² is not exhausted in the consideration of that act. The declared purpose of Jesus included a fulfilling of the Law,³ and Paul picks up that theme in Rom. 5.18-19 in contrasting the disobedience of Adam with the obedience of Christ. Not only was it that "one man's trespass" was countered by "one man's act," but "one man's disobedience" was rectified by "one man's obedience." Christ stood in the place of humble submission and complete obedience to the Law, as Adam and all his descendants had not done. "He was the only one who completely and genuinely stood in that place; He was the Jew."⁴ Likewise, Paul's thought seems to run along this line in his use of *κρίσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. The phrase *διὰ κρίσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* has always been a 'thorn in the flesh' for the interpreter. The generally accepted view is that it is an objective genitive,

¹E.g., Rom. 3.24, 4.25, 5.6-10; I Cor. 5.7; Eph. 1.7, 2.13.

²E.g., "obedient unto death, even the death of a cross" (Phil. 2.8).

³Supra, pp. 185-186.

⁴K. Barth, Christ and Adam, p. 33.

meaning "through faith in Jesus Christ."¹ Some have considered it to be a subjective genitive, "through the faith of Jesus Christ."² Others insist that it is impossible in this case to separate the objective from the subjective; that righteousness and justification must always be by both "the faith of Jesus Christ" and "faith in Jesus Christ." Thus Deissmann has insisted that a new use of the genitive must be designated in this case: "the 'genitive of fellowship' or the 'mystical genitive'."³ And yet, in the increasing consciousness that while the apostle spoke and wrote Greek his words were "always coloured by their Hebrew association,"⁴ exegetes are beginning to find Paul's use of πίστις to be more influenced by the Hebrew אֱמוּנָה than was previously thought. A. G. Hebert⁵ argues that just as אֱמוּנָה meant both 'faithfulness' and 'faith', so Paul used "the one word 'pistis' for the two things, Divine faithfulness and human faith."⁶ He points out that the Hebrew idea of 'faithfulness' often emerges in the LXX use of πίστις,⁷ and that

¹E.g., W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, Romans (I.C.C.), p. 83.

²E.g., J. Haussleiter, Der Glaube Jesu Christi und der christliche Glaube, Leipzig, 1891.

³A. Deissmann, Paul, pp. 162-163, and The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, pp. 177-178. Cf. J. S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, pp. 182-183.

⁴As C. H. Dodd says regarding δικαιοσύνη, δίκαιος and δικαιοσύνη in the New Testament, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 57.

⁵A. G. Hebert, "'Faithfulness' and 'Faith'," Theology, Vol. LVIII, No. 424 (Oct., 1955), pp. 373-379.

⁶Ibid., p. 376.

⁷E.g., Ps. 36.5-7, Isa. 28.16, Hab. 2.4.

commentators are agreed that Paul and other New Testament writers used the word elsewhere in this Hebrew sense.¹ He also notes that in three passages where διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is used, the following phrase "to all who believe" is simply redundant if the objective genitive interpretation of "through faith in Jesus Christ" is accepted.² Thus he suggests that this difficult expression πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ should be translated "the faithfulness of Jesus Christ," understanding that expression to mean "God's faithfulness revealed to him."³ K. Barth and T. F. Torrance have likewise interpreted the expression as referring to divine faithfulness; Barth translating it "God's faithfulness in Jesus Christ"⁴ and Torrance as "the faithfulness of Jesus Christ."⁵ Considering Paul's background, his other uses of πίστις in this sense, and the redundant nature of three passages if this position is not accepted, the translation "the faithfulness of Jesus Christ" for certain occurrences of this phrase is most convincing. There is no real reason for interpreting it as "God's faithfulness revealed to Jesus Christ" or

¹Rom. 3.3: τὴν πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ ; I Cor. 1.9, 10.13: πιστὸς ὁ θεός ; I Thess. 5.24: πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς ; II Thess. 3.3: πιστὸς δὲ ἔστιν ὁ κύριος . Cf. Heb. 2.17, 3.2; I Jn. 1.9; Rev. 1.5, 3.14, 19.11.

²Rom. 3.22: εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστευόντας ; Gal. 3.22: τοῖς πιστευούσιν ; and Phil. 3.9: ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει .

³A. G. Hebert, "'Faithfulness' and 'Faith'," Theology, Vol. LVIII, No. 424 (Oct., 1955), p. 373.

⁴K. Barth, The Epistle to the Romans, p. 96.

⁵T. F. Torrance, "One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith," E.T., Vol. LXVIII, No. 4 (Jan., 1957), pp. 111-114.

"in Jesus Christ." The Christology of Paul makes the expression "the faithfulness of Jesus Christ" most natural.

That is not to say that in every Pauline use of πίστις the idea of faithfulness is to be understood. Certainly πίστις and πιστεύω often carry the idea of human faith, trust and committal.¹ But it is to advocate that in the following passages the expression πίστewς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is best understood as "the faithfulness of Jesus Christ":

- 1.) Rom. 3.22 --- "The righteousness of God (is manifested) διὰ πίστewς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ to all who believe."
- 2.) Gal. 2.16 --- "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but διὰ πίστewς Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ in order to be justified ἐκ πίστewς Χριστοῦ."
- 3.) Gal. 3.22 --- "The scripture has consigned all things under sin in order that the promise ἐκ πίστewς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ might be given to those who believe."
- 4.) Phil. 3.9 --- ". . . not having my own righteousness which is of the law but that which is διὰ πίστewς Χριστοῦ, the righteousness of God which depends upon faith."
- 5.) Eph. 3.12 --- "The eternal purpose of God has been realised in Christ Jesus our Lord "in whom we have boldness and confidence of access διὰ τῆς πίστewς αὐτοῦ."

This may also be the idea behind the interjection of II Tim. 3.15:

διὰ πίστewς τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ .

¹E.g., Rom. 4.14, 16; I Cor. 15.14, 17; II Cor. 1.24. The context of Gal. 3.11 indicates that Paul understood the ἐκ πίστewς of Hab. 2.4 to refer to human trust and reliance, not human faithfulness or even the divine faithfulness as implied in the LXX reading of ἐκ πίστewς μου. Thus, the "through faith" of the R.S.V. is a fitting translation in Rom. 1.17 and Gal. 3.11.

Thus in II Cor. 1.20 Paul presents Christ as not only the 'Yes' from God, but also as our 'Amen' to God. T. F. Torrance has well expressed it in saying: "Jesus Christ is thus not only the incarnation of the Divine 'pistis', but He is the embodiment and actualization of man's 'pistis' in covenant with God. He is not only the Righteousness of God, but the embodiment and actualization of our human righteousness before God."¹ It is the faithfulness and obedience of Christ to the contractual obligation of the Law in His life and His death, as well as His sacrifice in the incarnation and Calvary experience, that is proclaimed as perfectly executed in the triumphant cry "It is finished." It is through both the sacrifice and the obedience of Christ that reconciliation has been made possible; both through His death and His life.² To Him (and to His) have all the promises been made,³ by Him have all the conditions been met, and in Him lies the fulfilment of the hopes and strivings of Israel. In the

¹T. F. Torrance, "One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith," E.T., Vol. LXVIII, No. 4 (Jan., 1957), pp. 113.

²Rom. 5.10: "If . . . we were reconciled to God through the death of his son, much more . . . shall we be saved in his life." 'His life' certainly refers to 'His risen life' (as K. Barth insists, Christ and Adam, p. 2), but we need not consider its reference to be exclusively to such. Paul's statement seems to be broader than that, including: (1) His earthly life of obedience, (2) His risen life of presenting that obedience to the Father on behalf of the believer, and (3) His risen life of making actual that obedience in the earthly life of every believer.

³The promises were made to Abraham's seed, i.e., to Christ (Gal. 3.16) and those that are Christ's (Gal. 3.29); cf. Gal. 3.22. See, C. A. A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, pp. 154-155, regarding the application of the concept of solidarity at this point.

faithfulness of Christ we find

the supreme difference between the Old Testament and the New Testament. Like the Old Testament, the New Testament also lays emphasis upon the faithfulness of God, and requires from man a corresponding faithfulness. But in the gospel the steadfast faithfulness of God has achieved its end in righteousness and truth in Jesus Christ, for in Him it has been actualized as Truth, and is fulfilled in our midst.¹

That which the contractual obligation of the Law demanded, Christ has fulfilled. He stood for mankind in offering the perfect righteousness, so that all who stand in Him stand before the Father not in their own righteousness but as robed in His righteousness. "It is the voice of God, no less than that of the sinner, which says, 'Thou, O Christ, art all I want; more than all in Thee I find.'"² And it is because both in His sacrifice He redeemed from the curse of the Law and in His perfect obedience He fulfilled the obligation of the Law that Paul can say "Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness." The sacrifice of Christ and the obedience of Christ are corollaries which can never truly be separated.

The abrogation of the Law παντι τῷ πιστευοντι . -- But there is still another element in that key expression of Rom. 10.4 which must be noted. Not only is the statement Christologically orientated,

¹T. F. Torrance, "One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith," E.T., Vol. LXVIII, No. 4 (Jan., 1957), p. 113.

²J. Denney, The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation, pp. 162, 235 and 301.

but Paul also asserts the element of conditional application. He speaks in Rom. 3.22 of "the righteousness of God" which has been manifested "through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ," and adds εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας . In Gal. 3.22 it is that "the promise" which is "derived from the faithfulness of Jesus Christ" is to be given τοῖς πιστεύουσιν . Phil. 3.9 speaks of "the righteousness of God" which is "through the faithfulness of Christ" and which (depends) ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει . And so, Paul says in Rom. 10.4 that "Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι."

As James Denney has so well put it:

The mere existence of Christ does not constitute the new humanity. It is only constituted as men in faith freely identify themselves with Him.¹

And again:

To emphasize the freeness of forgiveness is not to deny that it has other characteristics. It is not unconditional. God does not forgive the impenitent, who do not wish nor ask to be forgiven. He cannot do so, for forgiveness, like all spiritual things, cannot be given unless it is taken, and it can only be taken by a penitent and surrendered soul.²

Thus Rom. 10.4 "must not be construed as an ordinary historical judgment, to the effect that the law ceased to function at a given point in time. The statement about the τέλος of the law applies only to those who have through Christ been made sharers in the righteousness of the law. Otherwise, outside of the realm of faith, the law still rules."³

¹Ibid., p. 305. ²Ibid., pp. 132-133.

³A. Nygren, Commentary on Romans, p. 380.

Righteousness in the New Covenant

Paul's teaching regarding legality is thus summed up in two considerations:

1.) His agreement with prophetic nomism that legalism, i.e. the endeavour of 'I of myself' to please God, is doomed to failure because of the nature of man.

2.) His insistence that even prophetic nomism, i.e. that religious outlook which gave the priority to faith but also insisted upon fidelity to prescribed ordinances in fulfilment of the contractual obligation of the Law, has lost its validity because of the presence and work of Christ.

The thought of Paul indeed goes beyond that of the canonical prophets, non-canonical pneumatics, and even beyond the explicit teaching of Jesus. But it is based upon and in direct succession to the prophetic spirit and the intention and work of Christ. While the prophets and pneumatics of the Old Covenant did advocate a reacting nomism, they also denounced a merely acting legalism and anticipated a future time when God's relationship with man would take on a more intimate character. While Jesus' explicit utterances cannot be shown to go further than likewise denouncing a mere legalism and emphasising the element of trust in the fulfilment of the contractual relationship, there is in His words and attitudes the veiled foreshadowing of and in His sacrifice and obedience the basis for the later decisive break with the Law.¹ The maxim 'ex nihilo nihil fit'

¹Cf. J. S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, pp. 291-293; J.-L. Leuba, "Law: N. T.," Vocabulary of the Bible, ed. J.-J. von Allmen, pp. 228-230.

remains true, for, as Klausner insisted, "had not Jesus' teaching contained a kernel of opposition to Judaism, Paul could never in the name of Jesus have set aside the ceremonial laws, and broken through the barriers of national Judaism. There can be no doubt that in Jesus Paul found justifying support."¹ But, despite the importance of the note of anticipation in the manner and instruction of his Lord, it was the supreme act of sacrifice and obedience on the cross which "inevitably put the teaching into a secondary place. The deed of Jesus was mightier than His word."² In that 'the finished work of Christ' in sacrifice and obedience was the foundation stone upon which the apostle built his thought regarding legality and righteousness in the New Covenant, the dictum is true: "St. Paul begins where the earthly life of Jesus ends."³ It is in view of the Person and work of Christ that Paul rejected nomism as well as legalism, both being now classed as forms of legality; "for in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any avail, but faith working through love."⁴ It is 'in Him' that "we have redemption"⁵ and "have come to fullness of life."⁶

¹J. Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 369; cf. pp. 275-276, 369-371.

²A. S. Peake, The Quintessence of Paulinism, p. 12.

³Cf. W. Sanday, "Paul," H.D.C.G., Vol. II, p. 891.

⁴Gal. 5.6. In the light of Christ's presence, "Paulus nennt auch den Kult der Juden einen Dienst der $\sigma\lambda\upsilon\chi\eta$ " (G. Bornkamm, Gesetz und Schöpfung im Neuen Testament, p. 18).

⁵Eph. 1.7. ⁶Col. 2.10.

The believer in the New Covenant ceases to regard righteousness in terms of 'law' at all. He is "neither condemned nor justified by it. He hopes for nothing from the law, and fears nothing. For him the law is completely eliminated, as far as righteousness and freedom, condemnation and the wrath of God are concerned."¹ He has found that "the gospel of Christ is the very righteousness of God."² Or, as Luther has expressed it, that "no external thing, whatsoever it be, has any influence whatever in producing Christian righteousness or liberty";³ "one thing and one only is necessary for Christian life, righteousness and liberty. That one thing is the most holy Word of God, the Gospel of Christ."⁴

Since, therefore, Christ has brought to an end the possibility of a valid nomistic piety, Jewish nomism now being relegated to the position of one of "the elements of the world" (τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου),⁵

¹A. Nygren, Commentary on Romans, pp. 310-311.

²Ibid., p. 303.

³M. Luther, "A Treatise on Christian Liberty," Works of Martin Luther, Vol. II, trans. W. A. Lambert, p. 313.

⁴Ibid., p. 314.

⁵Whether στοιχεῖα refers to (1) rudimentary instruction, (2) the physical elements of the earth and, especially, the heavenly bodies, (3) the spirits over these physical elements and heavenly bodies, or (4) the angels that stood as executors of the Law, the intimate association of the Law with the στοιχεῖα (both are likened to guardians, Gal. 3.24 cf. Gal. 4.2-3; both stand in contrast to Christ, Gal. 3.1ff. cf. Col. 2.8; we have died to both, Rom. 7.4-6 cf. Col. 2.20; we were slaves to both, Gal. 4.21-31 cf. Gal. 4.3, 9) "suggests that Paul has placed both Judaism and paganism side by side among the elemental spirits" (Bo Reicke, "The Law and This World According to Paul," J.B.L., Vol. LXX, Pt. IV, Dec. 1951, p. 273).

any return to the Law for either 'justification' or 'sanctification' is a return to "the weak and beggarly elements" (τὰ ἄσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα)¹ and a renunciation of Christ.² It is to assert that the sacrifice and obedience of Christ are not sufficient, but are only the first step to or supplementary in the attainment of righteousness. But as righteousness in the New Covenant is not gained by the Law, neither is it aided or even necessarily to be expressed by the forms of the Law. The illustration of Luther at this point is entirely within the Pauline framework of thought: He who would gain righteousness by faith and works is as "the dog who runs along a stream with a piece of meat in his mouth, and, deceived by the reflection of the meat in the water, opens his mouth to snap at it, and so loses both the meat and the reflection."³

In recognising that Paul decries any thought of legality as being associated with righteousness in the New Covenant, we have touched only briefly on his insistence that true righteousness, and thus liberty, is based solely in Christ and subject only to Christ. This more positive aspect of righteousness and the concept of Christian liberty must be dealt with in the following chapter.

¹Gal. 4.9.

²Gal. 5.4.

³M. Luther, "A Treatise on Christian Liberty," Works of Martin Luther, Vol. II, trans. W. A. Lambert, p. 325.

CHAPTER IV

PAUL AND LIBERTY

It is truly said that the term 'liberty' is "so porous that there is little interpretation that it seems able to resist."¹ Moralists, religionists and politicians throughout the course of human history have embraced the concept; and in the course of its wide usage, the idea has become encrusted with a varying assortment of associations and connotations. Thus, it cannot be said that there is a 'standard' definition which truly represents the term in all of its contexts and which we can apply 'a priori' to it in understanding Paul's thought. Nor may we assume that in comprehending the apostle's teaching regarding legality we can merely reverse the affirmations of a nomistic position to their negatives and the negatives to positives, and, by contrast, thus understand his teaching regarding liberty; for Paul does not so much balance the concepts of legality and liberty against each other as does he measure them both by Christ. His teaching regarding the abrogation of the Law and his teaching regarding Christian liberty are as two spokes radiating from a central hub, and as spokes in a wheel they do definitely stand apart --- though not necessarily at 180 degree angles to each other. It is

¹I. Berlin, Two Concepts of Liberty, p. 6.

thus incumbent upon us to study Paul's teaching regarding liberty as well as that of legality if we are to understand his thought and action.

Background and Parallels to Paul's Thought

The apostle's teaching concerning liberty not only has a context, it also has a background in his Jewish heritage and many parallels in Greek thought. It is to these factors that we would turn first.

Jewish Background

It is usually assumed that "Freiheit ist eine abendländische Idee."¹ Thus many treatments of the subject entirely omit any reference to its appearance in the Old Testament or Judaism.² And yet, while it is true that the idea of liberty often became the consuming passion in the west, it is not entirely absent from Judaic thought.

In the Jewish literature there are few, if any, formal discussions of the subject; and where the thought occurs on a personal level it is always in a nomistic context.³ And yet the Hebrews knew their God to be the God who sets His people free: He released them from the bondage in Egypt that they might be in bondage to none but Himself;⁴ He lifted

¹H. Schlier, "Über das vollkommene Gesetz der Freiheit," Festschrift Rudolf Bultmann, p. 190. Cf. J. Weiss, Christliche Freiheit, pp. 7-11.

²E.g., H. Schlier "Über das vollkommene Gesetz der Freiheit," Festschrift Rudolf Bultmann, pp. 190-202, and "ἐλευθερία" Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel, Vol II, pp. 484-500.

³E.g., Psalm 119.44-45: "I will keep thy law continually, for ever and ever; and I shall walk at liberty, for I have sought thy precepts." Mish. Aboth 6.2: "'And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven (haruth) upon the tables.' Read not 'haruth' but 'heruth' (freedom), for thou findest no freeman excepting him that occupies himself in the study of the law; and he that occupies himself in the study of the Law shall be exalted."

b. Ber. 5a, where it is asserted that the study of the Torah protects from the influence of demons, releases one from suffering and gains forgiveness of sins.

⁴Lev. 25.39-46.

foreign subjugations when the people turned unto Him;¹ He delivered from Babylonian captivity;² He instituted the Jubilee (ἀφεσῶς, LXX) for them, in which time they were to "proclaim liberty (ἀφεσῶς, LXX) throughout the land to all its inhabitants";³ and He promised a day when His Servant would "proclaim liberty (ἀφεσῶς, LXX) to the captives."⁴ He is the God who forgives and frees. It was this conviction of true freedom as being theocentric which drove the nomistic extremists of Qumran into seclusion⁵ and the nationalistic extremists of Zealotism into action.⁶ And it is this realisation that stands as bedrock to all of Paul's thought regarding Christian liberty. The apostle simply could not conceive of a liberty which was not derived from God and which did not centre in God. Whatever Christian convictions went into the foundation and structure of his thought, and whatever Greek terms and ideas embellish his theology, the Jewish conviction that freedom must be theocentric if it is to be freedom at all lies as the undergirding supporting the whole.

Greek Parallels

When we turn to the Greek thought of Paul's day, we find that there are many points where the apostle and Stoicism are in seeming

¹Cf. The Book of Judges.

²Cf. Ezra 9.9, Hag. 2.4-5, Zech. 1.16-17. ³Lev. 25.10.

⁴Isa. 61.1. Paul uses ἀφεσῶς to mean forgiveness; see Acts 13.38, 26.18; Eph. 1.7; Col. 1.14.

⁵A. Dupont-Sommer: "How eloquently the ideas of liberty, equality, and fraternity are proclaimed in this religious society" (The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes, p. 79).

⁶Josephus: The Zealots showed "an unconquerable love of liberty which did not allow them to acknowledge anyone except God as their Lord and master" (Antiq. XVIII. 1. 6).

agreement. Both spoke of liberty in the personal sense. Both taught that liberty was gained by surrender within a context of obedience, and that it had as its consequence a true self-realisation and a real victory over circumstances --- even death. Stoicism made this quest for liberty central. In fact, to judge from the available records, Epictetus, the leading advocate of liberty in Stoicism, used the word about four times as much as did Christianity's great freedom advocate, Paul. W.A. Oldfather points out that "the words 'free' (adjective and verb) and 'freedom' appear some 130 times in Epictetus,"¹ while Paul used the noun *ἐλευθερία*, with its adjective and verb, only 29 times.² Some have suggested on the basis of this relation of frequency that "Epictetus knew more about freedom than Paul ever did,"³ while many have been convinced because of this similarity of theme and treatment than the great emphasis upon liberty in the Pauline letters "was probably a part of Paul's debt to the Greek world."⁴

These comparisons, however, are largely superficial. Whether we

¹W.A. Oldfather, *Epictetus* (The Loeb Classical Library), Vol. I. p. 218.

²I.e., 29 times with the inclusion of *ἀπελευθερος* in I Cor. 7.22. The other instances are: *ἐλευθερία* --- Rom. 8.21, I Cor. 10.29, II Cor. 3.17, Gal. 2.4, 5.1, 13 (twice); *ἐλευθερος* --- Rom. 6.20, 7.3 I Cor. 7.21, 22, 39, 9.1, 19, 12.13, Gal. 3.28, 4.22, 23, 26, 30, 31, Eph. 6.8, Col. 3.11; *ἐλευθερῶ* --- Rom. 6.18, 22, 8.2, 21, Gal. 5.1. In special cases *ἐξαγορεύω* (Gal. 3.13, 4.5) and *ἐξουσία* (I Cor. 9.4, 5, Rom. 9.21) also carry the idea of liberty.

³S. Anderson, "Freedom in Christ According to Paul the Apostle" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh), p. 134; though Anderson attempts to qualify this statement a few lines later in saying: "Epictetus knew more about freedom than Paul ever did, but that was all he knew. Epictetus' idea of freedom, while more intense, was less meaningful than Paul's. Epictetus talks about freedom, Paul bears witness to it" (*ibid.*, p. 134).

⁴W.M. MacGregor, Christian Freedom, p. 23.

view it as the result of merely natural social evolution or the product of Divine activity, there was in the spiritually sensitive of both the Jewish and Gentile world of the first century "a truly pathetic longing as of tired men for a passive kind of happiness";¹ and such an outlook would make the theme of liberty inevitable to any man who thought he saw a ray of light in the darkness. The Jewish community earnestly looked for the Messiah, while the Gentile world "stretched out its hands in longing for the other shore."² As Epictetus' theme of liberty is "not there as an effect of Christian teaching, but as a true reflection of the tone and temper of those social circles to which the Gospel made its powerful appeal,"³ so Paul's insistence upon the same theme is not derived either directly or indirectly from the teaching of such men as Musonius Rufus, but is the expression of realised Messianic hopes. Similarly, Paul and the Stoics are quite independent in their development of the theme of liberty. In fact, despite the superficial resemblances, they are in the main in opposition. Thus, while for Paul freedom was based in the grace of God and charismatic in nature, it was grounded in philosophy and the result of education for the Stoics;⁴ while Paul could define it as being 'in Christ', the Stoics insisted that it was synonymous with educated moral autonomy; and while Paul spoke of freedom from sin,

¹W.A. Oldfather, Epictetus (The Loeb Classical Library), Vol. I, p. xxvii.

²Virgil, Aeneid, VI. 314 (trans. H.R. Fairclough in The Loeb Classical Library).

³W.A. Oldfather, Epictetus (The Loeb Classical Library), Vol. I, p. xxvii.

⁴J. Weiss: "Paulus, ganz im Sinne des gesamten Urchristentums, fasst die Freiheit auf als eine wunderbare Wirkung Gottes, als etwas, das über die natürliche Ausstattung des Menschen hinaus liegt. Die Stoiker begründen ihren Begriff psychologisch. Für Paulus ist die Freiheit ein Charisma, für sie ein Erziehungsprodukt" (Christliche Freiheit, p. 22).

the Stoics advocated freedom from fate. If Paul could reject Jewish legalism, which theoretically started with God but practically received its impulse from man, how much more was he revolted by Stoicism with both its theory and practice centred in the human will. Never could the apostle have defined freedom as "desire that is free from any hindrance,"¹ or have claimed that the truly liberated man is he "who lives as he wills, who is subject neither to compulsion, nor hindrance, nor force" beyond that of his own educated moral intellect.² Neither is Paul's liberty an escape from creaturely fate. The "tolling bell"³ of suicide as the ultimate liberty may resound throughout the Stoic writings,⁴ but the apostle cannot echo the strain; for it is not nothingness which is our friend and creatureliness our enemy, but redeemed creatureliness which is our purpose and nothingness an impossibility. At the very heart of the matter, Paul and Stoicism are in disagreement. Both can speak of surrender and obedience, but to the one it is to Christ while to the other it is to the inner law of one's being. The one is Theo- and Christocentric; the other is anthropocentric. And in this aspect, Stoicism falls into the same category as Jewish legalism and nomism in view of Christ: legality.

¹Epictetus, Dissertations, I. 19. 2.

²Ibid., IV. 1. 175.

³W.A. Oldfather, Epictetus (The Loeb Classical Library), Vol. I, p. xxv.

⁴E.g., Epictetus, Dissertations, III. 13. 14: "Now whenever He does not provide the necessities for existence, He sounds the recall; He has thrown open the door and says to you, 'Go'. Where? To nothing you need fear, but back to that from which you came, to what is friendly and akin to you, to the physical elements."

Seneca, De Providentia, VI. 7: "Above all, I have taken pains that nothing should keep you here against your will; the way out lies open. If you do not choose to fight, you may run away. Therefore of all things I have deemed necessary for you, I have made nothing easier than dying."

Epictetus, Dissertations, II. 1. 19: "The poor flesh is subjected to rough treatment, and then again to smooth. If you do not find this profitable, the door stands open; if you do find it profitable, hear it."

Rather than Stoic thought, it was probably the Jewish conviction of true liberty as being theocentric which was the more basic in the formulation of the apostle's thought. Probably the greatest contributions of the Greek world to Paul's doctrine were the terms ἐλευθερία, ἀπελευθερωσ and ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ and the moral and intellectual climate which gave his message of freedom in Christ a willing ear. But in designating the Jewish conviction as the undergirding and the Greek thought as the embellishment and vehicle of Paul's doctrine, we have yet to note the heart and core of the matter.

Liberty 'In Christ'

It is at the foundation of his doctrine of liberty that Paul differs most radically from both Stoic and Rabbi. To the Stoic glorying in his own 'educated moral intellect', claiming freedom from all influences except that of an enlightened self-desire, and advocating that the essence of true wisdom lay in the adage 'know yourself', Paul answered: "But He [God] is the source of your life (ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ ὑμεῖς ἐστε) in Christ Jesus, whom God has made our wisdom, our righteousness and sanctification and redemption; that, as it is written, "He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord."¹ To the Nomist claiming that righteousness and liberty can be gained only through subjection to law, Paul spoke of "our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus."² He centred his doctrine of liberty not in the law of God, which is "weak through the flesh," but in Christ. For, to be 'in Christ' is to have righteousness and liberty. Educated moral intellect and guiding principles might be of aid in the exercise of the Christian's liberty, but neither knowledge

¹I Cor. 1.30-31. ²Gal. 2.4.

nor law enters into the basis of that liberty. The apostle proclaimed that the Christian is complete 'in Christ' (ἔστε ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι),¹ and that completeness includes the liberty of the Christian. It is this concept of being 'in Christ' which dominates all of Paul's thought regarding liberty, and thus we must look more closely at the phrase.

Interpretations of the Phrase 'In Christ'

Since the almost exclusive emphasis upon the term 'justification' began to abate in the nineteenth century, the expression 'in Christ' has quite naturally become the subject of much investigation and debate. The interpretations which have been advanced in the last century can be fitted into five basic categories.

A carry-over from the Mystery Religions. -- In the flush of the realisation that the Pauline letters could be paralleled at many points by what is known of the Hellenistic Mystery Religions, many investigators, lead by Bousset and Reitzenstein² and encouraged by the more radical treatments of Lake and Loisy,³ viewed the term as just one of the many items borrowed directly by Paul both in form and content from the Mysteries. Others, while agreeing to the Hellenistic nature of the expression, preferred to assert that there was no need for Paul to have borrowed from a pagan source since the synagogues of Diaspora Judaism had themselves become homes for the Mysteries --- as witness Philo.⁴

¹Col. 2.10.

²W. Bousset, Kyrios Christos, pp. 104-120; R. Reitzenstein, Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, (3rd. ed.), pp. 333-393.

³K. Lake and A. Loisy have gone further, in claiming that "Christianity has not borrowed from the Mystery Religions, because [under the influence of Paul] it was always, at least in Europe, a Mystery Religion itself" (K. Lake, The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, p. 215; cf. A. Loisy, "The Christian Mystery," H.J., Vol. X, Oct. 1911, pp. 50-64).

⁴E.R. Goodenough, By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism.

Thus, it was argued, the apostle's 'in Christ' carries the connotations found in the Mysteries: sacramental initiation, absorption into divinity, mystic identity, ecstatic experience, and all. But such a view has failed to carry conviction for both methodological and comparative reasons. Methodologically, the question of Hellenistic influence upon Paul at this point can never be as decisively settled in the affirmative as this view claims, for the information concerning the Mysteries is both meagre and of late date. The danger is to be more precise than the evidence¹ or to assume uncritically that the influence between the Mysteries and Christianity always moved in the one direction.² Scholarship today recognises that the question is not only how much was Christianity influenced by Greek thought and culture, but also how much are the Mysteries an abortion of Christianity. But comparatively, the differences between Paul's 'in Christ' and the union with divinity of the Mysteries have been most convincing against the view that Paul simply incorporated Hellenistic thought and form into Christianity at this point. In addition to the fact that he does

¹Edwyn Bevan has caustically commented: "Of course, if one writes an imaginary description of the Orphic mysteries, as Loisy, for instance, does, filling in the large gaps in the picture left by our data from the Christian eucharist, one produces something very impressive. On this plan, you first put in the Christian elements, and then are staggered to find them there" (Contemporary Thinking about Paul, An Anthology, ed. T.S. Kepler, p. 43, quoted by B.M. Metzger, "Considerations of Methodology in the Study of the Mystery Religions and Early Christianity," H.T.R., Vol. XLVIII, No. 1, Jan. 1955, pp. 8-9).

²For an excellent discussion of such methodological considerations, see B.M. Metzger's article, ibid., pp. 1-20.

not proclaim a sacramental initiation,¹ the apostle does not advance the fundamental mystery religion concept of absorption into the divine.² Similarly, while the Mysteries present a salvation that is solely individualistic, Paul's 'in Christ' is both personal and social;³ while salvation is freedom from fate in Hellenism, Paul accepts creatureliness and announces a salvation from sin and its associates; while faith is intellectual acceptance in the Mysteries, it is personal and ethical commitment with the apostle; while temporary and ecstatic rapture is the goal of the Mysteries, the ecstatic is only reluctantly spoken of by Paul and is

¹A. Schweitzer (The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, pp. 16ff. and passim) and K. Lake (The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, pp. 384-390), among others, have followed P. Wernle in declaring that Paul viewed the sacraments as inherently efficacious and Christianity as "centrally sacramental" (ibid., p. 389). Such an interpretation asserts that baptism was for Paul the essential initiatory rite into the relationship of "being-in-Christ." But, though the apostle regarded baptism and the Lord's Supper as of real value for the quickening of faith, there is no evidence that he viewed either, or both, as necessary initiatory rites. His explicit subordination of baptism to the preaching of the Gospel in I Cor. 1.17 and his ethics indicate that he was no sacramentalist (cf. H.A.A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, pp. 150-152; W.R. Inge, Christian Ethics and Modern Problems, pp. 74-75).

²Supra, pp. 63-64.

³W.D. Davies: "There is a social aspect to the Pauline concept of the being 'in Christ'; union with Christ however personal had meant incorporation into a community that could be described as one body. As far as we know, however, the mysteries were individualistic" (Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 90).

not considered characteristic of the Christian life.¹ Even the form of the expression 'in Christ', while certainly conducive to the thought of the Mysteries, cannot with certainty be attributed to that milieu for its occurrence in Paul. The question must always be asked whether this phraseology is a true 'genealogical' parallel, due to borrowing of forms or an aspect of basic thought, or merely an 'analogical' parallel, to be regarded as arising from a more or less equal religious experience and temper.² And Paul's Jewish background in the thought of identification, his Christian experience of personal fellowship with Christ, and his possible knowledge of the words of Jesus as recorded

¹J.G. Machen has well stated the matter regarding the Pauline visions: "The fact should always be borne in mind that Paul distinguished the visions very sharply from the experience which he had near Damascus, when he saw the Lord. The visions are spoken of in 2 Corinthians apparently with reluctance, as something which concerned the apostle alone; the Damascus experience was part of the evidence for the resurrection of Christ, and had a fundamental place in the apostle's missionary preaching" (The Origin of Paul's Religion, p. 59). Similarly, R. Bultmann: "Wohl kennt Paulus die Ekstase, aber sie ist für ihn ein besonderes Charisma, nicht die spezifisch christliche Lebensform (vgl. I Cor. 12-14)" ("Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus," Z.N.W., Vol. XVIII, Heft 1/2, 1924, p. 136). It is true that Paul highly regarded such experiences as recounted in II Cor. 12.1-5, but he valued them as prophetic revelation to an accredited apostle and not as that which should be considered an essential part of the Christian life.

²See A. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, p. 262, regarding this distinction, and B.M. Metzger, "Consideration of Methodology in the Study of the Mystery Religions and Early Christianity," H.T.R., Vol. XLVIII, No. 1 (Jan., 1955), pp. 9-10 for an excellent illustrated discussion.

in John's Gospel,¹ makes it indeed probable that the latter situation is more correct. It will always remain a question just how Hellenistically orientated was so-called Hellenistic Judaism, but the Mystery interpretation of Paul's use of the expression in question seems to have lost its case.

A literal local dative of personal existence in the pneumatic Christ. -- In his monumental work Die neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu', Adolf Deissmann advocated the view that the phrase should be interpreted in a literal local sense as designating the existence of the individual believer in the pneumatic Christ. He insisted that Paul viewed the Spirit as a semi-physical and ethereal entity; and that by equating the personal resurrected Christ with the ethereal Spirit, he could quite easily think of Christ as permeating the Christian and the Christian as living in Christ. Deissmann's favourite analogy was that of air, of which it can be truly said that it is in us and we are in it.² Certainly his work on this phrase was a great advance in New Testament studies. And yet, he unconsciously left the discussion open to two logical allegations which he himself could not accept: (1) that since Paul could so closely equate the Spirit and Christ, what is true of the

¹While it would lead us too far afield to enter into a discussion of the historic basis of the Johannine discourses, it seems probable that at least the phrase "Abide in Me, and I in you" represents a real element in our Lord's teaching; note: (1) the discourse on the bread of life in Jn. 6.48-58, which draws to a close in the words "he who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides ἐν ἐμοὶ χάρις αὐτοῦ "; (2) the analogy of the vine and the branches in Jn. 15.1-11, where the "abide, ἐν ἐμοί, χάρις ἐν ὑμῖν " motif occurs repeatedly; (3) Jn. 17.21: "that they also may be one ἐν ἡμῖν "; (4) Jn. 17.23, 26: "I ἐν αὐτοῖς "; (5) Jn. 14.20: "In that day you shall know that I am in the Father and ὑμεῖς ἐν ἐμοί and I in you"; (6) Jn. 16.33: " ἐν ἐμοί you may have peace. ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ you have tribulations"; (7) Matt. 18.20: "Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν ." Cf. also Matt. 25.40-45, where the idea is presented in embryonic form.

²Deissmann states the result of his investigation in one summary paragraph on pp. 97-98, Die neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu'.

Spirit as semi-physical and non-personal existence must be in Paul's mind to some extent also true of Christ; and (2) that by advocating the incorporation of the personal being of man into the ethereal and semi-physical substance of the pneumatic Christ, Paul has shown himself to be a very primitive metaphysical thinker. Hence J. Weiss agreed with Deissmann in the main, but argued that he did not go far enough; for while what is true of Christ is true of the Spirit, what is true of the Spirit is also true of Christ.¹ This association of Christ with the Spirit, insisted Weiss, is one place where "it cannot be denied that Paul's Christology is inclined, upon one side, to abandon the firm lines laid down by concrete ideas of a definite personality."² The apostle here enters into "abstract speculation" and effects "the sublimation and dissolution of personality."³ F. Büchsel, in opposition to Deissmann's literal local thesis, argued that to view Paul's 'in Christ' as a local dative was degrading both to the Pauline presentation of Christ, representing Him as "ein halb sachliches Fluidum,"⁴ and to the person of Paul himself, portraying him as a "primitiver Denker."⁵ And indeed, it is at these two points that Deissmann's interpretation of 'in Christ' does not truly represent the apostle.

¹J. Weiss, History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. II. p. 464.

²J. Weiss, Paul and Jesus, p. 22.

³Ibid., p. 24. Cf. History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. II, pp. 464-471.

⁴F. Büchsel, "'In Christus' bei Paulus," Z.N.W., Vol. XLII (1949), p. 146.

⁵Ibid., p. 152. H. Lietzmann refers to Paul's theory of being 'in Christ' as "a plastically conceived mysticism" (The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 183).

A dative of instrumentality, causality and/or source. -- In reaction to the local interpretation, many have insisted that the primary meaning of the expression has to do with instrumentality, causality and/or source. In a methodical piece of research on the phrase, F. Büchsel concludes that "es ist instrumental, kausal, modal und im Übertragenen Sinne lokal gebraucht."¹ He says that while the figurative sense is found in the contrast between ἐν νόμῳ and ἐν Χριστῷ,² its primary meaning is more adequately expressed by applying the instrumental idea to 'in Christ'³ and the dynamic idea to 'Christ in us'.⁴ This position has a real appearance of probability, for certainly to take the phrase in this way often yields a perfectly intelligible and theologically sound meaning. None would disagree that whatever the apostle meant by the expression, he did not exclude the ideas of Christ as the source, cause and power of the Christian's life. But the question which stands over all Büchsel's work, and which he neglects to raise, is: Why then didn't Paul use διὰ Χριστοῦ and ἐκ Χριστοῦ instead of ἐν Χριστῷ if he desired only to express the ideas of instrumentality, causality and source? And even if this question is answered convincingly, the further problem arises why the apostle then mixed διὰ or ἐκ Χριστοῦ and ἐν Χριστῷ when he meant the same thing.

¹F. Büchsel, "'In Christus' bei Paulus," Z.N.W., Vol. XLII (1949), p. 156.

²But even 'in the law' and 'in Christ' can be interpreted at times instrumentally; cf. the contrast in Acts 13.39 of ἐν νόμῳ and ἐν τοῦτῳ, which A.V., A.S.V. and R.S.V. translate "by the law" and "by him."

³F. Büchsel, "'In Christus' bei Paulus," Z.N.W., Vol. XLII (1949), p. 146.

⁴Ibid., p. 152.

A metaphor of personal communion with Christ. -- Similarly in opposition to the local interpretation stands the more general metaphorical view of this phrase. It is not that this position desires to minimise the personal element of intimate relation between the Christian and Christ contained in the phrase, but it considers it "hazardous to press the 'local' significance of the formula."¹ It accepts the more general but profound truth which Paul teaches of communion with Christ, but it shies away from trying to be more explicit in the exposition of that union with Christ by an emphasis upon the form of the expression. In its insistence that the metaphor stands for the believer's "supremely intimate relation of union with Christ,"² this interpretation has certainly caught the main theme of the apostle's teaching. But, and here we must leave the argument for the following section, "the cumulative effect of all Paul's uses of the phrase 'in Christ' demands something even more than this."³

A locution for corporation communion in the Church. -- Of late there has risen to prominence a different type of objection to Deissmann's interpretation. This position agrees with the local emphasis, yet views it as not primarily denoting individual and personal communion with Christ but as an ecclesiological formula. Of course the Roman Church has always taken this position, asserting that to be in the living Christ was to be in "the Church with its centre in Rome."⁴ But in the reaction to

¹H.A.A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, p. 121; cf. pp. 119-125.

²Ibid., p. 124.

³W. Barclay, The Mind of St. Paul, p. 128.

⁴As is C. Cary-Elwes' conclusion, Law, Liberty and Love, p. 247.

philosophic individualism and the rediscovery of the thought of corporate personality in the Scriptures, many Protestant theologians have viewed the phrase as speaking primarily of corporate life in the Body of Christ --- i.e., the organic Church. A. Schweitzer argued that "'being-in-Christ' is the prime enigma of the Pauline teaching"¹ if we view it as "an individual and subjective experience" rather than as "a collective and objective event."² Thus he insisted that "the expression 'being-in-Christ' is merely a brachyology for being partakers in the Mystical Body of Christ."³ While it is the commonest, it is not the most appropriate expression for union with Christ. It becomes the most usual, not only because of its shortness but because of the facility which it offers for forming antitheses with the analogous expressions 'in the body,' 'in the flesh,' 'in sin,' and 'in the spirit,' and thus providing the mystical theory with a series of neat equations.⁴

Similarly, R. Bultmann states that "' in Christ,' far from being a formula for mystic union, is primarily an ecclesiological formula"; thus "to belong to the Christian Church is to be 'in Christ' or 'in the Lord'."⁵ And in Britain, this position is strongly advanced by J.A.T. Robinson and L.S. Thornton as a corollary to their insistence that "the church as literally now the resurrection 'body' of Christ" was dominant in the thought of Paul.⁶ To this renewed emphasis we must give credit for reminding the Church of a vital element in Pauline theology, for the apostle could never envisage a Christian who

¹A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 3.

²Ibid., p. 123.

³Ibid., pp. 122-123. ⁴Ibid., p. 123.

⁵R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, p. 311.

⁶J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, p. 51; cf. L. S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ.

could rejoice in the personal aspect of being 'in Christ' without likewise accepting the corporate and social nature of that relationship. But while it is right in what it affirms, it is wrong in what it denies.

Significance of being 'In Christ'

Endless debate will probably continue to gather around Paul's 'in Christ', for it signifies that central aspect of the Christian life which is much better experienced than explained. Indeed, the more confident we are that we have reduced the expression to the cold prose of the psychologist's laboratory the more assured we can be that we have lost its central significance. The inexplicable must always remain in the truly personal relationship. And yet, that personal relationship can be intellectually understood and expressed up to a point. It is to that point, but only to that point, that we would seek to go in understanding the apostle's thought here.

It is certainly true that in many places the expression can be viewed as being used merely as a synonym for the adjective and noun 'Christian'. For example in his greetings to the churches, Paul could mean by "to all the saints in Christ Jesus" simply 'to all the Christians';¹ in his reference to "the dead in Christ," he need mean no more than 'the Christian dead';² and in his mention of certain individuals who were "in the Lord" or "in Christ," the use of the phrase could be only to identify them as 'Christians'.³ Similarly there are a host of

¹Phil. 1.1; cf. Eph. 1.1, Col. 1.2.

²I Thess. 4.16; cf. I Cor. 15.18.

³E.g., Rom. 16.7, 11.

passages where διὰ Χριστοῦ or ἐκ Χριστοῦ could be read just as well as ἐν Χριστῷ, and there would emerge a perfectly intelligible meaning. II Cor. 3.14, where the apostle speaks of the veil that "is done away ἐν Χριστῷ" (R.S.V., "through Christ"), Rom. 5.10, which speaks of being "saved ἐν τῷ ~~ζωῆ~~ αὐτοῦ" (A.V., A.S.V., R.S.V., "by his life"), Rom. 14.14, where he says "I know and am persuaded ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ that nothing is unclean of itself" (A.V., "by the Lord Jesus"), and Phil. 4.13, where Paul asserts that he "can do all things ἐν αὐτοῦ who strengthens me" (A.V., "through him") are but the most prominent examples. But the fact that in the following passages Paul could distinguish ἐν from διὰ and ἐκ in regard to Christ suggests that he used the prepositions a little more exactly than some would like to believe:

II Cor. 1.20 - "For all the promises of God have their 'Yes' ἐν αὐτῷ. Wherefore also we utter the 'Amen' δι' αὐτοῦ to the glory of God."

II Cor. 2.17 - ". . . but as ἐκ θεοῦ in the presence of God we speak ἐν Χριστῷ."

Col. 1.16 ---- " ἐν αὐτῷ were all things created, . . . All things were created δι' αὐτοῦ and εἰς αὐτόν."

Col. 1.19-20 - " ἐν αὐτῷ it was considered proper for all the fulness of God to dwell, and δι' αὐτοῦ to reconcile all things to himself."

Moreover, in most of the passages where it could be that Paul meant nothing more than 'Christian' or where it is asserted that the instrumental, causal, source or dynamic idea is uppermost in his thought, the local designation, if it were not for the revulsion of the interpreter against the seeming crudity of the idea, can just as easily be seen. Certainly the following savour strongly of the local flavour:

Phil. 3.9 --- " . . . that I might gain Christ and be found in him (ἐν αὐτῷ)."

Rom. 8.1 --- "There is therefore now no condemnation to those in Christ Jesus (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ)."

II Cor. 5.17- "If any one is in Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ), he is a new creation."

II Cor. 5.19- "God was in Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ) reconciling the world to himself."

Eph. 1.20 --- God's working was accomplished "in Christ (ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ) when he raised him from the dead,"

Eph. 2.20-22- "Christ Jesus himself being the chief cornerstone, in whom (ἐν ᾧ) the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord (ἐν κυρίῳ), in whom (ἐν ᾧ) you also are built into it for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι)."

Thus, while not assenting to all of Deissmann's positions nor insisting that there must be a unitary exegesis of the phrase, it seems best to agree that Paul's 'in Christ' has "a quite definitely local flavour."¹ And further, to insist that it is not just a bit of "verbal ingenuity"² or just one of many metaphors which must all be subservient to the controlling concept of 'the body of Christ',³ but that it is the dominant expression of the apostle's thought for the relationship of the believer to Christ. While certainly the phrase carries corporate overtones and social implications, it is used so often⁴ and in such individualistic settings⁵ that it must be viewed as much more than just an extension of meaning from a more fundamental concept of corporality. Of the two works written lately on this subject, E. Best's title

¹As E. Best, One Body in Christ, p. 1 and passim.

²As A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 117.

³As J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, esp. pp. 58-67.

⁴164 times according to Deissmann, Die neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu', pp. 1-2. Note the footnotes to pp. 118-123 for references.

⁵E.g., Phil. 3.9, II Cor. 5.17.

and treatment of "One Body in Christ" is much more representative of the Pauline emphasis than is that of J.A.T. Robinson's, "The Body"; for Best recognises the personal emphasis contained in the expression 'in Christ' while also stressing the corporate nature of the Christian life as contained in the metaphor of 'the Body', whereas Robinson subdues all to the corporate idea of 'the Body'.

But the question which arises when we assert a quite definite local and personal flavour for the phrase is the same one with which Deissmann wrestled so valiantly: How can we speak of the intermingling of two personalities in local terminology? Deissmann argued along the lines of an ethereal Spirit and pneumatic Christ, in which the believer lived as in a sort of rarified air and which could, as can air, also indwell the believer. But such an analogy is not quite Pauline. Paul spoke of Christ more as the "Universalpersönlichkeit"¹ than as ethereal or pneumatic: "in him all things were created in heaven and upon earth, things visible and invisible";² "in him all things consist";³ "in him it was considered proper for all the fulness of God to dwell";⁴ and "in him" God's plan for the fulness of time will be brought to completion in "bringing to summation all things in Christ, things in heaven and upon earth."⁵ As the Old Testament could say that Abraham "trusted in Jahweh" (אֱמַן אֱבְרָהָם בַּיהוָה)⁶ and nine times out of eleven use א rather than ב with the hiphil form אֱמַן when its object is God,⁷ and as Jesus is reported to have spoken of His relationship to the

¹A. Oepke: "Grundlegend ist die Vorstellung von Christus als Universalpersönlichkeit" (" &v , " Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel, Vol. II, p. 538.)

²Col. 1.16. ³Col. 1.17. ⁴Col. 1.19. ⁵Eph. 1.10.

⁶Gen. 15.6.

⁷Cf. Ps. 78.21f., Isa. 50.10, Zeph. 3.2, Jer. 17.5-7, Prov. 28.25f. Zeph. 3.12, Nah. 1.7, II Kings 18.5f. See W.H.P. Hatch, The Pauline Idea of Faith, pp. 3-9.

Father as being "in the Father" (ἐν τῷ πατρὶ),¹ all without diminishing the concept of the real personality of God, so Paul, with his high Christology, could speak of being 'in Christ' without that concept of person 'in' person softening or dissolving the fixed outlines of personality for either Christ or the Christian. To have been forced to give a definite psychological analysis of this relationship would probably have left Paul speechless, but he was convinced that he had experienced just such an intimacy with Christ.

Of course in positing a local and personal flavour for the phrase 'in Christ' we are admitting to a mysticism. But this need not be abhorred if we mean by the term 'mysticism' "that contact between the human and the Divine which forms the core of the deepest religious experience, but which can only be felt as an immediate intuition of the highest reality and cannot be described in the language of psychology."² It is not the pagan mysticism of absorption, for the 'I' and the 'Thou' of the relation retain their identities; but it is the 'I and Thou' communion at its highest.

Here, then, is the controlling concept for Paul's teaching regarding liberty. Christian liberty is both constituted and controlled by being 'in Christ'.

The Indicative and Imperative of Liberty

Before proceeding to Paul's teaching concerning the way in which the Christian's liberty in its direction and exercise is related to this being 'in Christ', which is actually the crux of this chapter and the immediate basis of understanding the Pauline practice, it is important to pause for a moment to see liberty as both a gift and a demand ---

¹Jn. 10.38; 14.10, 11,20; 17.21.

²H.A.A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, p. 122.

and to understand the apostle's thought regarding the relation between the two.

The Indicative of Liberty

In actuality it is impossible to departmentalise Christian liberty, and it does not appear that the apostle ever conceived of a purely 'forensic' or a purely 'inward' liberty. And yet, for purposes of analysis, we can speak of Paul as teaching that liberty in Christ is meaningful in three areas: (1) in the believer's relationship before his God, which we will call 'forensic', and (2) in the believer's ordering of his own inner life, 'personal', and (3) in the believer's relationship to his fellow-men, 'social'.

Forensic liberty. -- Much of what has been said in the previous chapter concerning righteousness in the New Covenant applies here as well. But it is not superfluous to approach the question of the believer's standing before God from the viewpoint of freedom. Nor is it unimportant; for, although the words have become hackneyed from use and abuse, the realisation of having been set free by God to stand before Him as a free man in Christ was the initial point of Paul's Christian experience and the basis for his Christian thought. Indeed, the basic realisation of freedom from condemnation comes out strongly in the opening words of that keystone chapter, Rom. 8: "There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus"; and almost defiantly in vs. 31-34 of the same chapter:

If God is for us, who is against us? . . . who shall bring any charge against God's elect? It is God who justifies; who is to condemn? It is Christ Jesus who died, yea rather who was raised, who is on the right hand of God and who intercedes for us.

The result of sin is that alienation from God which can rightly be called 'death';¹ God justly pronouncing judgment upon "those who do such things."² Christ, however, "gave himself for our sins,"³ and in so doing "redeemed us from the curse of the law."⁴ In this redemption "he has delivered us from the authority of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved Son,"⁵ thus giving to us the freedom to live unto God as a son and an heir;⁶ a freedom which is real and yet which is not fully realised, for as yet there is a sense in which we still await full sonship.⁷ It was this realisation of forensic freedom which was the cornerstone for Paul's doctrine of liberty.

Personal liberty. -- But while the apostle speaks definitely of liberty in the forensic sense, he speaks at greatest length of that liberation which has taken place in the inward life of every believer. Of prime importance in this area is the freedom from the compulsion of sin. Paul argues from the Old Testament and general experience that "all men, both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin,"⁸ But he also asserts that as Christians we "died to sin" with Him⁹ and were thus "set free from sin"¹⁰ --- "for he who has died is freed from sin."¹¹

¹Rom. 6.16, 21, 23; 7.5; Gal. 6.8. ²Rom. 1.32; 2.8-9

³Gal. 1.4. ⁴Gal. 3.13; cf. Col. 1.14.

⁵Col. 1.13. ⁶Rom. 8.14-17; Gal. 4.6-7, 22-31.

⁷Rom. 8.23. ⁸Rom. 3.9; cf. Rom. 1.18-3.20.

⁹Rom. 6.2-6. ¹⁰Rom. 6.18, 22; 8.2. ¹¹Rom. 6.7.

This freedom from sin is not presented as freedom from the possibility of sin, for the believer too must beware of the tempter,¹ but as freedom from the inward power and authority of sin.² The Christian is under no compulsion to sin, but is for the first time given true freedom of choice and power "to walk in newness of life."³ In close connection with this freedom is Paul's thought regarding the freedom from the tyranny of self. He saw man's condition as so dominated by sin, that when one would speak of what man is of himself he must speak of man as "sold under sin" and as controlled by his dead and deadening self.⁴ It is this universal cry of the sin-controlled and deadened self which Paul utters in Rom. 7.24: "Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death?" But he goes on in the next breath to praise God for deliverance from this tyranny,⁵ "for the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and death."⁶ C.H. Dodd has well caught the apostle's thought at this point in characterising his doctrine as that of "freedom from the tyranny of futile desires to follow what is really good."⁷

But not only is the man in Christ free from inner compulsion and tyranny. Paul also quite definitely taught freedom from the domination of the Law. Believers, who formerly were under the dominance of the Law as under a preparatory measure and until Christ,⁸ have "died to the Law" and in that death are "discharged from the law, dead to that which held

¹I Thess. 3.5; I Cor. 7.5; II Cor. 2.11.

²R. Bultmann: "Freiheit von der Macht der Sünde" ("Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus," Z.N.W., Vol. XXIII, Heft 1/2, 1924, p. 125. Cf. Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, p. 332).

³Rom. 6.4; cf. Col. 3.10. ⁴Rom. 7.14-23. ⁵Rom. 7.25a.

⁶Rom. 8.2.

⁷C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, p. 150.

⁸Gal. 3.19ff.

us captive."¹ The Christian lives his life no longer under a detailed code which regulates each particular action, but "in the new life of the Spirit."² And thus he walks in liberty, "for where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."³ He is "not under law but under grace";⁴ not that he might be uncontrolled but that he might "belong to another."⁵ And in close connection to this thought of the external domination of the Law being broken, Paul also speaks of freedom from the power of unseen spiritual forces of evil.⁶ This concept of demonic elements which are external to man, an idea which is admittedly foreign to the modern mind, must be taken seriously in the understanding of Paul. For the apostle, it was a real deliverance when Christ disarmed and triumphed over "the principalities and powers"; and it should not be too easily dismissed as a factor in our own Christian liberty.⁷

Social liberty. -- Of the three categories of liberty, the indicative of liberty in its social aspect is spoken of the least. And yet it seems to be assumed throughout. It is in this area that the widest divergence of opinion exists regarding just what is given in Christ. Certain sects have so emphasised the point of the gift of liberty in this area as to defy all human authority. On the other hand, Luther, in both his commentary on Galatians and his treatise on Christian liberty, tended to regard the justified man as free from all regulation "inwardly, in

¹Rom. 7.4-6.

²Rom. 7.6 ³II Cor. 3.17; cf. Gal. 5.18. ⁴ Rom. 6.14, 15.

⁵Rom. 7.4; cf. Paul's frequent reference to *δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (Rom. 1.1, I Cor. 7.22, Gal. 1.10, Eph. 6.6, Phil. 1.1, Col. 4.12).

⁶Col. 2.15, Eph. 6.10ff.

⁷Cf. J.S. Stewart, "On a Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology," S.J.T., Vol. IV (1951), pp. 292-301; O. Cullmann, The State in the New Testament, pp. 67-69.

his spirit," but as not as yet possessing freedom in the social area and thus subject to all regulations and works in "the outward man."¹ Realising definitely that the Christian life is lived in the tension between a presently effective salvation and a yet-to-be-completed salvation, he tended to view the liberty of the Christian as being given only to the inner man at the present time and to relegate the gift of liberty to the outward man to "the last day, the day of the resurrection of the dead."² And yet, while Luther closely approximated the Pauline conclusion, his argument is not quite the Pauline presentation.

While in its context the expression "τῷ ἐλευθερίῳ Christ has freed us" of Gal. 5.1 need refer to no more than such 'inward' liberty, the later words "ἐκ' ἐλευθερίῳ you were called, brethren" of Gal. 5.13, in the context of vs. 13-15, certainly refer to the outward man in the social side of liberty.³ Similarly, the thought that this freedom applies in the social side of life comes out in the passage which Bultmann has rightly called "the mightiest expression of freedom,"⁴ I Cor. 3.21-22: "For all things are yours, . . . whether the world or life or death, whether the present or the future, all are yours." And in the exclamation of I Cor. 9.1 of "Am I not free?" and the agreement of the apostle in I Cor. 9.19 that "I am free from all men," Paul repeats this declaration of social liberty. His teaching was not that liberty

¹M. Luther, "A Treatise on Christian Liberty," Works of Martin Luther, Vol. II, trans. W.A. Lambert, p. 328; cf. p. 312.

²Ibid., p. 328.

³See A. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, pp. 324-334, where it is pointed out that this phrase is probably adopted from the terms in the sacral manumission procedures and indicates a freedom to "do the things that he will" (ibid., p. 328) for "against all the world, especially his former master, he is a completely free man" (ibid., p. 326).

⁴R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, p. 331.

was confined to the inner man, but that the gift of freedom was also meaningful in man's outward functions --- though other factors must enter in in the exercise of that liberty besides just the realisation of liberty's indicative. We must consider this aspect of social liberty more fully in the last section of this chapter, but the very fact that Paul can appeal to his readers to manifest their liberty in love¹ and can speak of voluntarily relinquishing aspects of that liberty for the sake of his purpose² indicates that he viewed the gift of social liberty as part of the indicative of the Gospel.

The Imperative of Liberty

But the indicative of Christian liberty does not stand alone in Paul's message. While he announces that God has worked and is at work in the life of every believer, he also exhorts his converts to work out their own salvation.³ His teaching contains two sides: You are in Christ, "put on the Lord Jesus Christ";⁴ "You are dead to sin and alive to God, consider yourself so to be";⁵ "Sin will have no dominion over you," so do not permit it to have dominion over you;⁶ You are set free from the dominance of the Law, so "stand fast";⁷ You live by the Spirit, so "walk by the Spirit."⁸ For Paul, the indicative and imperative of the Gospel are so inseparably connected that any attempt to stress the indicative without the imperative or the imperative without reference to the indicative is 'a Satanic parody'.

¹Gal. 5.13-15. ²I Cor. 9.19-23. ³Phil. 2.12. ⁴Rom. 13.14.

⁵Rom. 6.11. ⁶Rom. 8.12-14. ⁷Gal. 5.1. ⁸Gal. 5.25.

Its essential nature. -- There are those who look upon the apostle's reference to liberty's imperative as basically inconsistent with his teaching regarding liberty's indicative, and only born of practical necessity. James Parkes, for instance, says that "the doctrine of works continually hurled through the front window of theological suppositions as often returned by the back door of practical necessity."¹ But Paul's insistence upon the imperative as well as the indicative of the Gospel proclamation is not in itself a confession of a discrepancy between the theory and the practice of Christianity or an inconsistency born of necessity; though, of course, the fact that he must exhort his readers to recognise the imperative demand in the Gospel certainly indicates that such a discrepancy was present in the minds of many of his converts --- and that he fully realised it. But rather than basing the imperative in practical necessity, he proclaimed that "the indicative bears at its heart an imperative."² It is part of the essential nature of the Gospel; "einer Notwendigkeit, die in dem, was von Gott her an uns geschehen ist, beschlossen liegt, also nicht nur aus der schmerzlichen Diskrepanz von Theorie und Praxis, Ideal und Wirklichkeit erwächst, wie man immer wieder gemeint hat."³

Paul viewed the necessity of that apparently contradictory relation of indicative and imperative, 'Gabe und Aufgabe,' as the result of "the present situation in redemptive history";⁴ a situation in which, while the essence of the Gospel proclamation is 'fulfilment', there is still sounded a definite note of 'anticipation', and, while the Christian

¹J. Parkes, Jesus, Paul and the Jews, p. 130; cf. W. L. Knox, St. Paul, pp. 94-95.

²J. S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, p. 199.

³G. Bornkamm, Das Ende des Gesetzes, p. 35.

⁴O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, p. 224.

legitimately rejoices in the 'no longer', there is still the realisation of the element of 'not yet'. Thus, while the old age has passed away, the new has not been fully brought about; while the compulsion of sin has been broken, sin is still present to tempt; while the tyranny of the 'body of death' (τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου) is crushed,¹ the 'mortal body' (θνητὸν σῶμα) yet remains;² while the domination of the Law is ended, forms of legalism and our perverted desire to 'gain' in divine favour still exist; while the supernatural antagonistic powers are disarmed and defeated, they are not destroyed.³ Indeed, there is a sense in which those who have become righteous yet "wait for the hope of righteousness"⁴ and those who have been raised to newness of life yet await "a resurrection (like his)".⁵ This is that tension between the present and the future which Martin Luther said "no sophisters will admit, for they know not the true manner of justification,"⁶ but "which contains the key to the understanding of the entire New Testament."⁷ In the realisation of this temporal tension as being inherent in the very nature of the Gospel itself, the apostle grounds the necessity of liberty's imperative. And in the fact that the Gospel imperative is applicable to that time between "the new creation" of II Cor. 5.17 and the final deliverance of I Cor. 15.24-28, the Christian ethic is indeed an 'interim ethic'; not that it has no application for the generations following early Christianity, but that it is

¹Rom. 7.24. ²Rom. 6.12.

³Col. 2.15, Eph. 6.11ff., I Cor. 15.24ff.

⁴Gal. 5.5. ⁵Rom. 6.5.

⁶M. Luther, Galatians, p. 226 on Gal. 3.6.

⁷O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, p. 199.

conditioned by the realisation that "the present is in fact an interim in the redemptive history."¹ In this sense "all genuine Protestant ethic is 'interim ethics'."²

The imperative of liberty must thus be declared an essential part of the Gospel message, and not just an inconsistency in Paul's thought born of practical necessity. Whereas he argued that in view of Christ the keeping of imperatives is a matter of inconsequence before God when a man knows not the indicative of the Gospel nor the temporal tension involved in the Gospel, Paul also insisted that "just because he [the Christian] has been set free, what he does --- previously a thing of no account --- now really matters, and he can be exhorted."³

Its relation to the indicative. -- But the question arises: In what sense does the imperative really matter in Paul's thought? What relation does the imperative have to the indicative in the Gospel message?

Many have viewed the relation of the indicative and the imperative as being that of equal rank, equal function and equal intent --- as if they stood shoulder to shoulder "so dass neben die Ethik des Wunders die Ethik des Willens tritt."⁴ Windisch, for example, interprets Paul as saying that while God makes us righteous by grace alone in the heavenly sphere (the indicative) we must make that righteousness truly applicable

¹Ibid., p. 213.

²E. Brunner, The Divine Imperative, p. 123.

³R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, p. 321.

⁴R. Bultmann characterising P. Wernle's position, "Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus," Z.N.W., Vol. XXIII, Heft 1/2 (1924), p.126.

in the earthly sphere (the imperative), and that only as these two types of righteousness work together, the heavenly righteousness coupled with the earthly righteousness, is there bestowed the divine eschatological salvation.¹ He bases his position primarily on the Sermon on the Mount,² but sees Paul saying the same thing in Rom. 6.19b. His words are as follows:

Unzweifelhaft setzt auch er [i.e. Paul] die Erfüllung einer δικαιοσύνη in irgendeinem Sinne zum Ziel (vgl. Rom. 6.19b). Soweit nun die Rechtfertigungslehre die Voraussetzung des imperative ist, ist die Antinomie leicht aufzulösen. Sie besagt: was in der nicht wahrnehmbaren Sphäre des göttlichen Handelns Realität geworden, gilt es nun auch in der irdischen Sphäre wahrnehmbar zu realisieren. Auf die Erlösung von der Herrschaft der Sünde hat der Mensch mit rückhaltloser Unterwerfung unter den Willen seines Erlösers zu reagieren. Norm und Ziel dieser Anstrengung heisst, wie bei der Rechtfertigung, δικαιοσύνη Rm. 6.19 (II Cor. 5.21).³

Thus Windisch gives only a slight twist to that view which sees the imperatives of the Gospel as determinatives on which "to hang heaven and hell."⁴ He interprets them as works which co-operate with the Gospel indicative to produce righteousness.

Since we must deal with the purpose of the ethical imperatives of the Sermon on the Mount in the following section of this chapter, and since such a consideration here would only anticipate that later discussion and not substantially advance our knowledge of Paul's attitude toward the Gospel imperatives, we shall not enter into the question of Jesus and ethical imperatives at this point. But while Windisch

¹H. Windisch, "Das Problem des paulinischen Imperative," Z.N.W., Vol. XXIII, Heft 3/4 (1924), esp. pp. 270-273.

²H. Windisch, The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount, pp. 27-29 and passim.

³H. Windisch, "Das Problem des paulinischen Imperative," Z.N.W., Vol. XXIII, Heft 3/4 (1924), p. 271

⁴A. Harnack, What is Christianity?, p. 72; cf. E.F. Scott, The Ethical Teaching of Jesus, pp. 38ff.

may believe that he has abundant material to prove his point from Matt. 5-7, his argument rests very precariously when he comes to Paul. It seems that Luther's translation of Rom. 6.19b has too strongly influenced his exegesis: "Also begeben auch nun eure Glieder zum Dienst der Gerechtigkeit, dass sie heilig werden." The verse reads literally: "Therefore now present your members (as servants) τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν." Now while the idea of 'in order that you become holy' can be read into the verse, it requires an extension of meaning for the preposition εἰς and a similar extension for ἁγιασμός in which it becomes equivalent to ἁγιασθήναι.¹ The fact that just over five chapters later, in Rom. 12.1, Paul can again urge his readers to present (παρίστημι) their bodies to God, and that without the idea that by so doing they gain any degree of holiness but rather that thereby they but respond to the mercies of God,² seems to weight the argument against Windisch's view that such a presentation is to be made as an element in the attainment of righteousness. While Windisch has certainly caught the note of urgency in the apostle's letters regarding liberty's imperative, he has misconstrued the Pauline motivation.

For Paul, the imperatives are based in the fact of a new nature. The Christian has become "a new creation," and in this capacity Christians are exhorted to present themselves to God ὡς εἰς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας.³ In the context of Rom. 6, the adverb ὡς εἰς carries the idea of actuality. Paul begins this section with a declaration that the very fact of the believer's death to the old nature and resurrection to the new ought to settle the

¹ ἁγιασμός properly refers to the process of sanctification, whereas Windisch would make the presentation referred to in the verse attain the result of that sanctification,

² Whatever τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν means ("spiritual worship", R.S.V.; "spiritual service," A.S.V.; "reasonable service," A.V.), it carries more the idea of response than of reward.

³Rom. 6.13.

question of his allegiance: "How can we who died to sin still live in it?" Do you not know?"¹ Similarly, the contrast between the "works of the flesh" and the "fruits of the Spirit" in Gal. 5.19-24 seems to point out this same thought of the changed nature as the basis for the acceptance and fulfilment of the Gospel imperatives. T.W. Manson has pointed out that "here the word 'fruit' seems to be chosen deliberately in order to suggest that the good deeds of the believer are characterised by a certain spontaneity. They are the natural outcome of a transformed nature rather than the laborious attempt to conform to an external code."² We must thus agree with Lake when he says: "Paul's position is not really difficult to understand by any one who grasps his belief in regeneration, and the fact that to him the central point in life is what you are, not what you do, so that conduct necessarily follows nature."³

Likewise, the imperatives find their motivation in the indicative of the Gospel; Christian ethic is motivated by love and not impelled by a desire to gain righteousness. James Denney has well captured the essence of the Pauline motivation in saying:

The child whom his father or mother pardons through pain cannot but be good while the sense of this forgiveness rests upon his heart, and it is this simple principle on which the whole New Testament rests. True forgiveness regenerates. Justification is the power which sanctifies. This truth, which we can verify in our forgiveness of one another daily, is the ultimate and fundamental truth of the gospel.⁴

"Paul's whole position is the lover's position";⁵ as we see in his declaration that

¹Rom. 6.2; cf. vvs. 3-4.

²T.W. Manson, "Jesus, Paul and the Law," Judaism and Christianity, Vol. III, ed. E.I.J. Rosenthal, p. 139.

³K. Lake, Paul: His Heritage and Legacy, pp. 128-129.

⁴J. Denney, The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation, p. 137.

⁵W. Barclay, The Mind of St. Paul, p. 170.

the love of Christ constrains (συνέχει) us, as we realise this fact (κρίναντας τοῦτο), that one died for all. Therefore all died. And he died for all in order that those who live might no longer live to themselves but for him who for their sake died and was raised.¹

Christian ethic, therefore, has not the character of works which can establish the relation of man to the beyond, but it takes the form of obedience to the One who has already established that relation for the believer.² In Paul's proclamation that righteousness is already realised in Christ, the ethic of the Gospel becomes a 'therefore/wherefore' ethic. Even the oft-cited Phil. 2.12, which exhorts to "work out your own salvation," begins with the oft-neglected words: "As you have always obeyed (ὑπακούσατε), so do now"; thus assuming the believer's "works" under the caption of 'obedience'. This distinction between works in order to gain righteousness and works taking the form of obedience on the basis of righteousness is that distinction which Martin Luther was grasping for in declaring: "Our faith in Christ does not free us from works, but from false opinions concerning works."³

The Two Normative Factors in Liberty's Guidance

But the question of Christian liberty is not concluded in noting that liberty finds its basis in Christ and must be considered as both a gift and a demand, important as these considerations are. The question logically arises: How is that demand to be known and carried out in

¹II Cor. 5.14-15.

²Cf. R. Bultmann, "Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus," Z.N.W., Vol. XXIII, Heft 1/2 (1924), pp. 123-140, for an excellent treatment of the Gospel imperative as having the nature of obedience and not works.

³M. Luther, "A Treatise in Christian Liberty," Works of Martin Luther, Vol. II, trans. W.A. Lambert, p. 344.

the particular situation? Paul exhorted his converts to "put on the Lord Jesus Christ" and "walk in the Spirit," but such exhortations would be only nebulous without the thought of how this liberty was to be actualised in practice. Some would argue that a consideration of such a topic as "liberty's guidance" is not only a contradiction of terms but also quite illegitimate for truly Protestant thought; and, indeed, if Christian liberty had only the negative quality of 'freedom from', the question should never arise at all. But since the apostle proclaims that liberty is also 'freedom to' and contains an imperative demand, we must inquire concerning his conception of how this liberty is to receive its direction and guidance for the particular situation.

This problem of how the Christian is to know the right and to actualise his liberty in the particular situation is far from a merely academic one. Protestant theology has often answered the question in reference to the teaching of the historical Jesus. In the last half-century, however, there has arisen a strong emphasis upon the pneumatic guidance of the resurrected Christ as the only criterion of the Christian life. In light of these different emphases, it is not unimportant to reconsider the problem from the perspective of the apostle of liberty.

The Mind of Christ

In I Corinthians, the epistle which deals at most length with the particular situation of liberty's application, the apostle puts to the forefront of his discussion one major element of the Gospel which makes the Christian ethic different from all forms of legalism and stoicism: pneumatic direction. He argues that the Christian life is

neither established nor guided by human wisdom,¹ but as it has been "revealed to us through the Spirit"² so is it by the Spirit that we "understand the things bestowed on us from God."³ His contrast is between systems of ethics which consist ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις and the Christian life which is directed ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος .⁴ And in that contrast between the "words of human wisdom" in the one case and the "spirit" in the other, there is an emphasis upon the non-external and immediate character of Christian guidance. This pneumatic element of direction he characterises as "the mind of Christ" (νοῦς Χριστοῦ).⁵

Throughout Paul's discussions of liberty, this factor of 'the mind of Christ' as applied by the Spirit reappears as the distinguishing feature in the direction of Christian liberty. Thus the Christian lives his life in the new life of πνεῦμα and not in the old of γράμμα ;⁶ and the apostle is a minister of a new covenant which is not of γράμμα but of πνεῦμα .⁷ Similarly, whereas it was the σάρξ which controlled and characterised the activity of the man without Christ, it is the πνεῦμα which is the distinguishing feature in the believer's guidance and ability.⁸ The exact relation between Christ and the Spirit in this matter of immediate and direct guidance is not explicit in Paul's letters. It would probably be most true to his thought to say that 'the mind of Christ' became operative in the life of the Christian through the

¹I Cor. 1.18-2.5. ²I Cor. 2.10. ³I Cor. 2.12.

⁴I Cor. 2.13. ⁵I Cor. 2.16. ⁶Rom. 7.6.

⁷II Cor. 3.6. ⁸Rom. 8.4-6, Gal. 5.16.

activity of the Spirit, as is his emphasis in I Cor. 2.6-16; though in II Cor. 3.17a he appears to equate the two in this matter by saying that "the Lord is the Spirit." But his conclusion is the significant aspect at this point: "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."¹ For Paul, there could be no liberty at all without the pneumatic element present; liberty is a matter of immediate personal fellowship between Christ and the believer in its direction as well as in its basis. And in this immediacy, the apostle can speak of the spiritual Christian as having knowledge which no human wisdom can approximate or even test; knowledge of "the mind of the Lord" --- for "we have the mind of Christ."²

Here indeed is that existential emphasis which has been so aptly captured and forcefully expressed by many of the modern theologians. And while it is explicitly stated in only a few places in Paul's letters, it lies implicit in his whole conception of the Christian life and of his own apostolic ministry. This is that realisation which caused him to speak of the 'normal' Christian as being a πνευματικὸς ἄνθρωπος and the Christian life as a κοινωνία τοῦ πνεύματος³ as well as a κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ⁴; and which, when perverted, could lead to such pneumatic excess as found at Corinth.

The Law of Christ

But the question must be asked: Does this emphasis upon pneumatic direction in Paul's thought necessarily exclude any type of external criterion for the direction of the Christian life? Does Paul view the Christian life as entirely devoid of external guidance and

¹II Cor. 3.17b. ²I Cor. 2.6-16. ³Phil. 2.1. ⁴I Cor. 1.9.

ordered only according to the inner direction of the Spirit?

Much of the modern interpretation of the apostle has answered 'Yes' to this enquiry. Brunner, for instance, is most insistent in declaring that

The Christian conception of the Good differs from every other conception of the Good at this very point: that it cannot be defined in terms of principle at all.

Whatever can be defined in accordance with a principle ----- whether it be the principle of pleasure or the principle of duty --- is legalistic. . . . The Christian moralist and the extreme individualist are at one in their emphatic rejection of legalistic conduct; they join hands, as it were, in the face of the whole host of legalistic moralists; they are convinced that conduct which is regulated by abstract principles can never be good.¹

Thus, Brunner goes on to say, there can be no "predefinition" in Christian ethics, for "the particular decision is not anticipated"; externally, Christian ethics must be described as "opportunistic" and "lacking principles."² It is this interpretation of Paul as teaching a "morality beyond rules"³ which is dependent solely upon the inward guidance of the Spirit which has gained the ascendancy in the theological thought of the day.⁴ And yet serious exegetical objections have been raised

¹E. Brunner, The Divine Imperative, pp. 82-83.

²Ibid., p. 134. It is true that Brunner does not repudiate biblical principles as a factor in the Christian's guidance, but he views them as possessing validity only to that measure wherein the Spirit makes them inwardly valid to the individual. He cannot accept the idea of externally valid 'propositional' principles for the Christian life, and condemns any reference to such as a return to "Pharisaic Judaism" (ibid., p. 138) and a "sub-ethical position" (ibid., p. 141).

³S. Anderson, "Freedom in Christ According to Paul the Apostle" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh), p. 279. Cf. R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I. p. 324.

⁴Note P. P. Bläser, Das Gesetz bei Paulus, pp. 234-243, and Sung Bum Yun, Römer 7, 25 und der Pneumatikos, for strong presentations of this position that Christian pneumatic guidance and any type of external principles stand as diametrically opposed.

by such men as C.H. Dodd, W.D. Davies and O. Cullmann against interpreting Paul's though so one-sidedly.

The New Lawgiver and Torah in the Messianic thought of Paul's background. -- In a careful and well-substantiated piece of research into the Jewish expectation of a new Torah, W.D. Davies argues that, while Edersheim and Dalman have overstated the case, the evidence for such an expectation within Judaism is not "inconsiderable and questionable enough for us to dismiss it, as does Klausner, as merely a late development in a Judaism influenced by Christianity."¹ Many points in Davies' investigation are of pertinence for our discussion here. He points out that while Jer. 31.31-34 speaks of a new covenant wherein God's law would be written on the heart, the passage does not automatically exclude the thought of an external type of direction also. Certainly the passage goes beyond others in speaking of a "new covenant," but it can be paralleled by Ps. 37.31, 40.8, Deut. 30.14, 6.6 and 11.18 in its reference to the law contained in the heart --- with none of these latter passages ruling out the presence of the external law. Indeed, there are even expectations in the Old Testament that some type of external and divine teaching would continue to be valid in "the latter days." Both the parallel passages of Isa. 2.1-5 and Micah 4.1-5 and the Servant passage of Isa. 42.1-4, if we can assume that the idea of the Servant was somewhat related to that of the Son of Man and the Messiah,² assert such an anticipation. Davies further quotes sections from the Targums on Isa. 12.3 and Song of Songs 5.10, Song of Songs

¹W.D. Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come, p. 85.

²See W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, pp. 171ff.

Rabbah 2.13, Midrash Qoheleth 2.1 and 12.1 and Yalqut on Isa. 26 showing that there was the expectation that, in the words of the Targum on Isa. 12.3, "you shall receive a new teaching with joy from the chosen of Righteousness."¹ On pp. 86-88, Davies wrestles with the problem of why the earlier Gemaras and Midrashim show no explicit trace of such an expectation, and concludes that this absence "may be due to deliberate surgery."² As he points out, we do know from Justin's Dialogue³ and such Talmudic passages as Deut. R. 8.6 and b. Shab. 104a⁴ that "the question of the New Torah agitated Judaism"⁵ and that the Rabbis answered the Christian propaganda with obvious polemic intent. And thus, the possibility of deliberate surgery is a very real one.⁶

¹W.D. Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come, pp. 70-74.

²Ibid., p. 86, Cf. N. Wieder: "The Rabbis suppressed it for polemical reasons" ("The 'Law-Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses," The Journal of Jewish Studies, Vol. IV, No. 4, 1953, p. 175).

³Justin, Dialogue with Trypho, 11 (Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. II, pp. 99-101). Justin insists that in Christ has come "an eternal and final law" which "has abrogated that which is before it" (ibid., p. 100).

⁴Deut. R. 8.6, which appears to be a direct rebuttal to Paul's interpretation of Deut. 30.11-14 in Rom. 10.6ff.: "'For this commandment . . . it is not in heaven (XXX, 11f.)'. Moses said to Israel: 'Do not say: Another Moses will arise and bring us another Torah from heaven'; I therefore warn you, 'It is not in heaven,' that is to say, no part of it has remained in heaven."

b. Shab, 104a: "These are the commandments, that a prophet may henceforth [i.e., after Moses] make no innovations."

⁵W.D. Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come, p. 87.

⁶Note J. Klausner's argument that all such evidence for the Jewish expectation of a new Torah is of late date and influenced by Christian thought, and therefore not of importance for the understanding of first century Jewish thought, The Messianic Idea in Israel, pp. 446-449. Cf. S. Zeitlin's similar argument in his note to N. Wieder's article, "The Idea of a Second Coming of Moses," J.Q.R., Vol. XLVI, No.4 (April, 1956), p. 365.

There is also in the discoveries at Qumran further evidence that the expectation of a new Lawgiver and Torah was probably a part of the common Messianic thought of Judaism. We have long known that this type of sect was awaiting "him who will teach righteousness."¹ But now with the discovery of the one page of biblical 'Testimonia' beginning with Deut. 18.18ff. and the knowledge that the sect anticipated at least some prophetic element in the realisation of the Messianic hope,² we must more readily agree with Davies' temperate conclusion that "we can at least affirm that there were elements inchoate in the Messianic hope of Judaism, which could make it possible for some to regard the Messianic Age as marked by a New Torah."³

But while Judaism seems to contain this thought in its embryonic form, the records we have from the hands of the early church bring it out more strongly. And it was the background of the early church which was probably more influential on Paul's thought at this point than was that of Judaism. In both Peter's speech on Solomon's porch and Stephen's

¹CDC 6.11 (8.10); trans. M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls.

²Four views as to the relation of "a prophet" and "the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel" in IQS 9.11 have been advanced:

1.) The prophet is the Messiah, while the anointed ones are his followers. See W.H. Brownlee, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," B.A.S. O.R. -- S.S., Nos. 10-12, pp. 35-36, 50.

2.) The prophet is the forerunner, while the Messiah to follow would combine in his person both priestly and kingly functions. See T. Gaster, The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect, pp. 15 and 108, n. 71.

3.) The prophet is the forerunner, while both a priestly Messiah and a kingly Messiah were expected to follow. See K.G. Kuhn, "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, pp. 54-64; M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 264-265.

4.) The prophet and the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel are three aspects of the one Messiah. See A. Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes, p. 55.

³W.D. Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age and/or Age to Come, p.85. Cf. N. Wieder's articles advocating that Judaism expected a Second Moses: "The 'Law-Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses," The Journal of Jewish Studies, Vol. IV, No.4 (1953), pp. 158-175, and "The Idea of a Second Coming of Moses," J.Q.R., Vol. XLVI, No. 4 (April, 1956), pp. 356-366.

defence before the elders it is emphasised that there is some sort of providential continuity between Moses and Christ by the quotation of Deut. 18.15: "A prophet shall (the Lord) God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me (ὡς ἐμέ)."¹ Similarly, as C.H. Dodd has pointed out, "it is not the least remarkable feature of the Gospels as historical documents that although they all --- even Mark --- are written under the influence of a 'high' Christology, yet they all --- even John --- represent Jesus as a teacher with His school of disciples."² This is seen most graphically in Matthew's presentation of the Sermon on the Mount, but it is also evident in the titles 'Ραββεί,³ 'Ραββουνί,⁴ Διδάσκαλε⁵ and 'Επιστάτα⁶ used by both Christ's followers and others throughout the Gospels. Many passages indicate that Jesus was regarded by the populace as a prophet with a teaching ministry,⁷ some even as ὁ προφήτης,⁸ and that Jesus encouraged this conception.⁹ And the Fourth Gospel, which could least be accused of Judaistic tendencies, presents Christ as thrice exhorting His disciples to keep His ἐντολαί¹⁰ and as setting forth His person as in some sense a new Torah.¹¹ Further, there seems to be

¹Acts 3.22, 7.37.

²C.H. Dodd, "Jesus as Teacher and Prophet," Mysterium Christi, ed. G.K.A. Bell and A. Deissmann, p. 53.

³Jn. 1.38, 49; 3.2, 26; 6.25. ⁴Jn. 20.16.

⁵Jn. 3.2, 11.28, 13.13-14; Matt. 8.19; Mk. 4.38.

⁶Lk. 5.5, 8.24, 45, 9.33, 49. 17.13.

⁷Mk. 6.15, 8.28; Lk. 7.16, 13.33, 24.19. ⁸Matt. 21.11; Jn. 6.14.

⁹Mk. 6.4; Lk. 4.24, 13.33; Jn. 13.13.

¹⁰Jn. 14.15, 21, 15.10. The use of ἐντολή in the "new commandment" of love in 13.34 and 15.12 is possibly only a figurative one, but in these three exhortations there seems to be a more external and tangible use of the word.

¹¹Jn. 14.6: Jesus is not only "the way" and "the life," but also "the truth."

indirect evidence in at least two passages that the Gospel writers who recorded the events as well as Christ's critics understood His claim to Messiahship to include that of being 'a prophet like unto Moses': (1) in the account in Mk. 14.65 of the mocking of Jesus where He is veiled and called upon to prophesy, possibly taunting Him with the accusation that in His silence He was not like the veiled Moses but like the veiled Balaam;¹ and (2) in the objection of the Pharisee recorded in Lk. 7.39 that Jesus was not "the prophet"² because He allowed a woman of the street to touch Him.

The Significance of the Law of Christ for Paul.--- In two passages Paul presents the idea of a 'law of Christ': In Gal. 6.2. he says that in bearing one another's burdens the Christian is fulfilling τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (the Law of the Messiah?), and I Cor. 9.21 he speaks of himself as not being without law before God but as being ἔννομος Χριστοῦ. Admittedly, both passages are exceedingly difficult. But the question must be asked: Is there in Paul's use of the phrase any thought of a standard in the Christian life which possesses an external significance and validity?

The modern interpretation of these expressions takes the form of two compatible positions:

1.) That in his reference to 'law' in the Christian life there appears the old pre-Christian mode of thought which Paul used almost subconsciously and without intending the term to be taken literally.³

¹Note Num. 24.3. Cf. C. H. Dodd, "Jesus as Teacher and Prophet," Mysterium Christi, ed. G. K. A. Bell and A. Deissmann, p. 57.

²Accepting the reading of B.

³Cf. J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. II, p. 554.

2.) That this 'law' referred to is the law of the Spirit and must be understood to refer to inward and non-propositional guidance.¹ But there are factors which stand as weighty evidence for the position that Paul viewed the Law of Christ to be more than simply acting in a Christian spirit and different in some respects from what is spoken of as "the law of the Spirit."²

Oscar Cullmann³ has pointed out that Paul was not opposed to using the word παράδοσις for the instructions and teachings of Christ and the Church, even though that term carried the idea of external authority within Judaism, Jesus had so strongly denounced τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων as being τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων,⁴ and Paul had himself abandoned τῶν πατριῶν μου παραδόσεων.⁵ Thus, though the slogan of the pious Jew was 'hold fast (κρατέω) the traditions',⁶ the apostle could exhort his converts "κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις which you were taught"⁷ and praise them when they did "hold fast (κατέχω, the synonym for κρατέω) τὰς παραδόσεις."⁸ Though he opposed τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων⁹ it does not follow that he opposed the external validity of all παράδοσις as such.

In fact, as C.H. Dodd has shown, "maxims which formed part of the tradition of the sayings of Jesus are treated as if they were in some

¹Cf. P.P. Bläser, Das Gesetz bei Paulus, pp. 234-243, and R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, pp. 328ff.

²Rom. 8.2; though actually there is never a reference to "the law of the Spirit" as such, it is "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus."

³O. Cullmann, "'KYRIOS' as Designation for the Oral Tradition concerning Jesus," S.J.T., Vol. III (1950), pp. 180-186.

⁴Matt. 15.1-9, Mk. 7.1-13. ⁵Gal. 1.14. ⁶Mk. 7.8-9.

⁷II Thess. 2.15. Cf. II Thess. 3.6, I Cor. 15.2, Col. 2.6, I Tim. 6.20, II Tim. 1.14.

⁸I Cor. 11.2. Cf. I Thess. 2.13. ⁹Col. 2.8.

sort elements of a new Torah."¹ While in discussing the problems of marriage in I Cor. 7 Paul may claim for his own view the direction of the Spirit and contrast it favourably with that which Christ has said on the subject, yet it appears that what Christ has said "remains uniquely authoritative."² Similarly, he can explicitly quote his Lord in such matters as the maintenance of the Christian preacher,³ the institution of the Lord's Supper,⁴ and the blessedness of giving⁵ as though such words of Jesus carried a decisive validity. And W.D. Davies has listed eight passages from the hortatory section of Romans where, though Christ is not explicitly credited, "Paul is clearly dependent upon the words of Jesus" and uses them as valid external guidance for the Christian life:⁶

- 1.) Rom. 12.14: "Bless them which persecute you: bless, and curse not." Cf. Matt. 5.44.
- 2.) Rom. 12.17: "Recompense to no man evil for evil." Cf. Matt. 5.39ff.
- 3.) Rom. 12.21: "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." Cf. Jesus' teaching on non-resistance.
- 4.) Rom. 13.7: "Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour." Cf. Mk. 12.13-17; Matt. 22.15-22; Lk. 20.20-26.
- 5.) Rom. 13.8-10: "Owe no man anything, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt

¹C.H. Dodd, " ΕΝΝΟΜΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ," Studia Paulina, p. 107. Cf. H. Riesenfeld, The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings, pp. 19ff.

²C.H. Dodd, " ΕΝΝΟΜΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ," Studia Paulina, p. 105. Cf. I Cor. 7.10 with Matt. 19.4-9, Mk. 10.3-9, Lk. 16.18.

³Cf. I Cor. 9.14 with Matt. 10.10, Lk. 10.7.

⁴Cf. I Cor. 11.23-25 with Matt. 26.26-29, Mk. 14.22-25, Lk. 22.19-20.

⁵Cf. Acts 20.35 with the substance of Lk. 14.12-14.

⁶W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 138.

not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there by any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law. Cf. Mk. 12.28-34; Matt. 22.34-40; Lk. 10.25-28.

- 6.) Rom 14.10: "But why dost thou judge thy brother?" Cf. Matt. 7.1; Lk. 6.37.
- 7.) Rom. 14.13: "Let us not therefore judge one another any more; but judge this rather, that no man put a stumblingblock or an occasion to fall in his brother's way." Cf. Matt. 18.7; Mk. 9.42; Lk. 17.1-2.
- 8.) Rom. 14.14: "I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself." Cf. Matt. 15.11; Mk. 7.15.

We must therefore agree with Prof. Dodd that "it is not, then, so clear, after all, that Paul intended to repudiate the understanding of Christianity as a new law."¹ Luther has indeed insisted that Christ "is no Moses, no exactor, no giver of laws, but a giver of grace, a saviour, and one that is full of mercy;"² but that statement must be viewed in its context of justification by faith alone and as a reaction to the schoolmen and 'meritmongers' who commercialised righteousness. The Pauline proclamation that "Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness for all who believe" and that the Christian is "not under law but under grace" must not be pushed to what only seems to be a logically consistent interpretation of the apostle; i.e., that thus the Christian is to receive his guidance for his life only from the inward direction of the Holy Spirit. While the apostle's use of the word 'law' is not identical with Judaistic usage, it is not accidental. He possessed and proclaimed a tradition of Christ's person and teaching which he regarded

¹C.H. Dodd, Gospel and Law, p. 66.

²M. Luther, Galatians, p. 178 on Gal. 2.20.

as an external and authoritative norm and pattern for the outworking of the Christian's liberty.¹ While it is certainly a mistake to consider the Law of Christ as the equivalent of the Rabbinic Halakah or to confine its designation only to the teaching of Jesus, yet it remains "that even for Paul, with his strong sense of the immediate governance of Christ through His Spirit in the Church, that which the Lord 'commanded' and 'ordained' remains the solid, historical and creative nucleus of the whole."²

The Two Normative Factors in their Interrelationship

Recognising, therefore, that guidance in the Christian life has both an external and an internal aspect in Paul's thought, the question arises as to the relation of these two elements in the outworking of the believer's liberty. If there be in reality two normative factors in the direction of liberty, how does Paul view their interrelationship and function?

The Directing principles and example of the Law of Christ. --

The Law of Christ stands as the standard of God for Paul. He seems to view teaching of Christ as the embodiment and one true interpretation of the Old Testament, as is at least indicated by the *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς* of I Cor. 15.3 where the Christian interpretation of the Old Testament

¹Cf. A.M. Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel, pp. 118-119.

²C.H. Dodd, " *ΕΝΝΟΜΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ* ," Studia Paulina, p. 110. Note the decided change in Dodd's position at this point from that in his earliest writing, The Meaning of Paul for Today, where he asserted that in the Pauline literature Jesus is "not . . . referred to as an outside standard" (p. 146) for Paul's message is "autonomy for the Christ-inspired conscience" (p. 148), to that contained in such later works as the above article and chapter four of Gospel and Law.

prophecies came about in the first instance through the instruction of Jesus.¹ But also he considers the person of the historical Christ to be the tangible portrayal and example of the divine standard, as seems evident in the significant phrase *κατὰ Χριστόν*² and his frequent appeals to the example and character of Christ Himself.³ Thus the Law of Christ must be understood as not only the teaching of Christ but also the example of the person of Christ; both comprising the new Torah.⁴

But it is significant that wherever the apostle brings to bear on a particular ethical situation the authoritative teaching or example of Christ, he never represents that new Torah as being a detailed code which has a ready-made answer for every circumstance. Any interpretation of Paul which views him as merely exchanging the Halakah of the Rabbis for the Halakah of Jesus fails to appreciate his thought of the Law of Christ. Even the definite command of the Lord regarding marriage is not considered by Paul to be 'law' in the Jewish sense of a detailed code covering every exigency but to partake of the nature of a principle; a principle which points the way to the solution in the particular circumstance but which must be applied anew to differing situations. Thus, though Christ taught that the non-separation of husband and wife is the principle which God has established from the beginning,⁵ He said nothing

¹Cf. G.W.H. Lampe's argument that the hermeneutical principles of the New Testament writers stemmed from the earthly instruction of Christ Himself, "The Reasonableness of Typology," Essays in Typology, p. 25. See also H. Riesenfeld, The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings, esp. pp. 28-30.

²Rom. 15.5, II Cor. 11.17 (*κατὰ χριστόν*); cf. Col. 2.8.

³Rom. 15.3, 7, 8; I Cor. 11.1; II Cor. 8.9; Eph. 5.2, 25, 29; Phil. 2.5-11; Col. 3.13; I Thess. 1.6.

⁴Note the insistence of Justin Martyr that in the New Covenant "an eternal and final law --- namely, Christ --- has been given to us, . . . He is the new law, and the new covenant, . . ." (Dialogue with Trypho, 11; trans. M. Dods, et al., Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. II, p. 100)

⁵I Cor. 7.10, 11b.

specific about ascetic separation within the marriage state¹ or how this principle works out when the relationship between husband and wife has been altered through the conversion of one party.² These are matters which Paul places under the controlling principle explicit in the Law of Christ, but for which he also recognises that specific direction must be sought for from another source.

The Law of Christ is thus viewed as a standard which in its negative aspect objectively passes judgment on the self-assertion and waywardness of the Christian and in its positive purpose gives direction through authoritative principles. Paul would have agreed with E.F. Scott's understanding of the ethical teaching of Jesus at this point:

Instead of framing laws he stated principles, and made them so few and broad and simple that no one could overlook them It is true that he enounced a large number of precepts which appear to bear directly on given questions of conduct. . . . But when we look more closely into the precepts we find that they are not so much rules as illustrations. In every instance they involve a principle on which all the stress is laid; but it is applied to a concrete example, so that we may not only grasp it as a principle but judge for ourselves how it works.³

Similarly, C.H. Dodd has remarked:

I suggest that we may regard each of these precepts as indicating, in a dramatic picture of some actual situation, the quality and direction of action which shall conform to the standard set by the divine 'agape'.⁴

Assuming that Paul knew of the words and actions of his Lord, it is significant that he never fell into the fallacy of a false precision in

¹I Cor. 7.3-6. ²I Cor. 7.12-16.

³E.F. Scott, The Ethical Teaching of Jesus, p. 27. Cf. Man and Society in the New Testament, pp. 52, 62.

⁴C.H. Dodd, Gospel and Law, p. 73.

urging his converts to forgive exactly "seventy times seven,"¹ or in advocating that the example of prayer which Jesus gave to His disciples was to be binding in its order or phraseology for a truly proper intercession.² There is evidence that even his Lord considered the concrete situations contained in His teaching as dramatic illustrations of the principle involved rather than binding requirements, for in the records of the trial there is no indication that He literally offered the other cheek --- though He certainly was true to the principle contained in Matt. 5.39.³ Indeed, the very fact that Jesus taught so much in parables --- so much so that of His public ministry it could be said that "he spoke nothing to them without a parable"⁴ evidences the fact that the principles were the vital elements while the concrete situations in which those principles were encased were meant to be only illustrative. Nor is there in Paul's appeal to his converts to "walk in love, even as Christ loved us and gave himself for us"⁵ or in his praise of the Thessalonians that they "became imitators . . . of the Lord"⁶ any thought other than that of following the principles of Christ's example. Certainly he is not exhorting them to repeat the sacrifice of Christ or praising them for their punctilious conformity to the external activity of the Lord's ministry. Paul, who insisted that "the written code (γράμμα) killeth,"⁷ was not prepared to view the Law of Christ as more than authoritative

¹Matt. 18.22; cf. Lk. 17.4. ²Matt. 6.9-13; Lk. 11.2-4.

³J. Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 394, C.G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, Vol. II, p. 79, and H. Windisch, The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount, pp. 103-104, have insisted that Jesus was not consistent with His own teaching when He was on trial in Jerusalem. But such an accusation fails to take into consideration this distinction between eternally valid principles and concrete situations used as illustration.

⁷II Cor. 3.6.

⁴Matt. 13.34. ⁵Eph. 5.2, 25. ⁶I Thess. 1.6.

principles set in concrete illustrations.

While on the one hand we must argue that the Law of Christ was for Paul no legalistic code of ethics,¹ on the other we must also insist that he understood its purpose to be more than merely to convey an impression of the atmosphere of the new life.² C.H. Dodd is true to the apostle's thought when he says that

the ethical precepts of the gospels serve two purposes. On the one hand, they help towards an intelligent and realistic act of 'repentance,' because they offer an objective standard of judgment upon our conduct, so that we know precisely where we stand in the sight of God, and are in a position to accept His judgment upon us and thereby to partake of His forgiveness. On the other hand, they are intended to offer positive moral guidance for action, to those who have, in the words of the gospels, received the Kingdom of God.³

Paul viewed the Law of Christ as both propositional principles and personal example, standing as valid external signposts and bounds for the operation of liberty and concerned with the quality and direction of Christian liberty.

The pneumatic guidance of the Mind of Christ. -- And yet, Luther has rightly insisted that "it is not enough nor is it Christian, to preach the works, life and words of Christ as historical facts, as if the knowledge of these would suffice for the conduct of life."⁴ In spite of all

¹As H. Windisch, The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount, passim.

²As. R. Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, pp. 92-94.

³C.H. Dodd, Gospel and Law, p. 64. Cf. K. Lake, Paul: His Heritage and Legacy, p. 48, and O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, p. 229 for similar expressions.

⁴M. Luther, "A Treatise on Christian Liberty," Works of Martin Luther, Vol. II, trans. W.A. Lambert, p. 326. Many have viewed Luther in this statement, and in such expressions as "I have need of nothing, except that faith exercise the power and dominion of its own liberty" (ibid., p. 324), as renouncing all validity to the external Word in the direction of Christian liberty. But, as R.H. Bainton, amongst others, has pointed out: "Here is the question of religious authority. The mystic finds it in inward experience, not in a book or creed. So Luther sometimes talked as if God or the Spirit operated directly. But more -

that has been said regarding the Law of Christ, if we view this as the sole source for liberty's direction and guidance we cannot claim to have truly interpreted Paul's message. In fact, to go only this far would be to agree more with Stoicism than with distinctive Christianity. For while the Law of Christ is a definite factor in the direction of Christian liberty, it is not the most distinctive factor nor that which actually produces the Christian ethic. Without the Mind of Christ through the activity of the Spirit at work in the believer, the principles of the Law of Christ would remain remote and unattainable. In a slightly different context, James S. Stewart has pertinently remarked regarding "that type of modern religion which is content to regard Jesus merely as example":

Were there no more than this, the contemplation of the perfect holiness of Jesus could only breed despair. No shining example, cold and remote as the stars, can cleanse the conscience that has been defiled, or break the octopus grip which sin gets upon the soul. The evangel of an ethical example is a devastating thing. It makes religion the most grievous of burdens.¹

And it is true as well in the matter of Christian guidance. For Paul, the believer's life must ultimately be guided and empowered by the Spirit if it is to be truly Christian. The words of Jesus concerning the Spirit, as presented in the Fourth Gospel, well represent Paul's thought as well at this point: "He will guide you into all truth; . . . for he will

commonly, even in the beginning, he was unwilling to divorce the Spirit from the outward Word; and so increasingly after the conflict with the radicals. Luther even went so far as to attribute to the Word an effectiveness practically 'ex opere operato' ("The Development and Consistency of Luther's Attitude to Religious Liberty," H.T.R., Vol. XXII, No. 2, April 1929, pp. 126-127).

¹J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, p. 168.

take what is mine and declare it to you."¹

The precise function of the Spirit in this matter of Christian guidance is probably best summed up in the apostle's use of the word δοκιμάζω --- testing, determining, proving. Cullmann has pointed this out in saying:

The working of the Holy Spirit shows itself chiefly in the 'testing' (δοκιμάζειν), that is, in the capacity of forming the correct Christian ethical judgment at each given moment, and specifically of forming it in connection with the knowledge of the redemptive process, in which, indeed, the Holy Spirit is a decisive figure.

This 'testing' is the key to all New Testament ethics. . . . Certainty of moral judgment in the concrete case is in the last analysis the one great fruit that the Holy Spirit, this factor in redemptive history, produces in the individual man.²

Hence, whereas in the Old Covenant the individual was to "determine the things which are best being instructed out of the law,"³ in the New Covenant the Christian is to "test all things"⁴ and "determine the things which are best"⁵ by reference to the working of the Holy Spirit in his life.⁶ And thus Paul exhorts: "Be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that you may determine what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God."⁷

The guidance of the Christian in his liberty is thus in Paul's thought a matter involving both the Law of Christ (νόμος Χριστοῦ) and the Mind of Christ (νοῦς Χριστοῦ), though, as in the atonement itself,

¹Jn. 16.12-15. ²O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, p. 228.

³Rom. 2.18. The alternate reading of A.S.V., "doest distinguish the things that differ being instructed out of the law," and Luther's translation, "weil du aus dem Gesetz unterrichtet bist, prüfest du, was das Beste zu tun sei," are probably closer to Paul's thought than most other renderings.

⁴I Thess. 5.21. ⁵Phil. 1.10.

⁶Note the close proximity of the exhortations "test all things" of I Thess. 5.21 and "quench not the Spirit" of I Thess. 5.19.

⁷Rom. 12.2.

neither the objective nor the subjective element of this relationship is productive of the Christian life if that one element is really considered to stand alone. It is not without significance that the two elements of 'the Law of Christ' and 'Spirit-directed testing' are joined so closely together in the opening vvs. of Gal. 6, and that they are both subsumed under the broader context of 'walking by the Spirit'; nor that the same epistle of I Cor. which so stresses 'the Mind of Christ' also contains the reference to being 'in-lawed to Christ'. Thus the 'spiritual man'. i.e. the man who not only notes the principles and example of the Law of Christ but also allows the Mind of Christ to make application to his ethical judgment at each given moment, "judges all things."¹ Such a man recognises that as he is true to the general direction given in the Law of Christ and obedient to the Mind of Christ, he need not be too concerned regarding the adverse opinion of men; for, as Paul insisted in his own case, "it is a very small thing that I should be judged by you or by any human court. . . . It is the Lord who judges me."² Likewise he realises that the same freedom of ethical decision which is his under the Law of Christ and the Mind of Christ must be allowed to his fellow-Christian. As he sees his brother desirous of acting within the bounds of the Law of Christ and in accordance with the Mind of Christ but evidently being directed differently from him in the details of his action, he recognises in Christian love, though he might be "persuaded in the Lord Jesus"³ of the correctness of his own

¹I Cor. 2.15a. ²I Cor. 4.3-4; cf. I Cor.2.15b, II Cor.10.7, Col.2.

³Rom. 14.14.

convictions, that "it is before his own Lord that he [i.e., the Christian brother] stands or falls."¹ Liberty is not only based in Christ, it is also directed and judged only by Christ.

The Place of the Apostle and Church in the Guidance of Liberty

In stating that liberty receives its guidance only from Christ, we must raise the further question regarding the validity of apostolic and ecclesiastical instruction and ethical pronouncements. Brunner, in apparent logical consistency with Paul's Christological emphasis, insists that thus "not even an Apostle can tell you what you ought to do."² And many have followed his lead to assert that "any reimposition of do's and don'ts --- even though imposed in the name of Christ --- is less than Christian. Christ knows no taboo."³ Yet, while this emphasis has caught the main point of Paul's teaching, it has not fully represented his thought; for the apostle did consider it his and the Church's legitimate function to exhort and make ethical pronouncements, and he himself spoke authoritatively regarding even specific situations.⁴ This may be considered a

¹Rom. 14.4; cf. Rom. ch. 14, I Cor. 2.15b, II Cor. 5.10.

²E. Brunner, The Divine Imperative, p. 118.

³S. Anderson, "Freedom in Christ according to Paul the Apostle" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh), p. 279. Anderson can further say that "it was Paul who first came to realise that freedom in God meant freedom from religion" (ibid., p. 149). In a similar vein, T.E. Jessop pleads for the Church to recognise that the Christian ethic is one of ruleless love and not moral law, Law and Love.

⁴C.H. Dodd speaks of "the downright peremptory tone which Paul adopts." He goes on to point out that the apostle "neither argues nor offers tactful advice. He gives 'orders'; the term which he employs is the term used for army orders. This may come as something of a shock to those who have been accustomed to think of Paul as the apostle of liberty, and even of what is nowadays called 'Christian anarchism'" (Gospel and Law, pp. 13-14).

great inconsistency in his thinking,¹ but evidently Paul did not think it to be so. Thus, while it is much beyond the scope of this work to enter into an extended discussion regarding Paul's consciousness of his own ministry or his thought regarding the nature and function of the Church, his thought on this more limited matter of an apostle's and the Church's place in the guidance of the believer's liberty must be considered.

The Responsibility of the Apostle and the Church

Paul certainly considered himself possessed of an authority, the which he said "the Lord gave for building you up and not for destroying you."² While he readily stated that his authority was not to enslave³ or lord it over the faith of his converts,⁴ he also insisted that he could legitimately reprove,⁵ discipline,⁶ instruct⁷ and even command.⁸

¹Cf., e.g., F.C. Burkitt, who, after treating "the high Paulinist doctrine" of liberty, goes on to say: "What, however, is also clear is that (like most theoretical anarchists) he did not always live up to it. In other moods Paul issues his own Decrees, and I do not find them always convincing" (Christian Beginnings, p. 122). W.L. Knox says that in I Corinthians Paul "is forced to introduce an elementary form of a Christian moral code, but it is entirely inconsistent with his theology in Romans and Galatians" (St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 318, n.3. cf. St. Paul, pp. 94-95). Even C.H. Dodd, in his earliest work, declared that Paul's "occasional attempts at a dictation" were "really not consistent with his principles" (The Meaning of Paul for Today, p. 147).

²II Cor. 10.8. Cf. I Tim. 2.7. ³II Cor. 11.20-21.

⁴II Cor. 1.24. ⁵II Cor. 13.2. ⁶I Cor. 5.3-8, I Tim. 1.20.

⁷I Thess. 4.2ff. and passim. ⁸Phm. 8.

And that which he claimed for himself in this matter of liberty's guidance, he expected of the Church. Thus the Church also was to rebuke error,¹ discipline flagrant wantonness,² and decide in particular matters where the welfare of the community was at stake.³ He even assures the church at Corinth that in such matters it assembles, and undoubtedly acts, "with the power of our Lord Jesus."⁴ Therefore he exhorts his converts to be subject to the leaders of the Church,⁵ for, in the words of Heb. 13.17, "they are keeping watch over your souls as those who will have to give account." He considers that both he and the Church have a rightful authority in this matter of liberty's direction.

The key to the understanding of the problem of how Paul could proclaim that Christ was the only guide for the believer's liberty and yet could believe himself and the Church to be responsible in some measure for that liberty seems to be found in the transition between chapters 2 and 3 of I Corinthians. In the closing verses of chapter 2, he speaks of the *πνευματικός* man who has no need of a religious authority to aid him in knowing the will of God; indeed, for whom such an authority would simply be superfluous. In chapter 3, however, he opens by declaring that his addressees were not *πνευματικοί* but rather were *σαρκικοί*, and thus begins to instruct and command in matters regarding their liberty.

¹I Tim. 1.20, Titus 2.15.

²I Cor. 5.4-8; II Cor. 2.6, II Thess. 3.14-15.

³I Cor. 6.1-6. ⁴I Cor. 5.4. ⁵I Cor. 16.16.

These were Christians (ἀδελφοί), not those who could be called ψυχικοί and thus unable to have spiritual understanding,¹ who had left the principles and example of the Law of Christ, and evidently were not obedient to the Mind of Christ, and who thus needed to be called back from the following of their own fleshly guidance to the guidance of Christ. Implicit throughout the Pauline teaching is this thought that the apostolic and ecclesiastical rebukes, instructions and commands are only necessary for those who are not as yet mature in Christ. Thus, to those churches and individuals that he considers well within the framework of the Law of Christ and desirous of being guided by the Mind of Christ, e.g., the churches at Thessalonica and Philippi and his "beloved fellow-worker" Philemon, he primarily appeals (παρακαλέω), encourages (παραμυθέομαι) and beseeches (μαρτύρομαι) to "lead a life worthy of God" and of "the gospel of Christ";² whereas to those churches which he feels are not spiritual, e.g. the church at Corinth, and to those of which he has no certain knowledge because of his lack of personal acquaintance, e.g. the churches at Rome and those addressed in the so-called Ephesian letter, he gives commands in the first case and instructions in the principles of Christ in the second --- as well as his usual exhortations to be directed by Christ and follow the guidance of the Spirit. Paul seems to have made a similar distinction as is contained in the ancient Jewish fable, The Story of Ahikar: "My son, send a wise man and give him no

¹I Cor. 2.14.

²I Thess. 2.11-12, Phil. 1.27, Phm. 9-10.

orders; but if thou wilt send a fool, go rather thyself and send him not."¹

Now certainly the conception of a two-strata religious society in which the more spiritually mature are authorised to instruct and even command the less mature can be criticised on the grounds that not only is it undemocratic, but too often it leads to blind obedience and/or tyranny. Such criticism is not hard to find today. And the fact that the officers and members of the 'visible' Church are still human makes the point of this criticism a real possibility, for whether it be Bishop, Presbyter or the will of the Congregation --- a matured individual, individuals or the matured opinion of the whole --- there is always the danger that in the process of ecclesiastical guidance the less matured will consider their life to be lived only according to that religious authority's instruction and that the one or ones in authority will take the character of a tyrant. While this danger is lessened in the more 'democratic' Congregational type of religious structure, it is not nullified; for, despite Rousseau's maxim that "by giving myself to all I give myself to none," the authority of the sovereign group can be just as tyrannical as that of a sovereign. Paul recognised these dangers, and thus insisted that the normal Christian life was lived "by the Spirit"² and that those who restored the wayward and less mature were to do it in gentleness, humility and love.³ But he still taught that οἱ πνευματικοί were in some manner to aid in the outworking of their

¹The Story of Ahikar, 2.41. ²E.g., Gal. 5.16-25.

³E.g., Gal. 6.1-5, II Cor. 2.1-11, II Tim. 2.25.

less mature brothers' liberty: "You who are spiritual restore such a one."¹

The Manner in which this Responsibility is to be Carried Out

We cannot leave this question without attempting some answer to the further problem of just how Paul conceived that this responsibility of an apostle and the Church should be carried out. Of course there are no explicit procedures which Paul lays out in this regard -- certainly it would be non-Pauline in both theology and method for him to have given a formal 'Rules for the Restoration of Saints'. And yet we can gather certain suggestions from his letters as to how an apostle and the Church should function in this matter of the guidance of liberty.

Four legitimate functions in the execution of this responsibility seem to be recognised:

1.) The censoring of action which is beyond the general direction of the Law of Christ. Paul's own rebuke of the ethical excesses at Corinth,² and his exhortations to the churches likewise to discipline and rebuke³ reveal his thought at this point.

2.) The reiteration of the principles and example of the Law of Christ to those who are new in the faith or tend to be wayward. Thus Paul had given ethical instruction to his new converts⁴ and could fill the instructions of Rom. 12-14 with reminiscences of the teaching of Jesus.

3.) The urging of obedience to the Mind of Christ. This appeal to "put on the Lord Jesus Christ," "have this mind in you which is

¹Gal. 6.1. ²I Cor. 5.3-5, II Cor. 13.1ff., I Tim. 1.20.

³I Cor. 5.4-8, II Cor. 2.6, II Thess. 3.14-15, I Tim. 5.20.

⁴I Thess. 4.2.

also in Christ Jesus," and "walk by the Spirit" he seemed to have considered to be the highest ethical appeal possible.

4.) The interpretation of the will of Christ for specific problems affecting the corporate life of the community in a particular area and at a particular time. This seems to be what Paul did in those matters of lawsuits, marriage, meats offered to idols, the veiling of women in church and the collection for the saints, which questions were of concern to the whole church at Corinth.

It is this fourth point which is most problematic, for in this case alone does he infringe upon that area which he proclaims is the exclusive domain of the Spirit. He seems to feel, however, that since the church has shown itself to possess an element of carnality by the very fact of its divisions and strifes, it is incumbent upon him as an apostle entrusted with the care of the churches to speak with the authority given him of God for the sake of the corporate life of the community. Thus he gives instructions and even commands for the particular situation to those whom he feels are in their present state not responsive to the Mind of Christ, and this he does for the sake of the corporate life of the Church.

But in all of this it must be noticed that he does not consider this really normal. It is abnormal because of his converts' abnormal spiritual condition. Similarly, he seems to recognise that in every pronouncement of this kind his words must be considered as an interpretation. While they are given with apostolic authority, and thus must be heeded, they can never take the place of or be equal to the express directives of the Lord nor the guidance of the Spirit. This distinction

seems evident in his mind in the following statements:

I Cor. 7.6 --- "But I say this by way of concession, not by way of command."

I Cor. 7.25 -- "I have no command of the Lord, but I give an opinion as one mercifully commissioned (ὡς ἠλεημένος) by the Lord to be trustworthy."

I Cor. 7.40 -- ". . . according to my opinion. And I think that I have the Spirit of God (on this matter)."

II Cor. 8.8 -- "I say this not by way of command."

Further, these were apostolic interpretations for a specific time and circumstance, not eternally valid principles. They were the Mind of Christ, he believed, for that circumstance; but he would insist that they are true for later and other situations only in the sense that the principle which they apply remains constant and only as the Spirit applies that principle anew to new situations in the same manner. He explicitly states that one of his opinions was conditioned by "the present distress,"¹ and it seems that he recognised the time- and situation-bound nature of his other pronouncements as well. We need not suppose, for instance, that he would have continued to argue for the inconsequential character of eating meat offered to idols when at a later time such an act acquired the connotation of a renunciation of Christ.

Thus as a father in maturity and an apostle in rights he applies the Mind of Christ as he knows it to the specific situation of those who are less mature and for whom he is responsible, insisting all the

¹I Cor. 7.26.

while that such action on his part was only an interim measure until they came to maturity and was done for the sake of the corporate community.

The Conditioning Factor in Liberty's Exercise

But there is also another vitally important element present in the Pauline teaching regarding liberty, and that is the concept of *ἀγάπη*. Much has been written regarding the significance of this word and its distinction from the less meaningful *φιλα* and the non-biblical *ἔρω*,¹ but it is impossible to overemphasise its importance in Paul's thought as the conditioning factor in the exercise of Christian liberty. With only a very slight extension of meaning to the words in his 'Song of Songs', the apostle could just as easily have said: Though I have all knowledge of the will of God and have not love, I am nothing. Paul's thought regarding the exercise of liberty contains both elements of (1) the knowledge of the will of God through the Law of Christ and the Mind of Christ and (2) the conditioning of that knowledge as it is put into practice through love.

As at many points in Paul's theology, and for that matter in the Christian life itself, these two concepts of the will of God and the love of God are so intimately joined that they can only be separated in practice at the cost of total destruction to the Christian ethic. Certainly truly to do the will of God is to act in love; while to act in a Spirit-inspired love is to fulfil the expressed Law of Christ and

¹E.g., A. Nygren, Agape and Eros, pp. 30ff. and passim; A.M. Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel, pp. 47-48.

undoubtedly often to be in conformity to the Mind of Christ. And yet Paul does not simply equate the two conceptions, as is the manner of so much theological thought today. He does not speak of love so much as directing as of conditioning the Christian's liberty. It is not that love is primary as giving guidance to the believer, for actions stemming from the best of motives and intentions can at times result in turmoil, harm and anything but the will of God. Rather, love stands as the qualifying factor to that ethic which has received its guidance from Christ. The same love which compelled and controlled God to act on behalf of man "has been poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit,"¹ so that now love, in both its divine manifestations and human responses, has become also the motivation for and the modifying element in the Christian ethic. As the will of God, expressed through the interaction of the Law of Christ and the Mind of Christ, is central in the guidance of liberty, so the love of God, both His love to us and our response, is central in its conditioning. It is this conditioning factor of love which, together with the pneumatic guidance of the Mind of Christ, makes operative in the particular situation the principles and example of the Law of Christ; and it is the union of these factors which results in the will of God being done in specific and differing situations.

Love to those within the Christian Community

The necessity of love within the Christian community is so basic to Paul's thought and teaching that he can say to the Thessalonians: "But concerning love of the brethren you have no need to have any one

¹Rom. 5.5.

write to you, for you yourselves have been taught by God to love one another."¹ While the Pauline correspondence has less explicit reference to brotherly love than does the Johannine literature,² the conception of such love lies basic to Paul's ethical teaching and, as will be pointed out in the following chapter, finds its best illustration in the apostle's practice.

The Johannine emphasis that love of God means love of the brethren as well finds its counterpart in Paul's presentation of the unity that exists between Christ and the Church, and thus between Christians themselves. As many have pointed out,³ it is probable that Paul first learned of the solidarity of Christ and Christians on the Damascus road in the words: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Henceforth there rang in his heart the gist of the reported saying of Jesus: "Inasmuch as you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it to me."⁴ Hence he used the strong metaphor *σῶμα Χριστοῦ* in describing the corporate fellowship of Christians in Christ.⁵ While we need not insist that this expression is to be taken realistically or ontologically,⁶ the close relation between symbol and reality which is a feature of Hebrew thought must needs be taken seriously as a warning against the

¹I Thess. 4.9.

²Paul's explicit exhortations to brotherly love are found in Rom. 12.10, 13.8; Gal. 5.13; Eph. 5.2.

³E.g., J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, p. 58; E. Best, One Body in Christ, p. 184.

⁴Matt. 25.40.

⁵I Cor. 12.27; cf. I Cor. 10.17, 12.12-30, Eph. 1.23, 4.12, Col. 1.18.

⁶As J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, and the more 'Catholic' interpreters.

too exact and exclusive identification of 'the body of Christ' with the Church,¹ we must not minimise the strength of this metaphor in signalling the intense unity of fellowship that exists between Christ and the members of His Church. Without asserting such an ontological union, it still remains true that the apostle could not "look into the eyes of a Christian without meeting there the gaze of Christ."² Therefore he tells the Corinthians that in "sinning against the brethren and wounding their weak conscience you are sinning against Christ,"³ and in making the Lord's Supper a gluttonous feast and through it even shaming the Christian poor you are "not discerning the body";⁴ i.e., in this case, probably both not discerning in the supper the divine significance of the things partaken of, the Lord's broken body and shed blood, and not discerning in the supper the divine fellowship that has been and is established in Christ and among members of Christ's body, the Church.⁵

¹Ernest Best has cogently argued: "Jer. 50.17, 'Israel is a scattered sheep', does not imply reality but metaphor; so likewise, Jer. 50.6, 'My people hath been lost sheep', and Isa. 5.7, 'For the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant'. Cf. Ps. 80.8; Hos. 10.1; Isa. 52.2. Israel is 'this' or 'that' --- and the references could be indefinitely extended --- but no one seriously believes that in these references anything more than a metaphor is implied. The word denoting comparison is just customarily omitted. It is true of descriptions of Yahweh in the Old Testament: Ps. 91.2, 'I will say of the Lord, He is my refuge and my fortress' --- which does not mean that the Lord is an inanimate castle but that in certain aspects of his being he behaves like such a castle. So it is in the case of the description of the Church as the Body of Christ" (One Body in Christ, p. 99).

²E. Mersch, The Whole Christ, p. 104.

³I Cor. 8.12. ⁴I Cor. 11.29.

⁵Cf. J. Moffatt, "Discerning the Body," E.T., Vol. XXX, No. 1, Oct. 1918.

It is because of this corporate relationship of believers in Christ that Paul speaks of his fellow-Christian as being a 'brother', a term which testifies to the closeness of the believer to other believers and which is exceeded in the figure of the family only by the words describing marriage itself --- which words are normally reserved in biblical terminology for the relationship of the Lord and His people.¹ Similarly, while Paul's use of ἐν designates the believer's personal relation to his Lord, his use of the prefix σύν illustrates his thought regarding his own unity with other Christians and the believer's corporate relation within the community of Christ and His own; e.g., συνεργός (fellow-worker),² συνκοινωνός (fellow-partner),³ συμμιμητής (fellow-imitator),⁴ σύνδουκος (fellow-slave),⁵ συστρατιώτης (fellow-soldier),⁶ and συναιχμάλωτος (fellow-prisoner).⁷

Thus the Christian's liberty within the community of Christ is to be conditioned by the love of God, a love which manifests itself in concern for the welfare of the fellow-believer⁸ and which motivates and controls every attempt in edification⁹ and restoration.¹⁰ If the will of God is to be truly done and the Christian's liberty to be truly exercised, all that is done must be done in love.¹¹ That same love

¹Cf. E. Best, One Body in Christ, p. 26.

²Rom. 16.3, 9, 21; I Cor. 3.9, 16.16; II Cor. 8.23; Phil. 2.25, 4.3; Col. 4.11; Phm. 1, 24.

³Phil. 1.7. ⁴Phil. 3.17. ⁵Col. 1.7, 4.7.

⁶Phil. 2.25, Phm. 2.

⁷Rom. 16.7, Col. 4.10, Phm. 23. ⁸Gal. 6.2, Phil. 2.4.

⁹I Cor. 12-14, esp. ch. 13. ¹⁰II Cor. 2.5-11, Gal. 6.1.

¹¹I Cor. 16.14.

which motivated God to give the gift of freedom in Jesus Christ must likewise motivate the Christian to waive his given rights of liberty wherever necessary for the sake of the corporate ideal.

Love to those outside the Christian Community

In earlier centuries, the Anabaptists caught up Paul's emphasis upon the distinctive reality of the brotherhood of believers in Christ and the obligation of love within that brotherhood, but arbitrarily limited the requirement of love for the Christian to that group only. They thus committed themselves to a double standard of love, one for believers and one for unbelievers. But their one-sided emphasis did injustice to the apostle's message. Though Paul did say that the Christian's goodness is to be directed "especially to those who are of the household of faith," he prefaced that statement by saying: "Let us do good to all."¹ And this same balance of love to both Christian and non-Christian is presented in Rom. 12, where it seems that vss. 3-13 deal with action within the Christian fellowship and vss. 14-21 with the believer's attitude toward those without. The same intensity of love is to condition the Christian's action in both spheres, for the believer is to be interested in the welfare of all of mankind whatever their spiritual condition.

In spiritual matters, this love is manifested to the world in a willingness to restrict one's personal liberty in matters which are of secondary importance for the sake of the Gospel. Paul explicitly states this principle in a series of balances clauses in I Cor. 9.19-23.

¹Gal. 6.10.

There he says that to the Jew he voluntarily "became as one under the law," even though as a Christian he holds himself to be free from the law, and to the Gentile he "became as one outside the law [i.e. the law of Moses]," for in truth he was done with that law --- though for different reasons than his Gentile audiences. Since, for Paul, the Law had lost its connection with righteousness in the coming of Christ and now only carried nationalistic significance, it had become less than secondary to the central issue of his message. Thus he was not going to alienate his Jewish hearers and obscure the point of his essential message by a rash disregard of the national traditions; nor was he going to cast a stumbling-block before his Gentile audiences by lauding that which to him and to them, but for different reasons, were only national traditions.

David Daube has pointed out that Paul's action of being "all things to all men" on secondary issues in order that he might stress the primary matter "had formed part of Jewish missionary practice long before Paul."¹ He cites the case of Hillel's acceptance of a proselyte who would accept only such written law as contained the most fundamental ethical principles, the great teacher feeling that in such an acceptance the main point was won and the rest would come in time.² Thus "at the decisive moment of conversion, he [i.e. Hillel] fell in with the notions of the applicant" in order to gain his major objective.³ Similarly

¹D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 336. See also pp. 336-341.

²b. Shab. 31a, Aboth de-R. Nathan 15.

³D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 336.

Daube cites the Letter of Aristeas 257, where, when the king asks how he might meet with acceptance when travelling abroad, the answer is given: "By becoming equal to all." In its context, this is advice for a traveller and has a political sense, and yet "it may be assumed that, as early as the time the Letter was composed, this was also a slogan of proselyte-makers. The author of the Letter himself was a Jewish propagandist."¹ Thus Daube argues that "Paul, when he wrote the passage from I Corinthians . . . (i.e. I Cor. 9.20-23), was drawing on a living element in Jewish religion."² But while this background be true, Paul's statement of his attitude in I Cor. 9.19, "for though I am free from all I have made myself a servant to all, in order that I might win the more," seems to have more of a reminiscence of the example of Jesus than that of Hillel. In Phil. 2.6-11 and Gal. 4.4-5 he presents Jesus as being truly free of all men and yet as having taken the form of a servant under the Law in order that he might redeem those who were under the Law; i.e., as emptying Himself of His rights and allowing Himself to be subjected to the very limitations which He came to break in order to lay the foundations of the Gospel. And the fact that in Rom. 15.8 and Eph. 5.2 Paul can hold up this example of Christ in becoming "a servant to the circumcised" as worthy of emulation indicates that even Paul's methods were Christologically based. It seems that Luther has best and most succinctly caught the apostle's

¹Ibid., p. 341.

²Ibid., p. 341.

thought in saying: "I will therefore give myself as a Christ to my neighbour, just as Christ offered Himself to me."¹ For Paul, the truly liberated man is the one who, like Christ, is free from evil and the possessor of God-given rights, yet, like Christ, willingly re-enters the arena of conflict and voluntarily relinquishes his rights in the non-essential matters in order that he might help his fellows find true freedom.

Thus the Christian's liberty in that sphere outside of the community of Christ, as well as within the community, is to be conditioned by the love of God; a love manifesting itself in concern for the welfare and salvation of those outside of Christ and motivating and controlling every action in the realisation of that purpose. That same love which motivated God to give and Christ to bring the gift of liberty must also motivate the Christian to restrict his liberty in matters of secondary importance for the sake of the central message of liberty in Christ. This conditioning factor of love in the exercise of the Christian's liberty is best seen at work in the Apostle's own practice, and so it is to that question we must turn in the following chapter.

¹M. Luther, "A Treatise on Christian Liberty," Works of Martin Luther, Vol. II, trans. W.A. Lambert, p. 337.

CHAPTER V

THE PAULINE PRACTICE.

Since the publication of F. C. Baur's Paulus in 1845, the problem of the Pauline practice has been considered by many to be the chief enigma in the study of the apostle. Continental theologians early viewed the seeming discrepancy between the teaching of Paul in the Epistles and the practice of Paul as represented in Acts as the weightiest argument against the veracity of the Acts account. Other interpreters, primarily British scholars, have tended to see these practices mainly as evidence that the apostle was just too ingenious to be hampered by logic. But either way, the difficulties of understanding the Pauline practice as represented in Acts, and as suggested in some of his own statements, have brought about a serious re-evaluation of the reliability of the Acts record or the moral character of Paul himself --- and more commonly, of both.

This chapter must therefore deal with the practice of Paul as it is revealed in his own letters and represented by his biographer, enquiring constantly into the relation between that practice and his teaching. The presentation here is not meant to be primarily a defence of the authenticity of Acts, for certainly other factors must also be considered in a real critical study of that work; though, of course, the conclusions arrived at in this chapter will have a direct bearing upon some of the introductory problems of the Acts. Nor is it our desire to smooth out possibly inherent rough places in the Pauline

profile or gloss over real inconsistencies. But it is our conviction that much of the criticism against the represented practices and stated methods of the apostle is in reality only the débris remaining long after the main structure of the Tübingen theory has fallen, and that such criticism stems from a failure to understand aright Paul's teaching regarding Christian liberty.

In any discussion of an historical figure, preference must usually be given to that persons own statements over those of his biographers in the reconstruction of his thought and action. So, too, in the study of Paul. It is only sound historiography to begin with his own letters and to be inclined to trust them over another's history should there be real points of conflict between the two. Thus we must turn first to those practices which Paul himself relates and evidences in his letters before considering those presented by his biographer, and thus we must constantly test the statements in Acts by the self-revelations in the Epistles. Of necessity the concluding point in the previous chapter will become the dominant theme of this, for in Paul's declaration of being "all things to all men" we have, as Lightfoot long ago insisted, "the key to all seeming inconsistencies in different representations of his conduct."¹

Within the Gentile Church

It is to Paul's practice ~~within~~ the Gentile Church to which we must first turn, for, as F. C. Baur said in commenting on I Cor. 9.20, "he can only have been a Jew unto the Jews in the same manner in which he was a Gentile to the Gentiles."²

¹J. B. Lightfoot, Epistle to the Galatians, p. 348

²F. C. Baur, Paul, His Life and Works, Vol I, p. 131

It is not Baur's methodology and starting point which are at fault in his construction of the Pauline profile, but it is his underlying presupposition of what Paul taught and was like in a Gentile context which led him to see such a sharp contrast between the Epistles and Acts. We must therefore begin by viewing anew the apostle's methods and actions within his own sphere of labour.

Paul's Missionary Activity

From the days of the Fathers, Paul's Athenian experience of Acts 17 has been cited as the illustration of the "all things to all men" principle as it works out in the Gentile situation. But since a proper historical method must always start with a consideration of those documents closest to the object of study, and in view of the criticisms against Acts, it is best at this point to centre our attention exclusively upon Paul's practice in the Gentile world as it is revealed in his own epistles. And in his letters, there is one factor regarding his missionary approach and method which stands out clearly and is of pertinence here --- i.e., his personal frugality.

In I Cor 9.1-18 the passage just preceding his famed and central "all things to all men" exclamation, Paul insists that as an apostle ---and especially so unto the Corinthians themselves --- he has the right to maintenance at the cost of the Church, and that, if he were married, his wife travelling with him would rightfully share in this privilege. He justifies this right to maintenance by reference to the analogy of wages paid to those who serve in worldly affairs, to the old Testament statement and practice, and to command of Christ. And yet, while he insists that this right of maintenance is the privilege of every apostle, he declares that he has not made use of the right. And the fact that in II Cor. 11.7-15 he must defend

himself against those who would discredit his apostleship by implying that he was ashamed to accept an apostle's due indicates that at least at Corinth he did indeed refuse himself this privilege. Precisely why he took this action is a little difficult to ascertain. He speaks of it as a practice that was needful for the sake of the Gospel¹ and the service to the Corinthians,² that was motivated out of love for the Corinthians,³ and that was meant to benefit the Corinthian church⁴ and to undermine the claims of the false apostles.⁵ He even speaks of this refusal of his full right in the Gospel, and thus his offering of the Gospel gratis, as his boasting and his reward.⁶ It is possible that the willingness to so deny himself was early learned in the school of Gamaliel I, for Hillel and his immediate descendants were known for their going beyond the call of duty in applying the more stringent ruling to themselves while the more lenient to the people.⁷ Probably the need for such action arose from the Greek suspicion of the sophists among the travelling philosophers of the day who would extract payment for their services and were not willing to live on voluntary contributions.⁸ But the significant factor here is that in so refusing his full rights, Paul was but manifesting in action a real element of his doctrine of Christian liberty; i.e., the indicative of our liberty in Christ must always be conditioned by a

¹I Cor. 9.12. ²II Cor. 11.8. ³II Cor. 11.11. ⁴II Cor. 11.7-9.

⁵II Cor. 11.12-15. ⁶I Cor. 9.15-18, II Cor. 11.10.

⁷Cf. Mish. Yom Tob (Betzah) 2.6, Mish. Eduy. 3.10: "What shall we infer from thy father's household [i.e. Gamaliel I's], which applied the stringent ruling to themselves but the lenient ruling to Israel?" See also Mish. Ber. 2.5-7; Mish Yom Tob (Betzah) 3.2; Mish. Bab. Mez. 5.8.

⁸Cf. R. H. Strachan, II Corinthians (M.N.T.C.), p.23.

love that is willing to sacrifice for the sake of the Christian's central message and purpose. Thus he declares in I Cor. 9.24-27 that for the sake of his message and purpose he exercises self-control in all things, and in II Cor. 6.3ff. that he seeks in the exercise of his liberty to "give no occasion of offence in anything in order that the ministry be not blamed."

Paul's Pastoral Ministry

But there are also other evidences in Paul's letters of his practice within the Gentile Church which are not usually considered when dealing with this subject. H. Chadwick¹ has pointed out that the apostle's famous confession of I Cor. 9.22. must also be applied to his dealings with the problems within the Corinthian Church. We have noted previously the apostle's thought regarding his and the Church's responsibility in censoring and instructing the Christian in his liberty, but it will also be instructive to follow Chadwick's suggestion and note how Paul deals with the basic situations and errors which contributed in bringing to a head the problems in the Corinthian Church.

In dealing with the libertines. -- In chapters 5 and 6 of I Corinthians, Paul strongly censors the immorality present in the church and the readiness of some of its members to go before heathen courts with a brother rather than be deprived of one's rights. It will probably continue to remain uncertain whether he was speaking to one 'party' in the Paul-Apollos-Cephas-Christ division in the church or dealing with a situation and mentality that cut through two or more of these groups. But in any case it is clear that he is

¹ H. Chadwick, "All things to All Men," N.T.S., Vol. I (1954-1955), pp. 261-275.

here concerned with Gentile Christian libertines whose watchwords seem to have been "All things are lawful for me!" and "Food for the stomach and the stomach for food!"¹ And while he censors their excesses in 5.1 - 6.11, he deals with their underlying thought in 6.12-20.

It is interesting to note that when he deals with the thought of the Christian libertines, he begins by unhesitatingly accepting their fundamental position that the Christian is free from all earthly restraint. Whether πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν are Paul's own words which were misused by his converts or were composed by the Corinthian converts as a natural inference from that which had been proclaimed to them, the point is that the apostle begins by agreeing with them in that which had probably become current among the Corinthian libertines as a trite maxim. Similarly with the expression τὰ βρώματα τῆ κοιλιᾶ, καὶ ἡ κοιλία τοῖς βρώμασιν. As the heathen world could speak of "the sword to the scabbard, and the scabbard to the sword,"² and mean by that "the male and the female, and the passion of each for intercourse with the other, and the faculty which makes use of the organs which have been constructed for this purpose,"³ so, it seems, the libertine Christians in Corinth joined the popular expressions of their pagan culture to their perverted idea of Christian liberty and made "food for the stomach and the stomach for food" a specious plea for sexual laxity.⁴ But even here, Paul begins by agreeing with their basic tenet.

¹I Cor. 6.12-13, ²Epictetus, Dissertations, I. 6. 6.

³Ibid., I. 6. 9.

⁴Cf. J. Moffat, I Corinthians (M.N.T.C.), pp. 68-69.

The apostle could easily be charged with being unscrupulous at this point. And if his claim to agreement with his errant addressees' basic claim was really not sincere, then he certainly cannot be relieved of such a charge. But in actuality, Paul did agree with them; though he agreed only up to a point. In effect, he says to these libertine Christians that if one considered only the indicative of Christian liberty, then indeed "all things are lawful"; if the Gospel proclamation was only that Christ has freed us for our full expression, then immorality is proper. But, like Epictetus' argument on this same question that "use is one thing, and understanding another,"¹ Paul went on to insist that the question of Christian liberty is not ended in simply a consideration of that which is lawful. Rather, the fact that "all things are lawful for me" must be constantly tempered by the realisation that "not all things are profitable" and the determination that "I will not be enslaved by anything!"² In the first qualification the apostle seems to have in mind the Christian community, declaring that liberty is limited "by reference to the moral or religious life of all those who are concerned, viz. the agent and those whom his conduct may influence."³ In the second he views the individual, urging that "we must beware of using liberty in such a way as to lose it."⁴ Or, in terms of the presentation of Paul's teaching in the previous chapter, he begins by agreeing that the Gospel indicative is indeed a declaration that all things are lawful to the Christian, but goes on to insist that:

1.) The imperative of the Gospel to "stand fast, therefore, and

¹Epictetus, Dissertations, I. 6. 13. ²I Cor. 6.12.
³A. Robertson and A. Plummer, I Corinthians (I.C.C.), p. 122
⁴Ibid., p. 122

do not submit to a yoke of slavery" must be heeded, which factor the libertines had ignored --- and thus were perverting Christian liberty --- in their slavery to their own sinful passions.

2.) The direction of liberty must be from Christ, whose direction the libertines had abandoned in their giving over to a harlot what rightfully belonged to Christ and in their following of their own fleshly desires.

3.) The exercise of liberty must be conditioned by love, which love is not manifested --- and thus true liberty not executed --- in a flagrant moral promiscuity.

Paul's earlier words in Gal 5.13 are apt for this situation also: "For you were called unto liberty, brethren; only use not your liberty as an opportunity for the flesh, but through love be servants of one another."

Thus the apostle truly agrees with his erring converts when they stress the indicative of the Gospel message, but he insists that the doctrine of liberty in Christ is more than just the acceptance of the indicative of that liberty if it is to be truly Christian liberty. He begins on their own ground and on that point wherein he finds agreement with them, and then leads them on from there.

The question is often raised why Paul didn't just quote the last clause of the Jerusalem Decree regarding *νομωσιν* in settling the question; for whether the Decree be considered a three-clause ethical pronouncement or a four-clause enactment covering both food and ethical questions, the final clause regarding immorality remains and would directly apply to this situation at Corinth. We must deal with the larger question concerning the existence, deliverance and Paul's acceptance of the Jerusalem Decree at a later point in this chapter. But suffice it here to say that the omission of the final point of the Decree at this point is no evidence either against the existence of that Decree or of Paul's refusal

to whole-heartedly accept it. The apostle is here dealing with the libertine mentality. It is probable that his addressees are those same Christians reflected in II Corinthians as criticising him for being too bound by earthly considerations and not taking a really spiritual view. Regardless of whether or not the Decree was existent or accepted by Paul, to have quoted any ecclesiastical pronouncement to those ultra-spiritualists who considered all such statements as sub-Christian would have immediately labelled him as beneath them in spirituality and would have closed the door to his endeavour to lead them on in the things of true Christian liberty. It could just as well be argued that part of the criticism against Paul in the Corinthian Church arose within the libertine group because he had originally delivered the Decree to them as that because he did not quote its last section in I Cor. 6 the Decree is spurious, known to Paul only after his third journey or unacceptable to the apostle. Whether or not the Decree was existent, delivered or accepted, Paul thought too much of these libertine Christians to revolt them and thus cause them to stumble by bringing in what they believed to be a sign of immaturity when it was not absolutely necessary to do so. He is dealing with Christians whose outlook is so warped that they can call moral laxity an exercise in spiritual liberty and ecclesiastical guidance a fleshly function, but even here he is "all things to all men" in order to lead them on to a true understanding and expression of the liberty that is in Christ Jesus.

In dealing with the ascetics. -- In I Cor. 7, the apostle turns to the first of those matters which had been asked him in the letter from Corinth: the question regarding marriage. For our purpose it is not necessary to extensively consider the broader

question of Paul and marriage,¹ nor even to attempt an identification of those within the Corinthian Church who had sent him this question and/or for whom it was a real problem. It will be sufficient at this point to note the mentality to which he is addressing himself and the approach he makes to his addressees.

Whereas in the two previous chapters Paul had dealt with the libertine type of thought, now he turns to the Christian ascetic.² Here he confronts a more difficult situation than the previous; for while the libertine movement would appear to many of those outside its ranks to be merely licentiousness clothed in piety, rigid asceticism usually gains the reputation of being eminently religious. Thus the apostle, if he is to gain those who stand without the ascetic group --- but view it with respect --- as well as the earnest ascetics themselves, must use the utmost Christian tact in the matter. This situation must be recognised, for it probably explains the carefulness and some of the intricacies involved in Paul's argument in this chapter.

The interesting factor to note in Paul's approach to the question is that he begins in agreement with those he seeks to correct. Nowhere in the chapter does he bring in the Hebraic argument of

¹The majority opinion seems to be that Paul "shows a surprising lack of appreciation of the spiritual possibilities in the marriage relation, in fact, a rather abysmal and embarrassing ignorance of the total meaning of marriage" (J. Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, p. 105) But note also O. Michel, "Wie spricht Paulus über Frau und Ehe?" Theologische Studien und Kritiken, Vol. CV, Heft 2 (1933), pp. 215-228, and H. Chadwick, "All things to All Men," N.T.S., Vol I (1954-1955), pp. 263-270, for an emphasis upon the external situation at Corinth affecting the manner in which the apostle casts his words, and M.S. Enslin, The Ethics of Paul, pp. 169ff. for a sympathetic treatment.

²Note A. Robertson and A. Plummer, I Corinthians (I.C.C.), p. 132 on I. Cor. 7.1, and J. Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief, p. 169 on I Cor. 7.1.

creation for the order and function of the sexes, for, evidently, he realises that such an argument would carry no weight with the dualistically-tainted ascetic mentality. Rather, he begins his discussion on these points in which they could both agree: "It is well for a man not to touch a woman," as in vs. 1, and "It is well for them (i.e., the unmarried and widows) to remain [single] even as I," as in vs. 8. In these two expressions, Paul, as in the case of the libertines, again seems to be quoting back to a group of Corinthian converts their own declarations. The first appears to be their motto, while the second is evidently their attempt to give a Christian justification to their thought through the example of Paul himself.

Now Paul truly did agree with the ascetics --- at least up to a point. He could never have thought of them as "these blind buzzards" who "cannot discern things which are the good creatures of God from vices,"¹ for Christian liberty also included the right to abstain from legitimate pursuits if one be convinced in his own mind that that be the will of Christ for him personally. And in Paul's own case, it seems that he believed himself to be divinely directed along similar lines to those of his ascetic addressees. It will probably never be conclusively settled whether Paul was or was not ever married, but it seems most probable that he never was.² The argument that as a member of the Sanhedrin he must have been a married man and a father

¹As said M. Luther, Galatians, p. 213 on Gal. 3.3, though Luther's invective was against the ascetics of his day who based their righteousness on their works of abstinence. Thus, this is not strictly a true parallel to the case at Corinth.

²Cf. A. Robertson and A. Plummer, I Corinthians (I.C.C.), pp. 138-139 on I Cor. 7.8.

is not strong, for this rule,¹ made in the interests of clemency within the council, may be of a later date. Similarly, Clement's theory that he was married, but that he left his wife at Philippi so as not to interfere with his travels and that he addresses her in the words *γῆραιε σὺνυε* of Phil. 4.3,² can be safely set aside since he could never agree with the ascetics that the unmarried and widows should "remain even as I" if he had all the while been married. That the ascetics could point out the example of Paul as substantiation for their views on continence indicates that he was unmarried rather than a widower; while his statement expressing the wish "that all were as I am myself" is more understandable as a desire that all possessed the gift of continence than that all should be widows and widowers or should simply remain unmarried whatever the situation. In this, as evidenced by his own personal practice, the apostle did agree with the ascetics: the best procedure, if one possessed the gift of continence, was to remain single. The gift of continence was probably especially valuable for the Christian amidst the moral excesses in the pagan world of that day, and celibacy "for the sake of the kingdom of heaven" had been praised by Christ Himself.³ But Paul entirely disagreed with the ascetics in their reason for sexual abstinence and in their insistence that this should be the normal experience of every truly spiritual Christian.

¹b. Sanh. 36b.

²Cf. A. Robertson and A. Plummer, I Corinthians, (I.C.C.), pp. 138-139 on I Cor. 7.8.

³Matt. 19.11-12

For Paul, abstinence from the sexual expression within marriage could only be enjoined, and the gift of continence was only given, (1) in the case of a desire to fulfil a specific purpose for the glory of God,¹ (2) in view of "the present distress,"² and/or (3) in anticipation of the imminent coming of Christ.³ He agrees with the ascetics that difficulties and troubles accompany marriage, and he would spare his converts that.⁴ But he insists that no sin is involved in marrying.⁵ Nowhere does he speak of marriage as sub-spiritual because of the material aspect in it causing defilement. Nor could Paul agree that celibacy was to be the normal or even the best procedure for every Christian. If the Corinthians were to accept such a tenet, they would become "slaves of men" rather than freemen in Christ.⁶ Both celibacy and marriage are callings of God.⁷ And while Paul believed that his and some of the Corinthians' gift of continence was the best gift for the furtherance of the Christian mission and the life lived in the interim period in God's redemptive history,⁸ he could not despise marriage as essentially sinful or as less than a calling of God.

We therefore see in Paul's approach to the Christian ascetics

¹E.g., in giving oneself to prayer (I Cor. 7.5) and in devoting oneself to difficult missionary endeavour involving physical risk (as seems true in Paul's case). But within the marriage state, such sexual abstinence was only to be temporary and to be agreed upon by both partners.

²I Cor. 7.26, so translating τὴν ἐνεστώσαν ἀνάγκην .

³I Cor. 7. 29, 31. ⁴I Cor. 7.28b, 32. ⁵I Cor. 7.28a, 36b, 38a.

⁶I Cor. 7.23. ⁷I Cor. 7.12-24. ⁸I Cor. 7.6, 38.

of Corinth that same application of the principle "all things to all men" as we saw in his dealings with the libertines. He begins at that point where he finds agreement with them, acknowledging that the indicative of the Gospel allows them to manifest their liberty in Christ in a rigid asceticism if they should so choose and agreeing with them that he has found the single state, with its necessary accompanying gift of continence, to be the best. But he goes on to undermine their dualistic justification for the abstinence from sexual relations by offering what he believes to be the true Christian reasons, and he renounces the view that such abstinence is alone truly Christian. He thus agrees with them that liberty in Christ allows for a Christian asceticism, but goes on to argue that:

1.) Continence must be considered a gift, not an obligation; else we enslave men to our ideal and do not allow them to stand in the liberty to which Christ has set them free.

2.) Abstinence from the sexual expression in marriage can be justified only in the light of our Christian purpose, the present circumstances and/or our expectation of Christ's soon return, but never on the ground that sexual relations within marriage are evil 'per se'.

3.) The obligation of permanent abstinence, without the gift of continence, can set one "aflame with passion" and be a "temptation to immorality"; thus causing havoc within the Christian community, and, by the ascetics' insistence upon it as an obligation for all, be a failure on their part to condition their own Christian liberty by love.

In dealing with 'the strong' -- In I Cor. 8.1 - 11.1, Paul takes up another point of real tension in the Corinthian Church: the matter of eating meat which had been previously consecrated to an idol. Two factions had formed within the church on this issue. The one group insisted that liberty in Christ meant freedom from the old Jewish prejudice against eating meat which had been previously offered to idols, and evidently taunted the other group with the nickname οἱ ἄσθενοῦντες.¹ The other group felt that to eat such meat was to participate at least to some extent in idolatry, and thus deny their exclusive oneness with Christ. Just who these eaters and non-eaters were is not our problem here. In all likelihood, however, the non-eaters had been influenced by Jewish thought, if not actually former Jews or Jewish proselytes,² while the eaters seem to be purely Gentile Christians closely approximating, if not actually identical with, the libertines discussed previously. Nor need we attempt to define the relationship between the strong and the weak of I Cor. 8 - 10 and the strong and the weak of Rom. 14.³ While the passage in Romans does speak of disputations over foods, and

¹A. S. Geysler has suggested that while the eaters looked down upon the non-eaters and called them οἱ ἄσθενοῦντες, the non-eaters' nickname for the eaters was, with a play on words, οἱ ἄσθεντες --- which the eaters changed to οἱ ἰσχυροί ("Paul The Apostolic Decree and the Liberals in Corinth," Studia Paulina, p. 124).

²What is meant for a Jew to eat meat offered to an idol is witnessed to by R. Simeon b. Gamaliel, the son of Paul's teacher, in his discussion of "the sacrifices of the dead" (Psalm 106.28) in Mish. Ab. Zar. 2.3: "Flesh that is entering in unto an idol is permitted, but what comes forth is forbidden, for it is as 'the sacrifices of the dead'." Note Mish. Aboth 3.3 for another early reference indicating the Jewish horror of eating such meat.

³For representative discussions, see J. H. Ropes, "The Epistle to the Romans and Early Christianity," Studies in Early Christianity, ed. S. J. Case, who opposes the equation of the two sets of opponents in each city, and P. P. Bläser, Das Gesetz bei Paulus, p. 86, who advocates their great similarity if not identity.

while the same types of thought and similar issues may lie behind those conflicts as that at Corinth, the problems as stated in the two accounts are sufficiently varied --- meats that had been offered to idols in I Corinthians and vegetarianism in Romans¹ --- to prohibit an absolute identification of the two groups at Corinth with their counterparts in the Roman epistle. Our task at this point is not to determine precisely who Paul's addressees were at Corinth, but how he deals with them.

Judging from the brief and general treatment given to the matters dividing the strong and the weak at Rome, such questions, though probably constantly arising, were not burning and disruptive issues in that church.² But at Corinth, this division regarding meats offered to idols seems to have threatened the very fabric of the Christian community. And to Paul, the issue was grave not so much because of the immature views of 'the weak' but because of the spirit of those he rather ironically refers to as "the strong"³ in condemning their less knowledgeable brethern. Thus Paul deals not so much with the problem of the rightness or wrongness of eating such meat or with those who he believes have failed to see the full implications of their liberty. Rather, he seeks to correct those who agree with him in their view of idolatry and meats but who would use their knowledge in a manner damaging to the welfare of their brethern. He is not so

¹Though the problem of demon contaminated meat may lie in the background of the question in Rom. 14, it is not so stated and must be read into that passage in order to make the problems identical.

²Assuming that Rom. 14 was meant for the Christians at Rome and not, as Renan suggested, that it was a part of a letter meant for the members of the Ephesian, Thessalonian and other unknown churches.

³I Cor. 10.22.

much troubled over immaturity and the failure to be theologically consistent as he is concerned over the spirit that would condemn these shortcomings in spiritual pride.

But again, it is instructive to note how he approaches these supposedly knowledgeable Christians. Indeed, there is no quotation of an ecclesiastical edict. Many have seen in this fact conclusive proof that the Jerusalem Decree, which dealt with this very question of εἰδωλόθυτα, was either unknown to Paul at this time, unacceptable to the apostle, or must be considered to be simply fictional.¹ Others argue that since the Decree was addressed only to "the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia," it could not legitimately be applied to a similar case in Europe.² Some, believing the theory that the Decree was spurious or unknown to the apostle to be "a rather drastic expedient" and the proposal that the Decree was meant for only a limited area to be unconvincing, have left the question unsettled in simply stating that "it is perhaps better to recognise that no quite satisfactory solution of the problem has yet been discovered."³ But, though again having to anticipate our later discussion of Paul's acceptance of the Jerusalem Decree, it is not without merit to direct our attention to the character of the apostle's

¹E.g., J. Weiss: "The discussions in I Corinthians about eating meat offered to idols are unintelligible if Paul had been in the position of being able simply to appeal to the Decree" (The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. I, p. 260); H. Lietzmann: "He writes not a single syllable about the Apostolic Decree" (The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 143).

²E.g., J. B. Lightfoot, Epistle to the Galatians, p. 308; F. J. A. Hort, Judaistic Christianity, pp. 74-76; J. G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, pp. 94-95; A. S. Geysler, "Paul, The Apostolic Decree and the Liberals in Corinth," Studia Paulina, pp. 136-137.

³A. S. Peake, Paul and the Jewish Christians, p. 22.

addressees in Corinth for at least a partial and possible solution to the dilemma. Here are those who pride themselves in being strong and possessing knowledge. Here are those who believe that they stand as equals with any --- much less are they ready to give subjection to a Jewish Christian desire when they see that the Judaistically influenced Christians of their own city are lacking in maturity and knowledge. It may be, as W. L. Knox suggested, that Paul was also thinking of 'the weak' and thus could not mention the Jerusalem Decree lest such a reference be "interpreted as an admission of the superiority of the Christians of Palestine and therefore of their leader, Peter, to Paul himself."¹ But it is also just as possible that the apostle had 'the strong' primarily in mind, and that he would not raise before them --- assuming for the moment that the Decree existed and was known to the apostle --- that which to them savoured of a legalistic flavour and which would close the door to his further endeavours to help them. The fact of Paul's silence regarding such a churchly pronouncement on this question is no evidence that he was ignorant of or refused to accept such an enactment. It could just as well be argued that the Corinthian assertion that "all of us possess knowledge" was a reaction to an original deliverance by the apostle of the Decree.² Paul is "all things to all men" at this point also, starting at that point where he can find agreement with his converts in order to lead them on to a fuller

¹W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 316
Cf. also p. 317 and p. 326, n. 31.

²Cf. J. Moffatt: "If at Corinth they were told of the Jerusalem decree against the eating 'eidolothuta', they probably resented or scorned the idea that they should be hampered by any local edict of the Palestinian churches which enforced such irrelevant scruples. 'We Christians know better; an idol is nothing to us'" (I Corinthians, M.N.T.C., p. 102)

understanding and expression of their Christian liberty.

Thus the apostle begins by agreeing with 'the strong' in their inferences from the indicative of the Gospel that "all of us possess knowledge" and that "an idol has no real existence" since "there is no God but one."¹ But he goes on to insist that in their refusal to condition their liberty by love for the sake of their weaker brethren, they are giving offence to those whom they are endeavouring to win outside the Church, working havoc within the Church, and not glorifying God in the exercise of their so-called Christian liberty.² Again, as with the libertines, he argues that while "all things are lawful," "not all things are helpful" and "not all things build up."³

In dealing with the ecstasies. -- "The typically Pauline

¹J. Weiss (The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. I, p. 326) and W. L. Knox (St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 113, n. 13) assert that Paul's view of idolatry in I Cor. 8 is fundamentally different and opposed to his position in I Cor. 10. Weiss sees this as evidence for these two chapters having been written at different times with different purposes in mind, while Knox believes that the apostle is unsuccessfully attempting to unite two incompatible theories regarding idolatry. But it seems that Paul's presentation in these two chapters is best paralleled, illuminated and explained by the incident recorded of Gamaliel II in Mish. Ab. Zar. 3.4: "Proklos the son of Philosophos asked Rabban Gamaliel in Acre while he was bathing in the Bath of Aphrodite, and said to him, 'It is written in your Law, 'And there shall cleave nought of the devoted thing to thine hand.' Why (then) dost thou bathe in the Bath of Aphrodite?' He answered, 'One may not make answer in the bath' because it is forbidden to speak words of the Law while naked. And when he came out he said, 'I came not within her limits: she came within mine! They do not say, 'Let us make a bath for Aphrodite', but 'Let us make an Aphrodite as an adornment for the bath'. Moreover if they would give thee much money thou wouldest not enter in before thy goddess naked or after suffering pollution, nor wouldest thou make water before her! Yet this goddess stands at the mouth of the gutter and all the people make water before her. It is written, 'Their gods', only; thus what is treated as a god is forbidden, but what is not treated as a god is permitted."

This last sentence is significant, since this is Paul's thought in I Cor. 8 and 10. But especially is this illustration significant since "tradition probably contains many sayings of Gamaliel I which are erroneously ascribed to his grandson of the same name" (W. Bacher, "Gamaliel

I," J.E., Vol. V, p. 559).

²I Cor. 8.7-13; 10. 24-32.

³I Cor. 10.23.

method of outclassing his opponents on their own ground"¹ is seen also in his treatment of the ecstasies in the Church at Corinth. We would probably have never known regarding the nature and variety of the Pauline ecstatic experiences had the apostle not had to deal with the Corinthian spiritualists; for though he highly valued visions and revelations as a dynamic factor in and a sign of his apostleship, he hesitated to speak of them in any detail.² He himself says that the Church could gain nothing by his repetition of such strictly personal ecstatic occurrences.³ But in dealing with those who were over-emphasising and misusing the pneumatic element in Christianity, Paul meets them on their own ground in those points where there was a common agreement. Thus, he agrees that the gift of tongues is a genuine supernatural $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$ ⁴ and that revelatory visions possess real validity.⁵ In fact, he counters his addressees' claims by declaring: "I thank God that I speak in tongues more than you all";⁶ and he tells of a time "fourteen years ago" when he was "caught up into Paradise ($\epsilon\omega\varsigma \tau\acute{\rho}\iota\tau\omicron\nu \omicron\beta\acute{\rho}\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma$)" and given an "abundance of revelations."⁷ These assertions were not manufactured. Evidently Paul was a true ecstatic. But the fact that he mentions these experiences nowhere so fully as he does in the Corinthian letters indicates that in that correspondence he has a definite purpose in mind in referring to his own prophetic ecstasies. From the tone of I Cor. 12 - 14 and II Cor. 12, that

¹H. Chadwick, "All Things to All Men," N.T.S., Vol. I (1954-1955), p. 272.

²Supra, pp. 218-219.

⁴I Cor. 12.10, 28.

⁶I Cor. 14.18

³II Cor. 12.1, 6.

⁵II Cor. 12.1-4

⁷II Cor. 12.2ff.

purpose can hardly be other than to confront his misguided converts on their own ground.

This he does in order to gain a hearing for his main thesis that spiritual gifts are given by the Spirit, "who apports to each one individually as he wills," and "for the common good."¹ Hence his plea is for the Corinthian Christians not to exalt the gift of tongues out of all proper perspective, but (1) to make love their aim, (2) to seek the spiritual gifts as the Spirit gives them, and (3) to use such gifts as are given for the upbuilding and edification of the Church. But the point here is: in order to win his ecstatically-minded addressees, his approach is that of an ecstatic unto ecstasies.

In all of these instances in Paul's pastoral ministry to the Corinthian Church, it cannot be said that the apostle is acting merely opportunistically --- if we mean by that word a taking advantage of a situation without regard for principles or ultimate consequences.² He is attempting no deception in his approach to his readers. In every case he recognises them to be real Christians, but Christians who in grasping an aspect of the Gospel message have perverted the truth which they possess into an error through an exclusive emphasis upon that element and/or an attitude of spiritual pride. In every case he seeks to work from the one element of truth which they have grasped to a fuller understanding and expression of their liberty in Christ. Rather than disregarding ultimate consequences, his whole

¹I Cor. 12.4-11.

²Chadwick speaks of Paul's "apostolic opportunism," but he seeks to disinflect the term ("All Things to All Men," N.T.S., Vol. I, 1954-1955, p. 264).

purpose is to strengthen his converts and the Church as a whole. And in his beginning with his addressees at that point where there is common agreement, omitting such arguments as would cause unnecessary offence, he is but working out his missionary and pastoral principle of being "all things to all men." Here is a legitimate flexibility of approach and elasticity of attitude which needs to be more characteristic of every Christian pastor, missionary, scholar and statesman. And with this insight into the apostle to the Gentiles who was ready to forego some of his personal privileges, desirous not to needlessly offend and willing to approach those with whom he disagreed on a point of common agreement, and all for the sake of 'the body of Christ' and every member in that Body, we are better able to tackle some of the very knotty problems regarding that same apostle's relations with the Jerusalem Church.

Relations between Paul and the Jerusalem Church

The question regarding relations between Paul and the Jerusalem Church has stood for over a hundred years as one of the most prominent problems in New Testament studies, with, perhaps, more scholarly effort expended upon it than upon any other. Although nothing new can be added by this author to the discussion of many years duration, it is necessary for the sake of understanding the Pauline practice to review the question again and to suggest such conclusions as appear to us most reasonable.

In approaching the problem, it is wisest to confine ourselves in our evidence to the letters of Paul. We agree with Baur¹ that "the two first chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians form a historical document of the greatest importance in our investigations into the

true standpoint of the Apostle and his relations to the elder Apostles."¹ Certainly highest priority must be given to such personal reflections, even though we need not agree that such portions "alone ought to be held as authentic."² This section will therefore deal with the relations between the apostle to the Gentiles and the Church of Jerusalem as they are evidenced in the Pauline epistles, leaving that further question of those practices recorded in Acts to the concluding section of the chapter.

The Judaisers and the Jerusalem Church

Whether or not we believe that Paul's career was one life-long conflict with the Judaizing antagonists, it is at least certain that we would have had very little information from Paul himself regarding his relation to the Jerusalem Church and its leaders if he had not had to combat these opponents. The threat from the Judaisers to the Pauline mission --- or at least his remembrance of that threat --- stands as the occasion for most of the apostle's references to Jerusalem Christianity. Thus, if we would understand those references, we must first have some knowledge of the Judaisers. We must ask who they were, what backing they had from the leaders of the Jerusalem Church and what influence they exerted within their own community.

Identity of the Judaisers. -- In attempting to understand the Judaisers, we cannot begin by assuming a unity of identification between the ψευδαπόστολοι of Corinth, who claimed to be both ἀπόστολοι Χριστοῦ and Ἑβραῖοι,³ those whom Paul had in mind as adversaries

¹F. C. Baur, Paul, His Life and Works, Vol. I, p. 105

²Ibid., p. 105

³II Cor. 11.13, 22.

to the Gospel in Rome, who would "cause dissensions and difficulties" in that church,¹ and the heretics of Galatia. Although it is probable that a basic similarity unites all of these Pauline opponents in such scattered localities as Galatia, Corinth and Rome, the identification of the Judaisers must depend primarily upon their description in that letter where their activity is most clearly evident; i.e., Galatians.

We need not be detained in the considerations of the merits or improbabilities of Lütgert's and Ropes' "two-front theory" in the identification of the opponents in Galatia,² for whether there were legalists and libertarians at Galatia, or only legalists, at least there were those proclaiming a so-called Jewish-Christian legalism; and it is only with this group that we are here concerned. Nor does it seem at all possible that such legalistic influence as was exerted on Paul's converts came only from the local Synagogue, i.e., that Paul's opponents were simply Jews advocating Judaism. The Christians of Galatia, who before their conversion probably had refused the ministry of the Synagogue, were not now more prepared to render greater due to the Jewish practices than their own apostle taught them --- unless they had been encouraged to do so by some Christian preachers claiming a fuller Christian message. These Pauline opponents in Galatia cannot be viewed as any other than those claiming to be Christians.

In the early thirties, E. Hirsch and W. Michaelis proposed the view that these heretics were strictly Gentiles who had been converted in a pre-Pauline time, circumcised before their baptism and now were actively advocating the necessity of the same to Paul's converts.³

¹Rom. 16.17.

²W. Lütgert, Gesetz und Geist; J. H. Ropes, The Singular Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians.

³E. Hirsch, "Zwei Fragen zu Galater 6," Z.N.W., Vol XXIX, Heft 3/4 (1930), pp. 192-197; W. Michaelis, "Judaistische Heidenchristen," Z.N.W., Vol XXX, Heft 1 (1931), pp. 83-89.

Using a quite different approach, J. Munck has also insisted upon the Gentile character of these legalists. He believes them to be Pauline converts who agreed with their spiritual father's central message but who felt "it safer to take over everything from the Jerusalem section of the church, though the leaders in Jerusalem had given the Gentile Christians freedom to follow Paul's Gospel."¹ The purpose of this chapter does not allow a detailed confrontation of either of the above views. Suffice it here to say that from Paul's manner of speaking of the situation in Gal. 1-2, it is difficult to picture these Judaisers as anything but Jewish Christians - in fact, Jewish Christians claiming to represent the official position of the Jerusalem Church. From Paul's anathema in 1.8-9 upon even an angelic messenger if the message of such a being should be different from that he had proclaimed to them, we can infer that these troublers came with high qualifications. From his strong insistence in 1.11-24 that his gospel was not dependent as to its source upon the Jerusalem disciples, it seems that this was exactly what his opponents claimed. And from his claim in 2.1-10 of an independent authority which the elder apostles also recognised, it can only be supposed that the heretics asserted just the opposite. Here were opponents claiming high qualifications and insisting that the Jerusalem apostles were both the source of Paul's gospel and the final authorities to which he must bow. All of these inferences, plus the fact that in Paul's reference to the parallel incident of the Antioch episode in 2.11-21² he closely joins

¹J. Munck, "Israel and the Gentiles in the New Testament," J.T.S., Vol. II, Pt. 1 (April, 1951), p. 10.

²It seems evident that in Paul's mind, though the Galatian question and the Antioch episode had superficial differences, these two cases dealt with basically the same issue.

"the ones from James" with "those of the circumcision party" of whom Peter was afraid, strongly suggest that the heretics of Galatia were none other than Jewish Christians claiming the authority of their home church in Jerusalem. In all probability, they were members of the strict law-abiding group in the Jerusalem Church of which James was officially the leader.¹

Relation of the Judaisers to the Jerusalem apostles. -- But in accepting the Judaisers to be members of the Jerusalem Church, the ancient problem of their relation to the Jerusalem apostles arises. F. C. Baur and his followers, depending to a great extent on the Clementine literature and interpreting Simon Magus to be a veiled representation of Paul, made it their major theme that the leaders of the Jewish Church were at one with Paul's opponents and often clashed with him themselves. They insisted that the whole church at Jerusalem was united in opposition to the Pauline message.² Others, though at many points removed from the Tübingen position, have likewise viewed the elder apostles as standing behind and with the Judaisers. Eduard Meyer could not accept the Clementine evidence, but strictly on the basis of Gal. 1 - 2 and the other Pauline letters insisted that Peter, and no other, was the leader of the legalistic agitation and actively led the campaign against Paul in all of the Gentile churches.³ Hans Lietzmann believed that the Jerusalem apostles were not actively engaged in that opposition, but that they did stand

¹See Appendix, pp. 358-359.

²F. C. Baur, Paul, His Life and Works, Vol. I, pp. 113, 119-130.

³E. Meyer, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, Vol. III, esp p. 434; cf. also pp. 424-426, 432-436, 441-442, 455-459, 464, 493-500.

in agreement with the Judaisers. And by so giving their support to Paul's adversaries they were "very dangerous opponents behind his back."¹ Lietzmann saw James as the one who was mainly responsible in encouraging the errorists in the Gentile churches, for he "belonged at bottom to those who were strangers to Jesus,"² and Barnabas as the one who actively opposed Paul in Galatia.³ During the last decades, however, there has been a waning in the influence of this Tübingen dialectic and a growing feeling amongst scholars that the radical emphasis of Baur is a lost cause. But recently echoes of old Tübingen have resounded in S. G. F. Brandon's assertions that "there can be no real doubt"⁴ and the evidence is "irresistible and the conclusion must accordingly be accepted that Paul's real opponents were the leaders of the Jerusalem Church."⁵

And yet, though the Judaisers possibly possessed "letters of commendation"⁶ from the Jerusalem Church and certainly highly extolled the merits and authority of the Jerusalem leaders, there is no real evidence against, and some for, the view that these antagonists to the Pauline gospel were taking a line of their own. Such positive evidence as exists for the basic agreement between Paul and the earlier apostles is better considered slightly later in this chapter. Negatively, however, it must be pointed out that while Paul has only the sharpest words of rebuke for the heretics, "he utters

¹H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 143; cf. pp. 142-145.

²Ibid., p. 83

³H. Lietzmann, An Die Galater (H.N.T.), p. 38

⁴S. G. F. Brandon, "The Crisis of 70 A.D.," H.J., Vol. XLVI (Oct. 1947 - July 1948), p. 222.

⁵Ibid., p. 223

⁶II Cor. 3.1.

not a single word" about the Jerusalem leaders who have been thought to stand behind them.¹ In fact, as Lietzmann confesses, it is only as "we look more closely and are able to read between the lines of his letters, [that] we perceive behind the servants of Satan, the false apostles, and the spurious brethren, the shadows of the great figures in Jerusalem."² But such 'reading between the lines' cannot be accepted on the same par as positive evidence. If one were simply to try to imagine what went on, then Lightfoot's suggestion seems to carry greater possibility:

In all revolutionary periods, whether of political or religious history, the leaders of the movement have found themselves unable to control the extravagances of their bigoted and short-sighted followers: and this great crises of all was certainly not exempt from the common rule. St. Paul is constantly checking and rebuking the excesses of those who professed to honour his name and to adopt his teaching: if we cannot state this of St. James with equal confidence, it is because the sources of information are scantier.³

There just does not seem to be any real evidence for the position that the Jerusalem leaders were in agreement with the work of the Judaisers; and thus we must agree that "man die Fiktion gänzlich aufgeben muss, hinter der Häretikern in Galatien stehe die Autorität der Jerusalemer Führer."⁴

Both Baur's insistence that the Judaisers must be identified with the whole Jerusalem Church and Munck's that there were no Judaisers in that church are extreme positions. Nor need we agree with the implication inherent in Schmithals' thesis that these were Jewish

¹H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 143

²Ibid., p. 143.

³J. B. Lightfoot, Epistle to the Galatians, p. 371

⁴W. Schmithals, "Die Häretiker in Galatien," Z.N.W., Vol. XLVII, 1956, p. 36.

Christian gnostics, who, because of their gnosticism, would not be controlled by churchly authorities though they could at the same time highly extol the Jerusalem leaders in debate.¹ Though they may have possessed gnostic tendencies, our knowledge of Jewish gnosticism is too meagre to enable such a precise identification. All that really seems evident is that while these were members of the Jerusalem Church, they were too short-sighted to share in the vision of their leaders. They probably considered themselves as being conscientious and acting from the best principles, though Paul viewed their action to be motivated by a fear of persecution and a desire for authority.² And as they remained within the confines of Palestinian Jewish Christianity, they were probably indistinguishable from the rest of the brethren. But when they travelled abroad, their true colours as "false apostles" and "spurious brethren" were manifest. On the basis of their evident Christian faith and godliness in Jerusalem, they had probably received general letters commending them to all Christians abroad. But it seems that they used these recommendations to their own purpose.³ In their visit to Antioch they appear to have had a real mission from James. But we need not suppose more than that they took a line of

¹Note Schmithals' characterisation of the Galatian heretics, whom he believes to have been gnostics: "Der gnostische Apostel weist sich nicht durch eine Traditionskette, durch die apostolische Sukzession, sondern durch direkte pneumatische Berufung" (Ibid., p. 38).

²Gal. 6.12, 13.

³Cf. E. F. Scott: "It does not appear that the leading Apostles were in sympathy with their attitude, much less with their onslaught on Paul; yet those obviously earnest men could not be refused 'letters of commendation' (I Cor. III.1) which certified that they were highly esteemed in the Jerusalem church. This it was that made their propaganda so dangerous. Wherever they went they were able to represent themselves as spokesmen for the mother-church, duly accredited by the foremost Apostles" (The First Age of Christianity, p. 140).

their own in the episode which Paul relates.

Influence of the Judaisers within the Jerusalem Church. -- In all probability, the Galatian Christians were won back to the Pauline Gospel.¹ The fact that the apostle's letter to them was preserved favours this view, as does also Paul's reference at a later date to the churches of Galatia joining in with the collection for the poor Christians of Jerusalem.² Likewise, it seems that in the Galatian battle the main thrust of the Judaisers' attack in the Pauline circles had been broken. While it is true that the legalists probably attempted to continue their policy of disruption among the Gentile Christians³ and that Paul was constantly aware of the danger from this source,⁴ it does appear that in the latter part of the Pauline ministry their influence was held in check and their attack was not made in quite the same manner as in Galatia. Whether this was the result of Paul's action, the decision of the Jerusalem Council, or both --- or even of other factors --- need not be considered here. The interesting question, however, arises concerning the influence of the Judaisers within their own mother church.

One gains the impression in scrutinising the Church of

¹Cf. A. S. Peake, Paul and the Jewish Christians, pp. 28-29.

²I Cor. 16.1; cf. Acts 20.4.

³Whether or not Paul is countering Judaising influence in his Roman epistle, at least the Judaisers' presence in some of the other Gentile churches seems evident by statements in II Cor. 11, Phil. 3 and the Pastorals (cf. P.P. Bläser, Das Gesetz bei Paulus, pp. 81-88).

⁴A. S. Peake speaks of the outburst against the Judaisers in Phil. 3.2 - 4.1 as "one of the fiercest which has come to us from his pen" (Paul and the Jewish Christians, p. 32). This need not be an interpolation from an earlier time, as Eph. 2.11ff. and Col. 2.11ff. indicate that at least the remembrance of the Judaising conflict was still in Paul's thoughts; cf. I Tim. 1.7, Titus 1.10-16, 3.9.

Jerusalem that the rank and file within its membership became more zealous for the Law and more strict in its practice of the Law as time went on. It appears that the stricter type of Jewish Christianity gained more and more of an influence over the community than did that of Am-haarez Christianity.¹ In earlier days, James seemed less fearful to speak out in opposition to those Christians of the Pharisaic party who opposed Paul.² Paul could argue as though his position was the characteristic view of the primitive church³ and come to the Jerusalem Council as though confident of the outcome.⁴ Later, however, James seemed to speak at the instigation of those zealous for the Law,⁵ and Paul had fears that the Jerusalem Church might not accept his labour for them in the collection he had made.⁶ We can only guess why, but it does seem that the type of mentality from which the Judaisers originated had a greater influence upon the Jewish Church itself than it had on the Gentile churches during the same period.

¹Regarding "Scrupulous" and "Am-haarez" Jewish Christianity see Appendix, pp.

²Acts 15.13-21.

³E. F. Scott says of Paul's recital of Peter's position in Gal.2: "It is commonly assumed that these sentiments of Peter --- if Paul is correct in his judgement of them --- were peculiar to Peter himself. . . . But we miss the significance of the whole incident when we read in it nothing more than the individual attitude of Peter. Paul, it is evident, means us to think of Peter as representing the view which was characteristic of the primitive church, although it had been perverted by the influence of the 'false brethren.' It is this that gives point to Paul's rebuke of the older Apostle. He appeals not so much to his private conscience as to his knowledge of the true position of the church. Peter, it is suggested, must know in his heart that this practice which he is countenancing is the later innovation, while Paul has taken his stand on the genuine primitive tradition" (The Beginnings of the Church, p. 121).

⁴There seems to be a note of eagerness in Paul's decision to go to Jerusalem in Acts 15.2.

⁵Acts 21.20-25

⁶Rom. 15.31.

Paul and the Jerusalem Apostles

Though the discussion has been often anticipated in the preceding paragraphs, it is necessary at this point to bring together the various scattered hints and references in order to formally and more completely deal with the question of the relations between Paul and the Jerusalem apostles.

Basic differences between them. --- It cannot be assumed that because the elder disciples in Jerusalem were not in agreement with the Judaisers that thus they were completely at one with Paul. The fact that "the disciples were first called Christians in Antioch"¹ indicates that even the heathen world could recognise some difference between the Christianity proclaimed by Paul and the Jewish Christianity of the early apostles, and thus between the apostles themselves.

We must, however, insist that those differences were not over questions of such basic importance as: (1) the circumcision of Gentile Christians, and (2) the communion between Jewish and Gentile Christians within the Church. While many have argued that Paul did have Titus circumcised in deference to the wishes of the Jerusalem leaders,² those same advocates have honestly admitted that from an exegetical standpoint they must return "a verdict of 'not proven'" for their position --- and that the opposite view is not impossible.³

¹Acts 11.26.

²Esp. K. Lake, Beginnings, Vol. V, pp. 196-198; F. C. Burkitt, Christian Beginnings, p. 118; W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 182-183.

³Cf. K. Lake, Beginnings, Vol. V, p. 198; W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 190, n. 19.

To argue from the omission of οἱ οὐδὲ in Gal. 2.5 of Codex Bezae, thus getting the sense of 'we yielded', is to argue from the least attested text.¹ Nor can it be said that the circumcision of Timothy and that of Titus are analogous situations,² for undoubtedly there was a real distinction made in the minds of most Jews, Jewish Christianity and Paul between one who possessed Jewish blood and one who was purely a Gentile. Paul nowhere disputed the right, or even the necessity because of the circumstances and views of the Jerusalem Church, of Jewish Christians to continue the practice of circumcision. But he strongly opposed it as a religious practice for Gentile converts. Timothy could quite easily have come under the classification of a Jewish Christian in the eyes of many. But Titus was definitely a Gentile believer. Nor is the statement of Gal. 2.3 --- "But not even Titus, who was with me, was compelled to be circumcised, though he was a Greek" --- most naturally read: Titus was circumcised, but not by any compulsion.³ While it might be suitable in regard to the half-Jew Timothy, such a concession in the case of the Gentile Titus, even if made under no compulsion, would undermine Paul's whole polemic and make Gal.2 more bluster than argument. As many have insisted, "we must give proper weight to Paul's actual statements, which cannot without violence be accommodated to the view that Titus was circumcised."⁴

¹All of the MSS. stand in opposition to D at this point, though the Fathers Irenaeus, Victorinus, Tertullian, Ambrosiaster, Primasius and the Old Latin agree.

²As K. Lake attempts to make them, Beginnings, Vol. V, pp.197-198.

³W. L. Knox admits that the greatest argument against his position is that the opposite view "gives a more natural interpretation of the Greek of vv. 3-5" (St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 190, n. 19).

⁴A. S. Peake, Paul and the Jewish Christians, p. 13, n.

There is no real evidence that on the question of the circumcision of Gentile Christians there was any difference between Paul and the elder apostles. In fact, both Paul's refusal to mention these leaders as his opponents and his bringing of at least one uncircumcised Gentile believer with him into the city on his last visit to Jerusalem¹ indicate that he never considered the Jerusalem leaders as his opponents on this issue nor feared that even in a church where legalism seems to have been growing those leaders could be pressured into asking for the circumcision of his Gentile converts and Christian companions. Similarly, Paul believed that the Jerusalem apostles stood at one with him on the question of communion between Jew and Gentile within the Church. It is significant that he does not rebuke Peter for acting from wrong principles, but for being untrue to his own principles.² As Paul saw it, Peter's action of breaking fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians in Antioch was an act of hypocrisy and a failure to consistently apply accepted doctrines. Although those who precipitated the disturbance at Antioch were "from James" and Peter acted more in regard for the welfare of his Jewish brethren than the larger good of the Gospel,³ Paul did not consider the Antioch episode as

¹I.e., Trophimus, Acts 21.29. Possibly also those of Acts 20.4.

²Cf., e.g., J. B. Lightfoot, Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 354-355; F. J. A. Hort, Judaistic Christianity, pp. 77-78.

³Many have understood Peter's action at Antioch to be an endeavour to protect the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem, probably those back home who would be subjected to antagonism by the Jews when the Judaisers' report of conditions in Antioch reached Jerusalem (cf. F. J. A. Hort, Judaistic Christianity, p. 78), or less likely the emissaries from James themselves who would be subjected to persecution by the Jews in Jerusalem if it had been known that they ate with Gentiles (cf. B. Reicke, "Der geschichtliche Hintergrund des Apostelkonzils und der Antiochia-Episode," Studia Paulina, p. 177).

manifesting any basic difference of doctrine or principle between himself and the Jerusalem leaders.

What differences there were between Paul and the elder apostles seem to stem in the first place from their different conceptions of their own missions. We need not agree with J. Munck that the apostles differed in their view of the pattern of redemptive history; i. e., Paul viewed God's program as being the conversion of a representative number of Gentiles first, then the conversion of Israel and then the 'parousia', as opposed to the Jerusalem Church's conviction of Israel first, then the 'parousia' and only then the conversion of the Gentiles.¹ Certainly Munck has done a service in pointing out Paul's thought of his mission as an indirect ministry to Israel² and in emphasising anew his remaining concern for his own nation. But in his main thesis, Munck has gone to the same extent as F. C. Baur in allowing his presuppositions to control his sources. Any presentation which discredits certain portions of the evidence --- even if that evidence be the account of Acts --- simply because it does not fit into the controlling thesis of the historian must be looked upon with a bit of suspicion. Rather than there being a difference between the apostles regarding the pattern of redemptive

¹J. Munck, Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte, pp. 1-60.

²Though E. Stauffer has better characterised Paul's thought as to how God would use his ministry for the benefit of Israel: "God accepts the Gentiles into the people of Christ in order to make the people of God under the old covenant jealous. . . . Indeed, the apostle's mission to the Gentiles itself appears in this light as the only possible, if indirect service he can render to the future of his people. In divine emulation the apostle brings the Gentiles into the Church so as to make the people of the old covenant 'jealous' on their part, and so to prepare the way for their salvation and their return" (New Testament Theology, p. 191)

history, it seems all we need insist upon is that there was a difference between them regarding each's own special mission within the overall redemptive program. There does not seem to be any real reason why we should reject the witness of the Gospels and Acts regarding the Jewish Church's consciousness of the universalistic import of the Gospel even while it continued to insist that its special mission was solely to Israel, or Paul's approach to his own nation in each city even when he proclaimed himself an apostle to the Gentiles.¹ All that seems evident is that while the apostles recognised the validity of each other's orders, they also insisted that each had been assigned a special responsibility. This is all that need be implied in Paul's recital of the events which led to and included "the right hand of fellowship" being given by James, Cephas and John to Paul and Barnabas.² They bound themselves to partnership in the general redemptive program of God and mutual recognition of one another's labours. Not that they parcelled out the area of the Empire geographically between them because they could only agree to disagree and desired to stay out of each other's hair, but they pledged themselves to respect each other's commission and methods.³

But while this difference seems to have been amicably resolved, both parties recognising their particular mission to be only one part of the overall redemptive plan of God and not the whole of that program, it appears that their difference regarding the nature of the

¹Infra, pp. 334-336.

²Gal. 2.6.-10

³Cf. J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. I, p. 268.

Church was more tolerated than settled. For both the Jerusalem apostles and Paul, the Church was the new and true Israel. But the consequences of this view took an ^pposite direction for each.¹ To distinctively Jewish Christianity, the Church as the new Israel implied that the new community was bound to retain its ties with the nation at almost any cost; and in practice, this meant that Jewish Christians, wherever situated, should retain their basic allegiance to the national customs. As the later Tanaanitic Rabbis of Judaism attempted to separate the religious from the national communities of Israel, preserving the religious while the national fell to ruin, so it seems that the Jerusalem Christians attempted a like separation. Only in this latter case, the Jerusalem leaders attempted to preserve the national customs while allowing the religious connotations of old Judaism to fall in that they were superceded by or incorporated into Christianity. To Paul, the Church as the new Israel meant that while the Church must always be conscious of its historical roots, it had no necessary commitment to continue putting forth its foliage in the same manner as old Israel. When used in a religious context, the name 'Israel' for Paul was emptied of all its necessary reference to a nation and retained only a spiritual content.²

This difference between the apostles had no practical effect when it came to relations within a purely Jewish or a purely Gentile church. But the clash of ideologies became apparent in the case of

¹See E. F. Scott, The Beginnings of the Church, pp. 35-42, for an excellent treatment at this point.

²This is evident in the Hagar-Sarah allegory of Gal. 4.21-31.

Jewish Christians within a Gentile Church. While the Jerusalem leaders were quite willing to permit fellowship between circumcised Jews and uncircumcised Gentiles within the Church, they were unwilling to see the Diaspora Jewish Christians forget their distinctive sign of Jewish nationality or relinquish the basic customs of the nation. This is forcibly illustrated in James' statement to Paul that there was a fear within the Jerusalem Church that Paul had really been doing what his antagonists said he had, i.e., that he had been "teaching all the Jews who are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children or observe the customs."¹ The very accusation against Paul implies that his opponents had caught his emphasis upon the non-essential significance of external matters, and had seen that the logical implication of such teaching as "neither circumcision counts for anything nor uncircumcision"² was the relegation of the Jewish practices to the category of purely optional matters devoid of all religious significance. Probably Paul let his hearers draw their own conclusions as to what he really thought of Jewish Christians continuing to circumcise their children and to practise the basic customs of the Jewish nation. But it appears that if it were not for the Jerusalem Church's mission to the nation and its strong feeling that as the new Israel it must continue to be tied to the national customs, he would have carried out his message to its logical conclusion and let the old practices of Judaism drop in his own life and in those of his Jewish converts. But here was another

¹Acts 21.21.

²I Cor. 7.19.

case like that of I Cor. 8-10. Thus, for the sake of those who are supra-scrupulous, he continues to be scrupulous himself and to teach the Jewish Christian of the Diaspora to "remain in the state in which he was called."¹ And in this case, Paul's action was taken both for the sake of the Jerusalem Church's mission and for the sake of not causing the 'weak' and overly-scrupulous Christians of Jerusalem to stumble.²

Their Christological agreement as the basis for unity. -- But while the apostles conscientiously, and no doubt from premises which each considered unassailable, differed in their ecclesiology, it must be remembered that they were at one in their Christology. Paul's Antioch rebuke of Peter was certainly recorded to reveal Peter's inconsistency of action. Yet we lose at least half the point to the Galatians if we do not see that in the narration of that episode Paul also insisted upon the basic bond of unity between Peter and himself in the matter of doctrine. Similarly, Paul's incorporation into his letters of early

¹I Cor. 7.20. Similarly in the question of slavery. The Gospel certainly contains the implication of opposition to such a practice. But it seems that if Paul saw this implication, he was willing not to draw it out for the time being that the primary element in the Gospel message of reconciliation with God be not obscured. Whether consciously or unconsciously, Paul took the course of emphasising the theological aspect of the Gospel while allowing many of the social implications to work themselves out at a later time from a basic Christian consciousness.

²This seems to be the answer to the great difficulty many have regarding Paul's presentation of law, as best expressed by A. Schweitzer: "Some passages take for granted its observance by the Jews as unquestionably right and proper, and only seek to maintain the freedom of the Gentiles in regard to it, whereas others reject it in principle, in such a way that Paul would be obliged to maintain also the emancipation of the Jews . . . if the rules of logical inference are to be applied. As it is, however, there is a want of congruence between the negative theory and the limitation of the practical demand" (Paul and his Interpreters, p. 146).

church Christology in at least I Cor. 15.3-4 and Phil. 2.6-11, and the sermons recorded of the early church in Acts, reveal that there was a basic Christological agreement between him and the Jerusalem apostles. While it may be that "the agreement between Paul and the Eleven was really confined to the place which Jesus holds in the world of history and in the life of His people,"¹ such an agreement is by no means incidental. To agree regarding Christ and to centre one's life in Him is to carry the distinctive stamp of Christian which unites in spite of all differences.

It is entirely false to continue the Tübingen fiction that Paul and the Jerusalem apostles could never agree in basic principles. While he was never one to seek agreement by a thinning out of convictions and was quite prepared to stand staunchly for what he considered to be the essence of the Gospel proclamation, Paul also realised the basic oneness that exists between believers in Christ and the need to preserve and strengthen that fellowship which has been established through Him. To view the actions of James and Peter as a continual campaign to bring about Paul's "complete overthrow"² and Paul's whole missionary activity as an attempt to silence the voice of Jewish Christianity by the majority voice of Gentile Christendom³

¹W. M. MacGregor, Christian Freedom, p. 180.

²As S. G. F. Brandon, "The Crisis of 70 A.D.," H.J., Vol. XLVI (Oct. 1947 - July 1948), p. 226.

³As W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 194-196. Knox observes that while his view "is based on what appears to be the most probable interpretation of the available evidence, . . . [it] has no direct authority from the original narrative of the Acts" (ibid., p. 196).

is to ignore their basic and controlling Christological agreement. Paul shows no evidence of such a tension in his relations with the elder apostles. In his report of the agreement with the Jerusalem leaders, it seems that "Paul is convinced that their intentions were honourable: the expression 'right hand of fellowship' is cordial and affectionate."¹ We may see sinister motives in the apostles' words and actions if we so desire. But it is important to note that while Paul differed at times with his fellow-apostles of Jerusalem, he always wrote of them with an attitude of respect. Even when dealing with the divisions in Corinth, a matter in which Peter was probably not personally involved though his name was being used, "he treats the name of Cephas with a delicate courtesy and respect which has almost escaped notice."² As J. B. Lightfoot pointed out, "when he comes to argue the question, he at once drops the name of St. Peter; 'While one saith, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal? What then is Apollos, and what is Paul?'"³ And it seems that he thought enough of Peter as a Christian, a fellow-apostle and a witness of the life, death and resurrection of the Lord to go up to Jerusalem *ἰστορήσασθαι Κηρδαίον* --- possibly both to establish fellowship

¹J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol I, p. 268

²J. B. Lightfoot, Epistle to the Galatians, p. 351.

³Ibid., p. 351

with him and to hear from his own lips regarding the historical Jesus.¹ Probably Silas stands as the best symbol for the basic unity and fellowship that existed between the apostle to the Gentiles and the apostles of the Jerusalem Church. Here was a Jerusalemite prophet who seems to have been in good standing in his own church, who joined Paul when the issues of his Gentile mission were certainly clear and shared with him the work of founding the churches in Macedonia and Achaia, and who later appears in close connection with Peter.² Just why Paul originally took him and why Silas disappears entirely in the Acts account after the missionary journeys are not known. But it is significant that, so far as can be seen in the records, no discord arose between the two.³ Some have considered it "remarkable that Paul took with him a native of Jerusalem, because Silas was probably accustomed to treat the tradition of the life of Jesus in a manner quite different from his own."⁴ It seems better, however, to interpret this easy

¹Gal. 1.18 is a much debated verse. Paul's insistence is that he did not go to Jerusalem διδασθῆναι by Peter, but ἱστορῆσαι Κηθῶν . But that does not necessarily mean, as Hort suggested, that he only went up "to 'explore' St. Peter, to find out how he would be disposed to treat the persecutor now become a champion" (Judaistic Christianity, p. 56). With Paul's strong emphasis upon the unity of believers in Christ, he would naturally desire to establish fellowship with Peter; and while being with the foremost of Jesus' earthly companions, he could not have failed to be interested in a first-hand portrayal of the earthly life of Jesus (cf. G. D. Kilpatrick, "Galatians 1:18 ἹΣΤΟΡΗΕΑΙ ΚΗΘῶΝ," New Testament Essays, ed. A. J. B. Higgins, pp. 144-149). The fact that Paul waited three years before making an attempt to visit Peter need not indicate an aloofness from or disagreement with this disciple even in the earliest days. Peake's suggestion at this point is as good as any: "Jerusalem would not be the safest place for Paul to visit after he had not merely failed to fulfil his commission from the High Priest but had gone over to the Christians" (Paul and the Jewish Christians, p. 8, n. 1).

²Evidently, see I Pet. 5.12.

³Cf. A. Harnack's treatment of Paul and Silas, The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, Vol. I, pp. 78-79.

⁴J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol I, pp. 277-278.

association of Silas with both the Jerusalem apostles and Paul as just another evidence of the basic unity that existed between the two sections of early Christianity and their respective leaders.

We therefore conclude that, though he disclaimed any dependence upon the Jerusalem apostles for his essential message and though he appears a bit irritated to have to agree with the Judaisers that the elder apostles were 'pillars' (στῦλοι) when in some ways he considered them most weak,¹ Paul was entirely prepared to accept the apostles of Jerusalem both as fellow-apostles in the work of Christ and as those who had been entrusted with the primary responsibility of witnessing concerning the resurrection.² As both fellow-workers and the indispensable connecting links between the historical Jesus and the community of the New Age, Paul saw it to be his duty and privilege to maintain fellowship with them at almost any cost to himself personally.

Paul's Willingness to Expend Himself for the Church

Before closing this section regarding the relations between Paul and the Jerusalem Church and taking up the consideration of the apostle's practices as represented in the Acts account, it is well to note that which readily serves to bridge the span between the two subjects: the collection for the saints of Jerusalem. Here is one point in his letters where the apostle shows himself willing to expend himself for the sake of Jewish as well as Gentile Christianity.

¹For the position that there is a relative, not absolute, disparagement in Paul's voice when he refers to οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι in Gal. 2.9, see: J. G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, pp. 120-121; C. K. Barrett, "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles," Studia Paulina, pp. 1-2.

²C. K. Barrett says: "Paul also could reckon himself a witness of the resurrection, but only as an exception --- an ἔκτρομα (I Cor, 15.8)" (ibid., p. 18 n. 1).

Though Acts has a great deal of detailed information regarding this collection and Paul's determination to present it personally, the apostle's own thoughts concerning it are better seen in his letters. In Rom. 15 he declares that he has earnestly desired for a long time to go to Rome, and from there to Spain. Yet, even though he is relatively near, he feels it his bounden duty to retrace his steps and return to Jerusalem in order to deliver the contribution of the Gentile Christians to the poor of the Jerusalem Church. And this, in spite of the fact that he fully realises that such a project is fraught with great personal danger. Even if we could not trust the long section of Acts where Paul is represented at Miletus, Tyre and Caesarea as fully realising that "imprisonment and afflictions" await him at Jerusalem,¹ the touching request of Rom. 15.30-32 --- "I appeal to you, brethren, . . . to strive together with me in prayers to God on my behalf, that I may be delivered from the disobedient in Judaea and that my service for Jerusalem may be acceptable to the saints" --- indicates that he was willing to go "even to the length of martyrdom" in the fulfilment of this mission.² But the question arises: Why did Paul feel himself so duty bound to present such a collection, and at such a great personal risk? Some have viewed him as under a binding commitment to the Jerusalem leaders; i.e., this contribution to their church was the price he had to pay for their recognition of his ministry and of the validity of Gentile Christendom.³ Others insist that he viewed the

¹Acts 20.17 - 21.14.

²A. Harnack, The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels, p. 64. See also p. 65.

³E.g., H. Achelis: "Das war der Preis, mit dem Paulus bezahlt hat: er gab die aussere Abhangigkeit für die innere Freiheit" (Das Christentum in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten, Vol. I, p. 48).

Jerusalem Church as the successor to the Temple, and that thus it was necessary for all Christians to support it in much the same manner as Judaism supported its central sanctuary with the annual temple-tax.¹ J. Munck argues that Paul's great concern to take the collection to Jerusalem stems from his view of the pattern of redemptive history; i.e., since "Jerusalem and Israel are the central part of the history of salvation," he must bend every effort in his Gentile mission for the welfare of Jerusalem Christianity.² And yet, as A. S. Peake said, it seems that all of these interpretations make

far too much of what was essentially a spontaneous expression of Christian philanthropy and brotherly love. The initiative in this had originally been taken by the Church of Antioch. It does not seem to have been a response to a claim that assistance to the mother Church might be rightfully demanded. The Apostles know from experience the sympathetic interest of Paul and Barnabas and the Church at Antioch, and they appeal that their help may be continued.³

As with the earlier famine relief to Judaea in which Paul took a leading part, so it seems that this larger collection was originally meant as an expression of Christian love to brethren in more difficult financial straits. Paul's desire to aid his Jewish Christian brethren springs most naturally from his teaching regarding a love-conditioned liberty and the Church as the Body of Christ in which all members "have the same care for one another."⁴ And it is

¹E.G., W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 298.

²J. Munck, "Israel and the Gentiles in the New Testament," J.T.S., Vol. II, Pt. I (April, 1951), p. 7.

³A. S. Peake, Paul and the Jewish Christians, p. 15, n. 1. J.B. Lightfoot has concisely stated the matter: "His past care for their poor prompted this request of the elder Apostles. His subsequent zeal in the same cause was the answer to their appeal" (Epistle to the Galatians, p. 111).

⁴I. Cor. 12.25; cf. 12.12-30.

on this basis of mutual concern and responsibility within the Body of Christ that he represents the collection to his Roman readers, in the words: "For if the Gentiles have shared in their spiritual blessings, they ought also to minister to them in material blessings."¹

But such a gift would not necessitate his personal appearance in Jerusalem and thus placing himself in great danger of Jewish reprisals. His words in I Cor. 16.3-4 indicate that he had contemplated only sending the gift on by representative from the various churches. For some reason, however, he felt it more advisable to accompany the delegates and present the gift personally. It seems that that reason lay in the increasing estrangement of the rank and file within the Jerusalem Church to Gentile Christianity, an estrangement which appears to have been brought about by the increasing influence in the church at Jerusalem of the more scrupulously-minded Christians. He is not trying to buy favour from the mother church for his mission or his converts, but he does desire that the collection which was gathered in love should be viewed by its recipients as a real token of love and a definite symbol of unity between Gentile and Jewish Christianity. And this seemed to him to require his presence as well as the money. Thus, in one sense, it can truly be said that the collection for the Palestinian Christians was an endeavour to preserve the unity of the Church.² And in his determination to personally present the contribution, we see his willingness to sacrifice himself, if need be, for

¹Rom. 15.27.

²Cf. P. I. Bratsiotis: "Es ist sogar nicht übertrieben zu sagen, dass das gesamte Wirken dieses Apostels als ein Kampf für die Einheit der Kirche verstanden werden könnte" ("Paulus und die Einheit der Kirche," Studia Paulina, p. 29).

the unity and welfare of the Church.

The Problem Practices of Acts

It is to the representation of the practices of Paul in Acts that we must now turn, for these actions have been so differently interpreted. To the one extreme stands the position of F. C. Baur that it is "unjust that the picture of the Apostle's character which we gain from his Epistles should be distorted by the misrepresentations of an author who lived long after the Apostolic period, and wrote in the interests of a party."¹ Far to the other extreme is James Parkes' insistence that only Acts should be trusted as truly representing Paul's thought in action, and that from these practices we see that he "in no way quitted the faith of his fathers."² And between these two positions, there is no want of diversified interpretation.

Jewish Vows and Customs

The point at which the Acts presentation seems to run most contrary to the principles of its central character is in its narration of the apostle's continued practice of the Jewish customs and vows. The circumcision of Timothy,³ the cutting of his hair at Cenchreae in token of a vow,⁴ and the joining of four Jewish Christians in a week-long temple ritual of purification, meditation

¹F. C. Baur, Paul, His Life and Works, Vol. I, p. 210

²J. Parkes, Judaism and Christianity, p. 84.

³Acts 16.3. ⁴Acts 18.18.

and offering in fulfilment of a vow,¹ are the most prominent of these disputed actions. Thus it is best to begin at this point in our discussion of the problem practices of Acts.

The credibility of these practices. -- Baur's argument was that because the apostle could not consistently have performed these acts, therefore he did not do them. But since A. Harnack's work on this problem, scholars have increasingly viewed these actions less suspiciously. Those who defend the credibility of Paul's performance of these practices have argued:²

1.) Since Paul defended himself in Gal. 5.11 against the charge preaching circumcision, there must have been that in either his teaching or his practice, or in both, which gave rise to this accusation.

2.) For an apostle who declared that his missionary practice was to be "all things to all men," such action is certainly possible.

3.) In a theology which lays great stress upon the essential oneness of believers and the need for Christians to restrict their liberty for the sake of their brethren, such action is not impossible.

4.) From the fact that Acts states that the Jerusalem vow failed to pacify the Jews, and implies from its silence that it also failed in reconciling the Jewish Christians to Paul, the recital of such actions --- and in such detail as in the case of the Jerusalem vow ---

¹Acts 21.23ff. W. M. MacGregor quotes Hausrath (Der Apostel Paulus, p. 453) as saying: "One could as well believe that Luther, in his old age, made a pilgrimage to Einsiedeln, walking on peas, or that Calvin on his deathbed vowed a golden robe to the Holy Mother of God, as that the author of Romans and Galatians stood for seven days in the outer court of the Temple, and subjected himself to all the manipulations with which rabbinic ingenuity had surrounded the vow, and allowed all the liturgical nonsense of that age to be transacted for him by unbelieving priests and Levites" (Christian Freedom, p. 71).

²E.g., J. B. Lightfoot, Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 347-348; A. Harnack, The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels, pp. 67-89.

is "absolutely wanton in character" if those actions were merely invented by a later author to show that harmony existed between Paul and Jerusalem.

And all these arguments have validity in countering the old Tübingen position.

But there still remains one significant point which has been consistently overlooked. Harnack bemoans the case that while Paul's letters show him willing to omit the Mosaic law in his work with Gentiles, we do not have any instance aside from the account in Acts where he came under that law for the sake of his Christian mission, his nation or his Jewish Christian brethren. His words are as follows:

Unfortunately, we are unable to produce any instance from his epistles to illustrate the latter situation, and we do not know either how far he went in his observance of Jewish laws or how often he found himself so placed. There is thus a serious gap in our first-hand knowledge of this side of St. Paul's conduct; but that this side existed there can be no doubt.¹

But there is one statement in his letters where he explicitly says that in a certain matter he submitted to the old Jewish law in his Christian ministry. And in this action of which he speaks, it seems that he submitted in a much greater measure than in the taking of any vows or the circumcising of any of his companions.

In II Cor. 11.24 it is stated: "From the Jews five times I received forty [lashes] less one." These lashes were undoubtedly received in the synagogue and at the hands of the officials of Judaism.²

¹Ibid., p. 55.

²See "Stripes," J.E., Vol. XI, pp. 569-570.

Now as a Roman citizen, a Jew could escape the synagogue whippings for heresy or misconduct by an appeal to the Imperial authorities --- though to do so would be to sever oneself from the ministry and fellowship of Judaism as well as its jurisdiction.¹ Undoubtedly the Pharisee Saul, even though he possessed Roman citizenship, would never have thought of such an appeal had there ever come a time when he was to be judged for a breach of the Law. But what was it that kept the Christian Paul so tied to the synagogue as to endure such lashings, when theologically he was separate from Judaism and politically he could escape this ordeal? Evidently it was not an absolutely essential tie; for when it became evident that to submit to Jewish legislation meant death and the cessation of his ministry, he did appeal for Imperial protection and judgment. Whether most of these synagogue whippings occurred in the early fourteen years of his Christian life or during his ministry as recorded in Acts in circumstances of which we have no account,² the point is that this is one of those things which he felt he must suffer as a servant of Christ.³ In the case of these five whippings we have explicit evidence from the apostle's own letters that at least at this point he did submit to Judaism's legislation even though he could theologically justify his escape

¹Cf. W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p.322 n. 12.

²J. Parkes: "Some of these incidents may be connected with the fourteen years of which we know nothing. In other cases, where Luke merely reports that the opposition secured his expulsion, there may have been an actual trial before the synagogal authorities, and a formal condemnation of his teaching by them" (Jesus, Paul and the Jews, p. 113). M. Dibelius argues for a pre-Acts ministry in Tarsus, during which time these whippings occurred (Paul, p. 70).

³Note II Cor. 11.23, where he subsumes such afflictions under the heading of things he suffered as a servant of Christ.

from such a punishment and politically could effect his release. And when we realise that the apostle was willing to go to this extent in being "to those under the law . . . as one under the law," the seeming strangeness of any further Jewish practice which Acts might record of him fades into insignificance. We must, therefore, insist that the Acts representation of the apostle's practice is entirely credible.

The rationale behind these practices. --- How then can such actions be explained? Many have viewed Paul as only acting according to expediency, i.e., in not allowing consistency to come between himself and action.¹ On this interpretation, he was willing to be inconsistent if such action could further his mission, smooth over tensions and/or relieve antagonisms. A. Schweitzer saw the apostle's practice as the practical result of his eschatological theology; i.e., since his Lord would shortly return, he believed it to be his mission only to proclaim preparedness for that coming and not to attempt any change in the 'status quo'.² J. Parkes believes that Paul could have easily performed these acts because he never departed from Judaism.³ In Parkes' view, the apostle has been misinterpreted by most of Christendom; and to an extent Paul himself is responsible for this confusion, since his words regarding the Law have more bluster and passion in them than real truth. But his actions reveal that the strong denunciations of the Law in his letters were not an essential

¹E.g., C. G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, pp. 182-183; W.D. Stacey, The Pauline View of Man, p. 16.

²A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, pp. 193-194.

³J. Parkes, Judaism and Christianity and Jesus, Paul and the Jews, passim.

or permanent part of his message. Some have even interpreted these practices of Paul to be a sentimental return to the old days, which, though contradictory to his teaching, must be excused on the basis of emotional ties.¹

Behind these practices, however, there seems to lie a more basic explanation than any of the above. If the charge of inconsistency were removed from the interpretations of expediency and eschatology, we could justly say that those positions are grasping onto truth. But expediency and eschatology were only elements of a broader ethical basis in the life of the apostle. It is his doctrine of Christian liberty which included both these elements and upon which his practice was firmly grounded.

Undoubtedly the apostle was convinced that it was his message more than that proclaimed by the Jerusalem apostles which better presented the work and teaching of Jesus Christ. He had not only caught the dominant theme of the Christian message, i.e., that in the work of Christ righteousness has now become a matter dependent upon Christ and entirely apart from the Law and that in the Body of Christ there can be no distinction of fellowship between Jew and Gentile; but he had also seen the implication that thus the Jewish law

¹W. M. MacGregor says: "The historian should take his hero as he finds him, with all his inconsistency and his weakness; for the very fact that a great man cultivates somewhere a secluded garden of sentiment and old prejudice, may count for something in the impact of his character when at work" (Christian Freedom, p. 71). And again: "Logically he was done with vows and all their associated formalities, but emotionally he clung to them; and where the interests of his work were not involved, he found pleasure and even, perhaps, a certain advantage in the old observances" (ibid., p. 72).

has no necessary claim upon the Christian as a form of religious expression or a manner of life. But his sweeping insistence that "neither circumcision counts for anything nor uncircumcision" could only partially be assented to by the Jerusalem Church. While the 'pillars' agreed with him that circumcision was neither a necessity for salvation nor a basis for fellowship, they could not agree with the implication of Paul's statement that the Jewish law was not a necessary 'lebensform' for those who were still Jews.¹ As a member of the true remnant of Israel whose primary responsibility it was to witness to the nation,² the Jewish Christian was expected to retain the national practices. It seems that Paul could applaud the Jerusalem Christians' desire to witness to their own nation, but he could never accept their eccesiological thought which stood behind that desire and made Jewish legality a necessary manner of life for every Jewish Christian. And yet, though "such scruples might be a mark of weakness, . . . they were none the less to be respected; in any case they were less reprehensible than the spirit which condemned them."³

Here we find but the out-working of Paul's teaching that the believer's liberty must be conditioned by love if it is to be truly an exercise of Christian liberty; and this love manifests itself within

¹Cf. P. P. Bläser, Das Gesetz bei Paulus, pp. 74ff., for this distinction of the Law as necessary for righteousness and the Law as necessary as a "Lebensform" or "Lebensnorm."

²See Appendix, pp. 373-376.

³W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 349.

the Christian community in a willingness to restrict one's own liberty for the sake of a weaker brother. The same principles found explicitly stated in I Cor. 8 - 10 seem to be again the basis for Paul's action when in contact with the Jerusalem Church. In the one case, his real thought was that "an idol is nothing" and "meats are nothing". In the other, it was that "circumcision is nothing." But in both cases it seems that he realised that "there is not in every man that knowledge."¹ Thus in both cases he restricted his personal liberty for the sake of the weaker brother. At Corinth he abstained from certain practices for the sake of certain local Christians, while for the sake of the Jerusalem Christians he performed certain actions. In both of these situations, he viewed the matters in question as entirely neutral in themselves to the man set free by Christ. But he refused to allow these neutral and purely secondary matters to cause a brother to stumble and to work havoc in the Church. He had no doubts that at least the majority of the members of the Jerusalem Church were earnest Christians desiring to do their Lord's will. Similarly, he fully realised the external pressures upon these believers, for he had both personally persecuted and been persecuted in Jerusalem.² Thus, while he could strongly denounce those who asserted that the Law was necessary for righteousness and/or fellowship within the Church, he could also tolerate in Christian love those who were true believers and yet who viewed the Law as a necessary form of religious expression and manner of life for all with a Jewish

¹I Cor. 8.7.

²I Thess. 2.14-16: "The Jews . . . who killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove us out,"

background.¹ Indeed, as Luther said, "he chose a middle way, sparing the weak for a time, but always withstanding the stubborn, that he might convert all to the liberty of faith."²

Paul would have agreed that "the truly emancipated man is not in bondage to his liberty."³ Thus, though it seems that his desire was not merely "to keep the gentiles free from the law . . . but also to win the Jews over to the new freedom of the children of God,"⁴ he could limit that very liberty he proclaimed for the sake of those both within and without the Church. In Corinth, he abstained from meat in preference to the overly-scrupulous believers whom he might otherwise cause to stumble. For the sake of similarly overly-scrupulous Christians at Jerusalem and the Jewish mission he allowed himself to be severely lashed five times by the synagogue authorities, circumcised one of his companions who was half-Jewish, took upon himself Jewish rites and vows when circumstances so demanded and generally continued his personal practice of the national

¹Calvin's insistence that "a slight superstition may be corrected with patience" (Calvini opera, VIII, 477) is entirely Pauline. Similarly Luther's distinction between the fundamentals and the adiaphora in the dispute regarding the date of Easter; for while he argued strongly for the position of the Eastern Church as against his own Church, he also insisted: "Therefore my advice is to let it alone and let it be kept as it now is, and patch and tear the old coat, and let Easter see-saw back and forth until the Last Day, or until the monarchs agree to change it together, in view of these facts. It breaks no one's legs and St. Peter's boat will not be hurt by it, since it is neither heresy nor sin, but only a solecism, or error, in astronomy" ("On the Councils and the Churches," Works of Martin Luther, Vol. V, trans. C. M. Jacobs, p. 186; cf. pp. 181-187).

²M. Luther, "A Treatise on Christian Liberty," Works of Martin Luther, Vol. II, trans. W. A. Lambert, pp. 339-340.

³F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 35

⁴H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 200.

customs¹. "Naturally, his fellow-countrymen did not understand, indeed could not understand, such freedom! But the Apostle was not therefore a hypocrite."² He can only be charged with hypocrisy and inconsistency if he had acted in opposition to his own principles and/or had professed to believe that these practices were essential when he really believed otherwise. But in actuality, "no one held to great principles more consistently."³ His wide diversity of practice springs most naturally from his doctrine of Christian liberty.

Continued Preaching in the Synagogue and to Jews

A survey of Paul's missionary procedures reveals the fact that Acts portrays the apostle as usually beginning his ministry in a city by preaching in the local synagogue,⁴ and this despite the repeated declarations in his letters that he is an apostle to the Gentiles.⁵ And as if this were not enough, the Acts account represents him as telling the Jews of Iconium that "it was necessary that the word of God should

¹Note Acts 22.17-21.

²A. Harnack, The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels, p. 81.

³Foakes Jackson's whole statement is pertinent: "This charge of lack of consistency is a delight to men of limited intelligence, who desire someone whom they can understand, and will always say exactly what they expect of him. As they cannot find such a man in Paul, his utterances often appear to them to be illogical. But this is not because he is really inconsistent, for no one held to great principles more consistently, but because of his exceptional breadth of view, and his power of seeing that there is more than one side to every question" (Life of St. Paul, p. 15).

⁴Acts 13.5 (Salamis); 13.14 (Antioch in Pisidia); 14.1 (Iconium); 17.1 (Thessalonica); 17.17 (Athens); 18.4 (Corinth); 19.8 (Ephesus).

⁵E.g., Gal. 1. 16, 2.7-9; Rom. 11.13, 15.16, 18. His mission to the Gentiles is also referred to in Acts 9.15, 13.47, 26. 17-18.

be first spoken to you"¹ and as taking the initiative in calling together the Jewish leaders in Rome to present the Gospel to them.² It is this great interest in Jews on the part of one who declared plainly that he had been "entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised even as Peter [had been commissioned] to the circumcised"³ which has caused many to doubt the historicity of the Acts account,⁴ a few to view Paul as still within the framework of Judaism,⁵ and some to argue that in each city he really only turned to the Gentiles when he found that his Jewish mission had failed.⁶ And, indeed, the question is pertinent: Could the apostle who declared so definitely that his ministry was to the Gentiles have been so careful to begin his labours in each city with the Jews?

Many have argued that to view this as a contradiction between the Epistles and the Acts "is to overlook the fact that the likeliest audience, even for the missionary to the Gentiles, was to be found at the divine service in the synagogue, where he would meet former pagans who had been converted to Judaism, proselytes, and, above all, the non-Jewish attenders, the so-called 'God-fearing Gentiles'."⁷ And this is certainly true. And yet, this explanation does not entirely cover Paul's practice of first approaching the synagogues or his evident interest in the conversion of Jews living in the Diaspora. In addition

¹Acts 13.46.

²Acts 28.17ff.

³Gal. 2.7; cf. 2.9.

⁴See J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol.I, p. 210.

⁵E.g., J. Parkes, Judaism and Christianity, p. 79.

⁶E.g., A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 181.

⁷M. Dibelius, Paul, p. 85.

to this factor, we must recognise that the concordat of Gal. 2.7-10 was neither a strictly geographical division of area nor a strictly ethnic division of responsibility. The apostle who could yearn so over his own nation as in Rom. 9-11,¹ see his Gentile mission as an indirect ministry to Israel in causing his own people to become jealous for the blessings of God,² declare the Gospel to be "to the Jew first and also to the Greek,"³ and believe that there is no distinction between Jew and Greek before God⁴ cannot be blamed if he interpreted the agreement recorded in Gal. 2 as designating only primary responsibility and not exclusive concern. This is what is indicated in Acts' representation of the Lord's words to Ananias: "Go, for he is a chosen instrument of mine to carry my name before the Gentiles and kings and the sons of Israel."⁵ Paul had no doubt that he was commissioned to be an apostle to the Gentiles, but he never interpreted this call as meaning total disregard for the Jew. Rather, it seems that he was attempting to follow his Lord's practice and command of putting the Jew first⁶ --- but never allowing that order to stand in his way or detain him from his primary responsibility to the Gentile.

Acceptance of the Jerusalem Decree

The account of the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15 stands as the watershed in the design and construction of the narrative in Acts. And in that chapter, "the most serious difficulty is to fit an acceptance

¹Esp. 9.1-3 and 10.1. ²Rom. 11.11,14.

³Rom. 1.16.

⁴E.g., Rom. 2.11, 3.9, 3.22.

⁵Acts 9.15. Cf. J. Munck, Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte, p.20.

⁶E.g., Acts 1.8.

of the Decree with the ethical system championed by S. Paul, for whereas most of the other difficulties come from our comparative ignorance, this comes from the express statements of the Apostle himself."¹ The problem is twofold: (1) Did Paul actually accept the Jerusalem Decree? and, if we believe he did, (2) Was he compromising his own teaching of Christian liberty in so doing?

The text of the Decree. -- But before going further, it is necessary to raise the question regarding the nature of the Decree. As is well-known, there is an important textual variation between the Neutral text and the Western text at this point. The received text lists four prohibitions: ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων καὶ αἵματος καὶ κνικῶν καὶ πορνείας;² while the text of D and its Latin associates omits καὶ κνικῶν, giving the other three and including the Golden Rule in negative form. If the four-clause text is accepted, we have a mixture of ceremonial, dietary and ethical injunctions. If the three-clause version be viewed as original, then it could possibly be said that the Decree is an ethical pronouncement. We need not repeat all the arguments both pro and con in this question which has rightly been called "one of the most tangled problems in the history of the early Church."³ But some summary and indication of the conclusions accepted by this author must be presented if we are to proceed further.

It was not until 1905 that the text of Codex Bezae began to

¹F.C. Burkitt, Christian Beginnings, p. 112.

²Acts 15.20, 29; 21.25.

³A. S. Peake, Paul and the Jewish Christians, p. 17.

be looked upon by more modern scholarship as offering a real alternative to the received text. In that year, Gotthold Resch, continuing the work of Hilgenfeld, published Das Aposteldekret nach seinem ausserkanonischen Textgestalt in which he argued that the Western Text, with both its omission of "things strangled" and its inclusion of the negative Golden Rule, was original. This work so influenced A. Harnack that he changed his previously published opinion and strongly supported the three-clause text --- except that he took the negative Golden Rule to be a later insertion.¹ In close succession, K. Lake joined Harnack and advocated that the Neutral "things strangled" and the Western Golden Rule were both additions attempting to clarify the shorter but ambiguous original version.² And since 1911 there have been others who have agreed with Harnack and Lake in accepting the three-clause text of D while deleting its addition of the Golden Rule.³ It seems that most agree because they feel that the three clauses of the Western Text, interpreted as prohibitions against idolatry, murder and impurity, better fit into a Pauline acceptance than the four ceremonial, dietary and ethical injunctions of the received text. But the acceptance of the Western reading cannot in any sense be called the "generally accepted view."⁴

¹A. Harnack, The Acts of the Apostles, pp. 248-263.

²K. Lake, The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, p. 48-60.

³E.g., J. Jocz, The Jewish People and Jesus Christ, p. 68; P. Carrington, The Early Christian Church, Vol. I, p. 104.

⁴As J. Jocz speaks of it, The Jewish People and Jesus Christ, p. 68.

To view the Jerusalem Decree as a bit of basic moral legislation, so elemental in its ethical propositions that Paul could easily have expressed his approval, is indeed tempting. The sins of idolatry, murder and moral impurity were often grouped together by Judaism and the early church as the three basic heinous sins of the world,¹ and it would not be hard to project this thought into the considerations of the Jerusalem Council. But on a textual basis, it is very difficult to justify the abandonment of the received version. We have no real evidence that there ever existed a short form of the text without both "things strangled" and the Golden Rule;² and if the Western text "is wrong in its addition, it lies under the suspicion of being wrong in its omission."³ Similarly, while it is usually best to prefer the shorter reading, in this case the shorter reading appears in a text which, since the radical rejection of the Western Text by Westcott and Hort, generally does not highly commend itself to all. Nor can it be said that the

¹E.g., b. Yoma 9b: "Why was the first Sanctuary destroyed? Because of three (evil) things which prevailed there: idolatry, immorality, bloodshed."

Mish. Aboth 5.11: "Captivity enters the world on account of idol-worship, fornication and bloodshed."

b. Sanh. 74a: "Any sin denounced by the Law may be committed by a man if his life is threatened, except the sins of idolatry, fornication and murder."

b. Erech. 15b: "Whoso slandereth his neighbour committeth sins as great as idolatry, fornication and murder."

Rev. 22.15: "Without are the fornicators, and the murderers, and the idolaters."

²K. Lake insists that Tertullian's exclusion of both "things strangled" and the Golden Rule "is the extremely important exception" (The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, p. 49, n. 1).

³A. S. Peake, Paul and the Jewish Christians, pp. 18-19.

Western Text really gets around the ceremonial and dietary nature of the Neutral version, for to interpret αἷμα as murder is to avoid the more natural sense of 'the eating of blood' for the term. Since, therefore, the arguments for the three-clause text are rather inconclusive and can establish no more than a mere possibility for the genuineness of that text, the four-clause text appears in the generally more acceptable Neutral group of texts and the problem of ceremonial and dietary injunctions is really not set aside by an acceptance of the Western Text, it seems best to read the Jerusalem Decree as prohibiting: εἰδωλόθουτα, αἷμα, πνικτά and πορνεία.¹ The fact that the Western texts present it as an ethical pronouncement coupled with the Golden Rule is probably due to a remodelling of the Decree to make it a rule for the whole Church at a later time when the prohibitions of 'blood' and 'things strangled' had lost their meaning.

Arguments against Paul's acceptance of the Decree. -- The major argument against Paul's acceptance of the Jerusalem Decree is that this decree "was by no means an insignificant legal requirement" and cannot be reconciled with the apostle who "undisturbedly . . . pushed along the straight road of freedom from the law."² And evidences in support of this view that he refused to accept the Decree, or at best gave only a careless and passive consent to it in the interests of peace,³ have been seen in both what is said and what is omitted in the

¹Note the excellent discussions of this question in J. G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, pp. 87-91, and A. S. Peake, Paul and the Jewish Christians, pp. 17-20.

²H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 142.

³W. Sanday's position, Theologische Studien Theodor Zahn dargebracht, p. 332 (as cited by A. S. Peake, Paul and the Jewish Christians, p. 20).

Pauline literature. The incident of Peter's vacillation at Antioch and the statement of James in Acts 21.25 have convinced many that the Decree was sent out without consulting Paul, some time after the conference at Jerusalem and without Paul knowing of it until much later.¹ Similarly, the fact that "he writes not a single syllable about the Apostolic Decree"² has been seen as proof that either he knew nothing of it, or, assuming that he agreed to it at the Jerusalem conference or heard about it shortly afterward, could not wholeheartedly accept it.³ We are not so interested in the date of the Decree, though that question is inseparably bound together with the other. Our concern here is in whether the above-mentioned 'evidences' can really be considered as evidence for Paul's disparagement of the Decree, while in the next section we will consider the main problem regarding the relation of the Decree to the apostle's doctrine of liberty.

It has already been noted that there was a real reason for the omission of the Decree in the Corinthian correspondence.⁴ Paul could not quote any type of an ecclesiastical statement to those supra-spiritualists of Corinth if he desired to win them over to a truer understanding and expression of Christian liberty. His method even in his churches was that of being "all things to all men," and it seems that he would not have used a churchly pronouncement in such a case

¹E.g., J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. I, pp. 260-261, 274-275.

²H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 143.

³E.g., ibid., p. 143; J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. I, pp. 5, 260; W. M. MacGregor, Christian Freedom, pp. 31, 142.

⁴Supra, pp. 286-287, 295-296.

even if he had written it himself.

But despite the theory of Lütgert and Ropes regarding the errorists in Galatia, and Schmithal's synthesis of that view,¹ it does not seem that Paul's failure to mention the Decree in his Galatian letter can be explained along similar lines. The solution to the problem of the omission in Galatians seems to be that the apostle wrote to his converts before attending the conference at Jerusalem. We agree with W. M. Ramsay, F. C. Burkitt, J. G. Machen, G. S. Duncan, W. L. Knox and others that "the most natural interpretation of the biographical statements in Galatians i and ii is that they were written before the 'Council' at Jerusalem."² This implies acceptance of the South Galatian theory and the correlation of Gal. 2.1-10 with Acts 11.30, subjects which cannot be dealt with here. But while there are problems in dating Galatians before the Council, there seem to be greater historical difficulties in dating it later. The most evident difficulty in the early date concerns the relation of Galatians to Romans. But, as J. Weiss has well said, that latter writing of the apostle "is in some degree rather a great monologue than a letter, . . . a cross-section of his mental life which could have come equally well

¹W. Lütgert (Gesetz und Geist) and J. H. Ropes (The Singular Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians) saw a similar group of pneumatic converts in the Galatian churches as at Corinth, while W. Schmithals ("Die Häretiker in Galatien," Z.N.W., Vol. XLVII, 1956, pp. 25-67) views the heretics of Galatia and Corinth as Jewish-Christian gnostics possessing both the pneumatic and the supra-spiritual traits which come out so strongly in the Corinthian letters.

²F. C. Burkitt, Christian Beginnings, p. 116. Cf. ibid., pp. 116-118; W. M. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, p. XXXI and The Teaching of Paul, pp. 372ff.; J. G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, pp. 78-87; G. S. Duncan, Galatians (M.N.T.C.), pp. XVIII-XXXII; W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 220-227.

from almost any period of his life."¹ To insist, however, that Galatians was written after the conference is to introduce confusion and difficulty at many points in the relation of Galatians to Acts. We must agree with P. Carrington that "the arguments which perplexed the older theologians and still go on in the schools were due in no small degree to the fact that they accepted the later date of Galatians, which was traditional in their time."² When the events and statements of Acts cannot be correlated with those of Galatians, there is another solution besides a scepticism of the veracity of Acts. The early dating of Galatians is not so lacking in support that it can be easily set aside. And it produces a workable union between Galatians and Acts.

We therefore conclude that Paul's lack of reference to the Jerusalem Decree is no real evidence that he was unaware of it or really didn't accept it. Nor is there any conclusive evidence that the Decree was not arranged at the Jerusalem Council, as represented in Acts 15. Accepting the early date for Galatians, Peter's vacillation was also earlier than the Council and does not therefore have a bearing on the question at hand. And James' statement to Paul in Acts 21.25 could be viewed just as easily as a reassurance of the elder apostles' recognition of Gentile independence within a context of brotherly forbearance as that James was telling Paul of that which he had not known.

Christian liberty and the Decree. -- But if it be insisted that there is no reason to believe that Paul refused to accept the

¹J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. I, p. 363.

²P..Carrington, The Early Christian Church, Vol. I, p. 91.

Decree, is there any reason to believe that he could have approved it without compromising his own teaching regarding Christian liberty? In discussing this question, we must recognise two factors:

1.) That in the Council of Jerusalem two different types of "necessary things" were considered. Firstly, the theological necessity of circumcision for righteousness was discussed, and rejected. Secondly, the practical necessity of Gentile abstinence from certain practices for the sake of Jewish-Gentile fellowship within the Church and for the sake of the Jewish mission was considered, and approved. The major work of the conference had to do with the vindication of Gentile freedom, while the secondary matter was concerned with an expression of that freedom in regard to the scruples of others.¹

2.) That in the teaching of Paul a definite place was given to apostolic and ecclesiastical authority in the guidance of Christian liberty. As was noted in Chapter IV, Paul believed that when there is a division of the Church regarding the will of God for a particular situation, and when that division threatens the welfare of the Christian community, then it is the responsibility of the apostles and the Church to attempt to interpret the Mind of Christ for that specific condition in the interests of the life of the Church and the preservation of liberty.

Taking these two factors into consideration, we can see no reason why the apostle would not have willingly accepted the Jerusalem Decree. On the primary question of the fact and recognition of

¹Cf. M. Luther's excellent discussion of the Jerusalem Council, "On the Councils and the Churches," Works of Martin Luther, Vol. V., trans. C. M. Jacobs, esp. pp. 150-154, 188, 193-195.

Gentile liberty, his point was won. But on the problem of how this Gentile liberty was to be expressed in view of the scruples of both the Jewish Christians and the unconverted Jews, there seems to have been real confusion within the churches. We cannot believe that this problem only later arose among the Gentile Christians at Corinth or that the Christian Pharisees' fears in the Jerusalem conference were entirely unfounded.¹ Here was a primarily temporal and circumstantially conditional situation which, in view of the uncertainty within the churches regarding it and the vital necessity to preserve a fellowship among believers and a contact with the Jewish people,² made it necessary for the apostles to give what they believed to be a correct interpretation of the Mind of Christ for the specific situation. This seems to be entirely within the range of the thought of Paul as has been outlined previously.^{2a} Thus we agree with F. C. Burkitt's conclusion regarding the Decree, that "as a rule of life it was such as St. Paul would approve, or at least be quite ready to comply with, so long as it was understood by intelligent Christians to be a concession to the scruples of others, not a positive Divine ordinance."³

¹J. B. Lightfoot's suggestion seems probable: "It is strange indeed that offences so heterogeneous should be thrown together and brought under one prohibition; but this is perhaps sufficiently explained by supposing the decree framed to meet some definite complaint of the Jewish brethren. If, in the course of the hot dispute which preceded the speeches of the leading Apostles, attention had been specially called by the Pharisaic party to these detested practices, St. James would not unnaturally take up the subject and propose to satisfy them by a direct condemnation of the offences in question" (Epistle to the Galatians, p. 306).

²Acts 15.21 states that such a decree was needful in view of Jewish scruples. See Gen. 9.4 for the prohibition, and cf. Jubilees 6.7, 10, 7.28 and 21.5-6.

^{2a}Supra, pp. 263-270.

³F. C. Burkitt, Christian Beginnings, p. 134. Cf. J. G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, p. 93.

Claims in Defence

In the present chapter we have argued that in his missionary activity, his pastoral ministry and his inter-church relations, as presented in both his letters and the account of Acts, the apostle Paul was but consistently working out his own teaching of Christian liberty. But one point more is pertinent in discussing the relation of his practice to his teaching, and that point has to do with the claims which Acts represents Paul as making in his speeches of defence. The question is, could the apostle of liberty have said:

- 1.) "I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees,"¹ when he certainly did not practice a policy of exclusivism in his Gentile mission?
- 2.) "With respect to the hope of the resurrection of the dead am I being judged,"² when he was really being questioned for his preaching of the resurrection and Person of Jesus Christ?
- 3.) "I went up to worship at Jerusalem,"³ whereas he hardly came for the primary purpose of worshipping in the Temple?
- 4.) "I came to bring alms and offerings for my nation,"⁴ when he really was bringing a collection for the poor Christians of the Jerusalem Church?

Can we believe that Paul's Christian liberty and his missionary approach of being "all things to all men" allowed him to go to the extent of what appears to be outright dishonesty? Is liberty in Christ entirely principleless, so that it matters not how we accomplish our purpose so long as the end is achieved?

¹Acts 23.6; cf. 26.5. ²Acts 23.6, 24.21, 26.6-8.

³Acts 24.11. ⁴Acts 24.17.

Many have agreed with J. Weiss that "we must be on our guard against spoiling the portrait of Paul by the impressions we receive from the speeches of the Apostle which have been interpolated, especially the speeches in the defence during his trial."¹ J. Parkes, on the other hand, fully accepts these statements as evidence that the apostle never really broke with Judaism.² Most of those who accept these claims as Pauline interpret him as playing the 'enfant terrible' before rather unworthy opponents. But even if we attribute the most evil of intentions to his accusers, there still appears to be something not quite straightforward in Paul's replies; it still appears that the apostle used his liberty as an occasion for an adroit manoeuvre which was not really sincere.

But much of our suspicion regarding these claims must be credited to our own ignorance of the Judaism of Paul's day, the manner in which the author of Acts condensed the speeches which he included and the thought of Paul regarding his nation. Although the Talmudic literature represents the Pharisees as practising a strict exclusivism, it is quite possible that this was not so strictly carried out in earlier times.³ In the Gospels, while the Pharisees looked askance at Jesus for eating with publicans and sinners⁴ and for allowing His disciples to eat with unwashed hands,⁵ they are also presented as

¹J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol I, p.148

²J. Parkes, Judaism and Christianity, pp. 79ff.

³Cf. W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 21, n. 41 and p. 22, n. 47.

⁴Matt. 9.10-13, Mk. 2.15-17, Lk.5.29-32.

⁵Matt. 15.1ff., Mk. 7.1ff.

inviting Him to dinner¹ and arranging a temporary alliance with the Herodians.² In all likelihood, Pharisaism in this earlier day was not so stereotyped as it later became under Rabbinic development.

Probably Paul still could have been considered a Pharisee because of his belief in the resurrection and his personally scrupulous observance of the Law, even though he did not separate himself from Gentiles and the Am-haarez.

The claim that "with respect to the hope of the resurrection of the dead am I being judged" has been especially criticised. But here we must realise that probably "whenever the Resurrection was spoken of, our Lord, as a matter of course, formed for St. Paul, for St. Luke, and for the listeners the efficient cause."³ This is suggested in the reporting of Paul's Athens address, for in that speech, after speaking in 17.31 of God's "raising him [i.e. Jesus] from the dead," the Acts account continues in 17.32 with the words: "But when they heard of the resurrection of the dead," At least in this instance, the phrase "the resurrection of the dead" carries the connotation of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead as well as the more general doctrine of a resurrection. Acts presents Paul throughout his defences before the Imperial authorities as making clear that it was the resurrection of Jesus Christ he meant,⁴ and that his Roman judges clearly understood this.⁵ And thus when the

¹Lk. 14.1ff.

²Mk. 3.6.

³A. Harnack, The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels, p. 87.

⁴Acts 24.14, 24.24, 26.23.

⁵Acts 25.19.

single phrase. "the resurrection of the dead" is used by Paul and/or by Luke, even when before Jewish judges, it seems to refer to the whole doctrine of the resurrection --- especially as it has been validated and illustrated by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. There does not seem to be any deceit here on Paul's part. Luke may have been condensing the apostle's speech to the extent of leaving out the obvious, as seems was done in Acts 17.32. But "we may even believe that St. Paul, at the beginning of his discourse, said roundly, 'Touching the Resurrection of the dead I stand here called in question'; for Luther also declared a hundred times that he was called in question touching the merits and the honour of Jesus Christ, while his opponents asserted that these things did not come at all into the question."¹

Nor need we see a touch of insincerity in the declarations "I went up to worship at Jerusalem" and "I came to bring alms and offerings to my nation." Though Acts 24.11 records Paul as saying that he "went up to worship at Jerusalem," only three verses later, in 24.14, the account represents him as continuing: "But this I admit to you, that according to the Way which they call a sect, I serve the God of our fathers." No deceit was intended, as the clarification shows. Similarly, though A. Harnack considered this the least defensible of the problem practices in Acts,² the same Paul who could say in Rom. 15. 31 that the collection he was bringing for the Jewish Christians was

¹A. Harnack, The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels, p. 87.

²Ibid., p. 73.

"my service which is for Jerusalem (ἡ διακονία μου ἡ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ)" ¹ could also say that "I came to bring alms and offerings for my nation (ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου παρεγενόμενῃ καὶ προσφορᾶς)." What he did, he did not only for the relief of the Christian poor in the Jerusalem Church and not only for the unity of the Church universal, but also "for all Israel; he had ever before his eyes the nation in its entirety The conversion of the whole nation was the ultimate aim of all his exertions." ² And by aiding that branch of the Church whose mission it was to call the nation to its Messiah, he was indirectly engaged in a mission to his own nation.

Of all the practices of Paul as presented in Acts, these claims made in defence are probably the most susceptible of being interpreted as a false representation by the author of that work or a compromise by the apostle of his own ethical teaching. But even here, it does not seem that there is any real contradiction between the teaching and the practice of the apostle Paul.

¹Though Codices B and D have ἐν rather than εἰς.

²A. Harnack, The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels, p. 74.

CONCLUSION

The present study has considered the legality-liberty dialectic of the apostle Paul in a number of areas in his life and thought. But the matter cannot be left there. Theology is more than merely historical investigation. Not only must the theologian deal with historical and exegetical matters, but he must at least indicate the relevancy of his studies for the present day. Indeed, every matter of inquiry "has a bearing upon the duties of life."¹ And this is especially so in regard to the Christian religion, which is rooted in what God has done in history and is vitalised by what He is doing in experience. Thus it is needful not only to draw this study to a conclusion, but also to indicate in a few words some general implications for our lives from the study of Paul.

Life, religion and hope for Paul were all centred in Jesus Christ, as the apostle himself declares in Phil. 1.21: "For me to live is Christ." It was the identification in the Damascus road experience of the crucified Jesus with the expected Messiah of Israel's hopes which altered the whole course of Paul's life. It was his realisation of the

¹Epictetus' whole statement is: "Most men are unaware that the handling of arguments which involve equivocal and hypothetical premisses, and, further, of those which derive syllogisms by the process of interrogation, and, in general, the handling of all such arguments, has a bearing upon the duties of life. For our aim in every matter of inquiry is to learn how the good and excellent man may find the appropriate course through it and the appropriate way of conducting himself in it" (Dissertations, I. 7. 1-2, trans. W. A. Oldfather, The Loeb Classical Library).

Person and work of Christ which caused him to view Jewish nomism, as well as all forms of legalism, as possessing no validity before God. It was in intimate fellowship with Christ that he found the basis for true liberty. It was through the interaction of the Law of Christ and the Mind of Christ that he came to know the will of God in his life. It was in the divine love manifested in and through Christ, and thus also in and through those who are 'in Christ', that he found the conditioning factor for all of life. And it was his realisation of the central importance of Jesus Christ in the history of redemption and the life of every believer which influenced his actions both in staunchly withstanding those who would minimise the significance of Christ's Person and work and in willingly tolerating those who knew the centrality of Christ in their own lives but who were immature in other matters. Paul's faith was Christologically orientated. And in his Christian teaching and practice, he allowed nothing to obscure the centrality of Christ --- whether it be a form of legalism or the exercise of Christian liberty.

But what can be said regarding the relevancy of Paul's message to our day? Is his teaching merely of historical and antiquarian interest? Not at all! The apostle's message is extremely pertinent in this day when 'the Christian graces' are stressed, but all too often the central significance of Christ is passed by.¹ And as long as men

¹Note J. S. Stewart's words regarding Paul's proclamation that "salvation is of the Lord": "He must be blind indeed who denies the relevance of this to an age like our own, in which so many modern substitutes for the Gospel --- secularism and humanitarianism and moralism and legalism --- have appeared on the field, and so many voices are declaring that Abana and Pharpar are better than all the waters of Israel. Even among Christians the attempt to develop Christian graces (which are the circumference of religion) without having first faced up to the question of self-surrender and rightness with God (which is religion's

seek to gain in divine favour through what they can do and take comfort in a mere self-justification, the teaching of Paul will retain its relevancy. The Church must always instruct and guide in the matter of the exercise of Christian liberty because of the 'carnal' character of many of its members; but whenever that ethical instruction and/or churchly pronouncement is proclaimed or accepted as the heart and core of the Christian Gospel which alone needs to be followed, there has entered in the element of legalism. Similarly, though the Church proclaims a moral inwardness, there is always the danger, which is too often realised in practice, of confusing two different types of inwardness --- Stoic inwardness, which is really a form of humanism, and Christ-centred inwardness. The Gospel is not Stoic teaching in a religious guise; the Gospel breaks even the inner legalism of Stoicism. W. R. Inge has well stated: "Christianity cannot live on moral aphorism, or on a 'galvanisation' of Platonism or Stoicism in Christian dress, but only on the 'Christus-mystik' which was the heart of St. Paul's religion, and which led him to lay increasing emphasis on the brotherhood of believers in 'the body of Christ'."¹ It is personal knowledge of and fellowship with Christ which is the heart of the Gospel proclamation. And whenever theological knowledge, mental assent to a creed or a 'plan of salvation', ascetic practices, the performance of ecclesiastical rites, ethical behaviour or even love to one's neighbour be viewed as man's action which gains salvation and sanctification from God, we have

centre) is not unknown; and as long as this is so, Paul's doctrine of justification, so far from being an obsolete survival of merely historical and antiquarian interest, will remain a living word of God, challenging and convincing and convicting, and mighty to save" (A Man in Christ, p. 245).

¹W. R. Inge, Christian Ethics and Modern Problems, p. 385.

as an external and authoritative norm and pattern for the outworking of the Christian's liberty.¹ While it is certainly a mistake to consider the Law of Christ as the equivalent of the Rabbinic Halakah or to confine its designation only to the teaching of Jesus, yet it remains "that even for Paul, with his strong sense of the immediate governance of Christ through His Spirit in the Church, that which the Lord 'commanded' and 'ordained' remains the solid, historical and creative nucleus of the whole."²

The Two Normative Factors in their Interrelationship

Recognising, therefore, that guidance in the Christian life has both an external and an internal aspect in Paul's thought, the question arises as to the relation of these two elements in the outworking of the believer's liberty. If there be in reality two normative factors in the direction of liberty, how does Paul view their interrelationship and function?

The Directing principles and example of the Law of Christ. --

The Law of Christ stands as the standard of God for Paul. He seems to view teaching of Christ as the embodiment and one true interpretation of the Old Testament, as is at least indicated by the *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς* of I Cor. 15.3 where the Christian interpretation of the Old Testament

¹Cf. A.M. Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel, pp. 118-119.

²C.H. Dodd, " *ΕΝΝΟΜΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ* ," Studia Paulina, p. 110. Note the decided change in Dodd's position at this point from that in his earliest writing, The Meaning of Paul for Today, where he asserted that in the Pauline literature Jesus is "not . . . referred to as an outside standard" (p. 146) for Paul's message is "autonomy for the Christ-inspired conscience" (p. 148), to that contained in such later works as the above article and chapter four of Gospel and Law.

plement and enlarge the original content of faith, but it is not an independent source of truth. It is all controlled by the central and common tradition of the Gospel of Christ and the Law of Christ. ¹

And so Paul would teach us that freedom from γράμμα is not also freedom from γραφή;² liberty 'in Christ' is not only personal but is also social in that the believer is part of 'the Body of Christ'; Christian liberty is not devoid of propositional truths and guidance, though its vital nature is not grasped if only these are accepted.

And in the apostle's practice we have an example worthy of emulation. While he certainly didn't anticipate many of the present-day problems of interchurch relations and the personal exercise of liberty, Paul did demonstrate forcibly in his own activity at least two principles which should be more true in the outworking of the Christian ethic in the present day: (1) the need to stand firmly for the central significance of Jesus Christ in the redemptive program of God and in the reconciliation of men to the Father; and (2) the need to manifest true Christian love and brotherly tolerance to those who know the Person of the Gospel proclamation but with whom we cannot fully agree regarding matters of secondary importance. Of course, the cases are legion where these two principles need to be applied in daily life. We would not, nor could not, attempt to formulate 'rules' as to how these principles should be applied in every exigency. We can only pray that in each personal decision we might have the 'Mind of Christ' and that in every church deliberation the direction of the Spirit might control.

¹Ibid., pp. 58-59.

²Cf. O. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel, pp. 174ff.

APPENDIX

CHRISTIANITY IN JERUSALEM

In dealing with the Pauline teaching and practice, the tangent subject of Christianity in Jerusalem constantly arises. At many points in the body of this study we have treated in passing an aspect or more of that branch of early Christendom which carried the distinctively Jewish stamp, but it will be of value to attempt here a broad outline of the circumstances and thought of the Christians in the Holy City. The subject of Jewish Christianity is certainly deserving of a much more extensive treatment than will appear in the following pages, but a summary sketch of its main features will suffice for our purpose of better understanding Paul's teaching and practice in relation to the Christianity of the Jerusalem Church.

Its Constituency

In the early days of its existence, Jerusalem Christianity seems to have encompassed three types of Jews. These can conveniently be designated by the names of their best-known representatives: Peter, James and Stephen. As time went on, however, the three were narrowed to two; and still later, it appears that of the remaining two, one became dominant.

The Am-Haarez. -- The first followers of the Lord were those classed by the Jews as the 'Am-haarez', i.e. 'the people of the land' who practised the basic minimum standards of the Law but who made no real attempt to be Pharisaically scrupulous. It was this class of Jew (ὁ πολλὸς ὄχλος of Mk. 12.37) who heard Jesus gladly. And certainly the original twelve, drawn as they were from such occupations as fishing and tax-gathering, could hardly have been credited with any

Pharisaical keeping of the Law.

In the early gatherings of Christians in Jerusalem, this type of Jew undoubtedly predominated numerically. To whatever extent we view the Galilean disciples of the Lord returning to their homes after the events of the Passion Week,¹ at least a nucleus remained at Jerusalem and there joined the Judaeans in forming the first Christian community in that city. Though these early believers had never devoted themselves to a detailed legal observance in their pre-Christian experience, either because of the demands of earning a living or the lack of inclination, they were nonetheless loyal Jews both nationally and religiously. And now as Christ's followers, while their law-abiding had not become increased through their new allegiance, at least it was not diminished. Peter, for instance, still ignored the principles of separation established in the Rabbinical schools in his missionary activity when he was left to himself,² yet he never renounced the basic national customs and practices. He frequented the Temple as before,³ and, while there is no mention in Acts of any but Jewish Christians "zealous for the law"⁴ making vows and sacrificing, in

¹Cf. L. E. Elliott-Binns, Galilean Christianity, pp. 33ff.

²E.g., in his residence with one whose business was tanning hides (Acts 9.43), in his ministry to the Samaritans (Acts 8.14-25), in his eating with the Gentile Christians of Antioch previous to the arrival of those from James (Gal. 2.12). In Gal. 2.14, Paul implies that this was Peter's regular custom.

³Acts 2.46, 3.1 - 4.4, 5.20-26, 5.42.

⁴Acts 21.20.

all likelihood his type of Jewish Christianity joined in at least the basic offerings of the Temple. Am-haarez Christianity in Jerusalem gave no appearance of change in its relation to the Law. While its central doctrine of the Messiahship of Christ did not increase its law-abiding, that belief did not make its practice any less Jewish than it had been. Thus the populace seems to have looked upon this group favourably, and the Pharisees seem to have tolerated the Christians because of their unchanged practice of the basic national laws. The Sadducees, however, despite the Am-haarez Christians' continuance in the national customs, must have always looked with grave suspicion upon their teaching concerning Jesus as an authority greater than that of the Temple authority.

The Scrupulous. -- As "the number of the disciples multiplied greatly in Jerusalem,"¹ "a great many of the priests"² and "those of the party of the Pharisees"³ came into the Jerusalem Church. Similarly we read of the legally scrupulous James becoming one of the 'pillars' in the church, and later evidently taking charge of affairs. We need not insist that James was an ascetic⁴ or a legalist in the sense in which that term has been used in this study,⁵

¹Acts 6.7. ²Acts 6.7. ³Acts 15.5.

⁴The tradition quoted from Hegesippus (Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, II. 23. 4-7) probably is no more than a guess and an attempt to magnify James, though scholars as F. C. Burkitt, Christian Beginnings, pp. 57-65, and P. Carrington, The Early Christian Church, Vol. I, pp. 104-105, have accepted it.

⁵As, e.g., H. Lietzmann: "James, the leader of the church, belonged at bottom to those who were strangers to Jesus, and strove for the ideal of a Jewish 'righteousness'" (The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 83).

nor that his rise in the Christian Church was the occasion of a return to legalism within the Jewish Christian community. It would be unfair to simply credit his position in the Church to a Jewish materialistic and legalistic veneration of one who was related to the Lord. Probably it is more accurate to say that his rise came as the result of the need for one to lead this growing section of scrupulously minded Christian priests and Pharisees in the Church, and that his relation to Jesus, his Davidic descent, his strict law-abiding and his personal qualities eminently fitted him to this task of interesting, holding and governing those who might have looked down upon 'Am-haarez' leadership.¹ It seems that even the Jerusalem Church, to a very limited extent, was trying to be "all things to all men" in its mission to the Jewish populace. The character and thought of this type of Jerusalem Christianity must be constantly referred to throughout the following pages; but suffice it here to note that here were Christians who, like the 'Am-haarez' group, continued their Jewish practices in much the same manner and to much the same extent as they had done before their conversion.

The Hellenists. -- From the beginning of the Christian community in Jerusalem, those designated the 'Ἑλληνιστάι' in Acts were

¹A. Schlatter has well commented in saying: "The fact that, prior to the Crucifixion, James had not been able to throw in his lot with Jesus did not weaken his position in the Church. James' experience was the same as everyone else's. For all alike the Resurrection constituted the turning point and transformation of their relationship to Jesus. There was no one in the Church who did not recall with penitence his former conduct; they all knew that they had found occasion of stumbling" (The Church in the New Testament Period, p. 12).

present in the Church. Discussion has long continued regarding just who is signified by this term. Most have accepted it as referring to Greek speaking Jews from the Diaspora who settled in Jerusalem.¹ Others interpret it to mean simply Gentiles of the Greek-cultured world,² some to Jewish proselytes,³ and a few to a radical reforming 'gentilistic' party with Judaism which accepted the moral aspects of the Law but was set against sacrificial worship.⁴ Lately, C. F. D. Moule has suggested that these were "simply Jews (whether by birth or as proselytes) who spoke only

¹E.g., F. J. A. Hort, Judaistic Christianity, p. 48; H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 88. The major question regarding this interpretation is why, then, Paul calls himself a Hebraicist when he was also from the Diaspora.

²E.g., J. H. Ropes, Beginnings, Vol. III, p. 106. It is difficult, however, to visualise purely Gentile Christians in the Jerusalem Church at such an early date --- if, indeed, at any time during the first century. The case of Cornelius is related as being quite exceptional. Probably, being a Roman soldier, he did not long remain in Palestine to cause embarrassment to the native Christians.

³E.g., E. C. Blackman, "The Hellenists of Acts vi. 1," E.T., Vol. XLVIII, No. 11 (Aug., 1937), pp. 524-525. But the fact that in Acts 6.5 special attention is drawn to only one of the seven as a proselyte seems fatal to this view that all seven were proselytes.

⁴E.g., M. Simon, St. Stephen and the Hellenists, and O. Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, pp. 18-32. But real evidence for such a party is lacking. The only possible suggestion of a Gentile interest in the Qumran texts is in the mention of proselytes as one of the four ranks within the community in CDC 14.3-6 (17.1-4), and this probably only refers to Jewish candidates for membership who were undergoing probation (cf. M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 263). Further, it cannot be said that the Qumran community was definitely set against a sacrificial worship 'per se' (supra, p. 179). These religious separatists still hoped to "succeed in reoccupying their native soil," CDC 13.20-21 (16.10-11), and to share in a purified temple worship.

Greek and no Semitic language, in contrast to 'Εβραῖοι , which would then mean the Jews who spoke a Semitic language in addition, of course to Greek."¹ Such a definition seems to be an advance in the explicit meaning of the term. Certainly it hurdles the difficulty in the traditional interpretation of why Paul calls himself a Hebraicist when he is also from the Diaspora, explains why Hellenistic synagogues were needed in Jerusalem, and offers an insight into the problem of why the seven deacons of the early church appear as evangelists within their own Hellenistic circles when they were appointed for the supervision of material matters. But, judging from Paul's Corinthian opponents' assertion that they were 'Εβραῖοι and not 'Ελληνισταί and the apostle's emphatic rejoinder καὶ γὰρ ,² the terms 'Εβραῖος and 'Ελληνιστής denote more than mere language differences. They seem also to connote the ideas of 'a Jew trained in the best traditions of his fathers' as versus 'a Jew whose basic mentality is that of Hellenism'.

Most of the Hellenists had probably returned to the homeland out of religious ardour. Some had probably found the religion of the homeland entirely satisfying; others possibly reverted to the fundamentalism of the Rabbis and priests in a blind reaction to the liberality they had witnessed in the Diaspora; while undoubtedly there were those who in returning had had their idealistic dreams broken

¹C. F. D. Moule, "Once More, Who Were the Hellenists?" E.T., Vol. LXX, No. 4 (Jan., 1959), p. 100.

²II Cor. 11.22.

by the casuistry and hair-splitting which they witnessed in many quarters. Those who blindly held to their new-found legal scrupulousness as the only safeguard to a more liberal spirit possibly appear in the Acts as those who disputed with Stephen and who stirred up the opposition against him. Those who had become disillusioned with the legalism of Jerusalem were probably those who, if they became Christians, were most vociferous in speaking out against that legalism. We need not speak of the Christian Hellenists as approximating the Pauline preaching. In the speech attributed to Stephen, there is no indication of a mission to the Gentiles or an offer of an absolutely law-free gospel --- though there is a strong rebuke of Israel's constant missing the significance of the working of God because of its emphasis upon the externals. But the significant aspect for our consideration here is that in this group we find Jews within the Jerusalem Church who differed from the others in that church in two ways: (1) linguistically, and (2) in their relation to the Law. Their linguistic differences probably resulted in separate meetings being held for Aramaic and Greek speaking Christians.¹ This in itself possibly branded them

¹A. S. Peake says regarding the Aramaic- and the Greek-speaking members of the church that, "while the relations between the two sections remained cordial, they may have thought it wisest to hold separate meetings" (Paul and the Jewish Christians, p. 4). He attributed this need for such a division primarily to conservative versus liberal differences, but such a separation could have taken place merely on a linguistic basis. While undoubtedly some of both sides were equally conversant in either Aramaic or Greek, and certainly all the Hellenists knew at least a few basic phrases of Aramaic, probably the native Christians felt most at home under instruction given in Aramaic while the most of the Hellenists would tend to prefer their worship and teaching in Greek.

as inferiors in the Jerusalem Church, both to those without the Church and to some of those within. But their changed relation to the Law resulted in their expulsion from the city itself. Here were those who were naturally under suspicion by their Hebraic Jewish brethren as being contaminated with a liberal spirit, who had come to Palestine with the declared purpose of practising the faith of their fathers in the strictest possible fashion, but who now as Christians desired only to live as the Am-haarez. And not only so, but they were vociferous in their opposition to Pharisaic principles. The Pharisees could tolerate the Am-haarez Christians, for they had always been Am-haarez and even as Christians did not speak against a rigid law-abiding. But these Hellenists, who had entered the land under the guise of returning pilgrims, were not only ceasing their strict devotion but also spreading about in the Holy City itself that religious liberalism which the Hebraicists detested in the Diaspora. The religious leaders could do little in stamping out that dangerous spirit where it already existed in the Diaspora and in Palestine itself, but they could preserve the Holy City from such contamination and thus, they believed, best prepare the way for the Messiah.

It therefore seems best to interpret the persecution recorded in Acts 8 as primarily directed against the Hellenists,¹ though

¹As, e.g., H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 90.

probably the Hebraic Christians also took this as an occasion to become as inconspicuous as possible in the country surrounding Jerusalem. We are told that the whole church was scattered throughout Judaea and Samaria, "except the apostles." But evidently only the Hellenistic Christians felt it to be inadvisable to return to Jerusalem at some later time. Thus the Jerusalem Church is narrowed to two Semitic speaking types of Jews who are quite willing to retain that relation to the Law which they practised before their conversion. Just exactly how these two groups reacted to each other, we are not told. And yet it does seem that Acts represents the stricter group as increasing in strength and influence from the time of their defeat in Acts 15 to their pressure in Acts 21 for some sign from Paul himself that he still observed the Law. Indeed, as J. T. Milik suggests, it may be possible that this increasing influence of the stricter party within the church was in part the result of "a perpetual increase in Essene influence on the early Church."¹

Its Essential Theology

In realising that at Jerusalem there existed a type of Christianity which claimed to be distinctively Christian and yet which continued those practices which were distinctively Jewish, and evidently without feeling that there was a basic inconsistency

¹J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, p. 142. Milik believes that we can see this Essene influence "almost taking over and submerging the authentically Christian doctrinal element; indeed, it may be considered responsible for the break between the Judaeo-Christians and the Great Church" (ibid., pp. 142-143).

in such a dual loyalty, the question logically arises regarding the theology of this group. We need not inquire regarding every point of their thought, but at least the following four doctrines must be seen if we are to form a faithful outline of their essential theology: Christ, the Church, the Law and Eschatology.

Christology. -- Many Jewish and some Christian scholars, noting the fact that the Jerusalem Church continued to observe the Jewish rites and customs, have asserted that Jewish Christianity intended to be no more than a conventicle within the Synagogue and/or a sect of Judaism,¹ and that, if it had not been for the Pauline antinomianism, Christianity could have continued to the present-day under the wings of its parent religion. But to view the Christianity of Jerusalem as only a sect of Judaism is to fail to appreciate the radically new factor which had drawn these Jews together: the Person of Jesus Christ. J. Parkes and R. T. Herford have made the difference between the Church and the Synagogue to be primarily that of their attitude toward the Torah rather than that of their view of Christ.² G. F. Moore has minimised the significance of their Christological beliefs by insisting that the Jerusalem Church "was not a schismatic body; its leaders and the mass of their followers were, aside from their peculiar messianic and eschatological beliefs, observant Jews, as their teacher had been."³ But, though

¹E.g., J. Parkes, Judaism and Christianity. Parkes also insists that it was Paul's intention for the Church to remain within the fold of Judaism --- at least for Jewish Christendom to so remain.

²Cf. R. T. Herford, Pharisaism, p. 146; J. Parkes, Judaism and Christianity, p. 78.

³G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, p. 187.

they did observe the Jewish law, that does not mean that they intended to be no more than observant Jews.¹ For them, the central significance of history was not still to be anticipated in the coming of a future Messiah, but was to be seen in the Messiah who had come in the Person of Jesus Christ;² the primary function of true religion was not the keeping of the Law in anticipation of the coming Messiah, but the knowledge of and fellowship with the Christ who has come unto His own. These were not observant Jews who also possessed "peculiar messianic and eschatological beliefs"; these were those who were primarily Christ's, but who were also Jews. The Church's difference with the Synagogue "was not about secondary matters such as the Golden Rule or the relation of intention and deed or even the nature of Messianic activity, but about the affirmation by the Church and denial by the Synagogue of Jesus' Messiahship and divinity."³ The Person of Christ was "the one great special

¹E. F. Scott has remarked that while it seems that they had no intention of breaking with the nation, "it does not follow, however, that the disciples aimed at nothing more than to constitute a sect within the parent religion. With the fullest consciousness that they had come into possession of something new, they may yet have sought to retain their hold on the system they had inherited and to construe their new faith by the categories which it supplied" (The Beginnings of the Church, p. 111; cf. also pp. 109-115).

²O. Cullmann has pertinently remarked: "He who does not see that the radically new thing in the New Testament is the Primitive Christian shifting of the center of time can understand Christianity only as a Jewish sect" (Christ and Time, p. 86).

³D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, p. viii. For a similar emphasis, see J. Jocz, The Jewish People and Jesus Christ, passim; W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 323-324; H. Danby, The Jew and Christianity, pp. 1ff.

point"¹ which distinguished the Jewish Christians from Judaism even while they continued the Jewish practices.

S. G. F. Brandon has recently insisted that the basic distinction between Gentile and Jewish Christianity was Christological. He believes that the Jerusalem Church accepted only "the Jesus of History," "the Jewish Messiah," whereas Paul proclaimed "the Christ of Faith," "a universal Saviour-god."² But, as J. S. Stewart says, "it is a point of first-class importance" that the records we have do not present "any disagreement between the primitive Christian community and Paul on the ground of Christology."³

The circumstance that his Christology stood unchallenged means that nothing in it was felt to be alien to the fundamental tenets of the Church. He was simply making explicit what had been present in germ in the Christian attitude to Jesus from the first. Even pre-existence was less an arbitrary importation than an inference from acknowledged fact.⁴

And not only is there no evidence that the Jewish Church opposed Paul's Christology, but there seem to be indications that Paul really believed that both Gentile and Jewish Christianity stood together at this point. The incorporation into his teaching of some of the Christological confessions of the early church⁵ and his representation of Peter as agreeing with him that "a man is not justified ἐξ ἔργων νόμου

¹C. G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, p. 135.

²S. G. F. Brandon, "The Crisis of 70 A.D.," H.J., Vol. XLVI (Oct. 1947-July 1948), p. 225, and The Fall of Jerusalem and The Christian Church, pp. 4, 54-87.

³J. S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, p. 294. Cf. J. G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, pp. 129-136.

⁴J. S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, p. 296.

⁵See C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments, pp. 19-29; O. Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions, pp. 22-23 and passim.

but διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,"¹ are significant items in the apostle's testimonial to the basic orthodoxy of Jewish Christendom's Christology.

Ecclesiology. -- But besides being conscious that their distinctiveness lay in their acknowledgement of and relationship to Christ, the Jerusalem Christians were aware of their own special existence as the ecclesia of God. It is important to recognise that whereas the majority of Jews in those early years probably regarded Jewish Christianity as only a sect of Judaism, the church at Jerusalem considered itself the true Israel. These Christians were not a party or school of thought within Israel, they were Israel; or probably more true to their thought, they were the faithful remnant within the nation who alone had accepted the working of God in Jesus Christ and thus who alone could truly be called the ecclesia of God.² They were a minority, it is true. But they could look back on every movement of God in the nation --- the prophetic revivals, the pneumatic psalmody, the Hasidic resistance --- and note that at the heart of matters stood a small minority which was well aware of its own numerical insignificance. "Just as Israel had always been a small band living among the great peoples of the

¹Gal. 2.16.

²For an excellent discussion of the Jerusalem Church's consciousness of itself as the true Israel, the Ecclesia of God, see E. F. Scott, The Beginnings of the Church, pp. 35-42. J. Jeremias points out that "the idea of the Remnant is of central significance for late Judaism. Here beats the heart of piety at the time of Jesus" ("The Qumran Texts and the New Testament," E.T., Vol. LXX, No. 3, Dec. 1958, p. 69).

earth, but not ashamed of its smallness, so within the small band there was at many times a smaller band,"¹ But, "on each occasion the minority in question held itself to be the true representative of Israel's heritage and mission, and sought to appeal to the conscience of other Jews, to awaken them, and to bring them into line."²

This consciousness of their own nature as the true Israel, the faithful remnant within the nation, lies as the implicit presupposition behind many of the Jerusalem Christians' actions. Hence must at least partially be understood the urgent need to replenish the number of special apostles to that number corresponding to the number of tribes in Israel,³ the importance of making Jerusalem their headquarters, and the need to obey God rather than men in standing as the prophetic remnant in calling back the rebellious sons of Israel. Here, though without the separatist and ascetic bent of mind which drove the covenantors of Qumran away from that which they highly esteemed, is a parallel between the Jerusalem Church and the Essenes; for the Jerusalem Christians and the Essenes both claimed, as R. H. Charles said of those in CDC, "to be the true Israel: hence the Temple was their Sanctuary, Jerusalem their holy city, and the cities of Israel the sphere of their missionary effort."⁴

¹A. D. Nock, St. Paul, p. 52. ²Ibid., p. 52.

³Acts 1.15-26.

⁴R. H. Charles, Ap. and Ps., Vol. II, p. 793.

The Law. -- When we turn to consider the thought of the Jewish Church regarding the Law, we find our records strangely silent. Even in Acts 15, where there is the record of a council which met regarding the question of Gentile Christianity and the Law, there is no suggestion that the correlary subject of Jewish Christianity and the Law was ever brought up --- it being of course assumed that the latter would go on keeping it. But nowhere is there an attempt to express the rationale behind such an observance. Perhaps this very omission is an indication that the Jerusalem Christians, knowing the temperament of their brethren and remembering the persecution of the Hellenistic Christians, were reticent to consider the subject. But it would be unfair to assert from the silence that the Jewish Christians never attempted to correlate their Christian theology with their Jewish practice. Probably the more enlightened members of the church, believing the Law to be a yoke which the Jews had never borne successfully and salvation for the Jew as well as the Gentile to be found only in Christ,¹ justified their continued adherence to the Law in one or more of the following ways:

1.) On a religious basis: As members of the new and true Israel, which is to pre-Christian Judaism as the flower to the stalk, they were duty bound to keep their ties with old Israel. They could also argue that since 'Israel', 'religion' and 'life' as a whole possessed

¹See Acts 15.10-11, Gal. 2.15-16. Cf. B. H. Branscomb, Jesus and the Law of Moses, pp. 104-106, regarding the non-obligatory character of the Law for righteousness for even the Jewish Christians, and E. F. Scott, The Beginnings of the Church, pp. 120-121, regarding Paul's belief that the catholic spirit was the spirit of the whole Jerusalem Church.

a new significance to the believer in Christ, so the practices of Judaism could be viewed in a new light and used as expressions of the believer's devotion to Christ. While relation with God is not to be gained by such observance, certainly the liberty which is in Christ must allow the Christian to express that relation through old forms which have been given a new significance if he so desires. At least it is evident that from a religious perspective, the Jerusalem Christians still regarded the Law as "an appropriate vessel into which their own devotion could be poured."¹

2.) On a nationalistic basis: As members of the nation they felt duty bound to render allegiance to those unifying practices of national Israel. As J. B. Lightfoot argued, to the Jewish Christian the Law "was a national institution, as well as a divine covenant. Under the Gospel he might consider his relations to it in this latter character altered, but as embodying the decrees and usages of his country it still demanded his allegiance. To be a good Christian he was not required to be a bad citizen."²

3.) On a practical basis: As members of the remnant of Israel commissioned to call the rebellious sons of Israel to repentance, they were duty bound to continue their practice of the Law if they were to remain in the land and gain a hearing for their central message. If they really believed that in view of the Person and work of Christ the Law had taken its place as a purely secondary

¹J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. I, p. 54.

²J. B. Lightfoot, Epistle to the Galatians, p. 312.

matter, then they could reasonably insist that the performance or non-performance of that secondary matter should not be made to interfere with the vital element of the Christian message.

We are not attempting to manufacture reasons to justify their action. The above proposals are only attempts to penetrate the silence and understand the action and thought of the Jewish Christians from their perspective. Undoubtedly other reasons were advocated, but, judging from what we know of Jewish Christianity from the New Testament records, these at least seem to be the most likely arguments advanced within the Christian circles of Jerusalem.

Eschatology. -- It has been noted that the central significance of history for Jewish Christianity was no longer the anticipated Messiah, but the revealed Messiah. Their faith did not stem from an expectation of, but from an encounter with, the Messiah of Israel's hopes. But, while their spiritual focus had shifted in their conversion, their hopes for the kingly coming of their Christ was in no way lessened. While they based their faith on the past work and present fellowship of Jesus Christ, they still looked to the future for the second coming of their Lord.

This expectation also stands implicitly behind many of the actions of these early Christians. Their continuance in the Temple, for instance, was not the result of a growing legalism within the church. Nor did it only stem from their eccesiology, their mission or the example of their Lord in His earthly ministry. All of these are factors. But it seems that their great hopes of an early return of their Lord, who "shall suddenly come to his temple,"¹ must also

¹Mal. 3.1.

be considered as a factor in explaining why they "continued steadfast with one accord in the temple."¹ Probably, "like Simeon in the Gospel story, they resorted every day to the temple, believing, like him, that they would there witness the coming of the Lord's Christ."² Similarly, their willingness to have "all things in common"³ was probably motivated in part by their expectation that the end was near. And it must be noted also that this hope for an early consummation of history in the coming of the Christ in power and majesty probably was one great reason why the Jewish Christians felt no great compulsion to attempt a definition of their relation to the Mosaic law. When their Lord comes, He would settle this difficult question. Until then, they would continue emphasising the matters of prime importance and also continue on as they had in that secondary matter of the expression of their faith.

Its Mission

It appears almost self-evident that the Jerusalem Church considered its own peculiar mission to be to the house of Israel.⁴

¹Acts 2.46.

²E. F. Scott, The Beginnings of the Church, p. 22. Cf. also B. H. Branscomb, Jesus and the Law of Moses, p. 271; H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 77.

³Acts 4.32.

⁴Cf., e.g., F. J. A. Hort, Judaistic Christianity, pp. 41-42; B. H. Streeter, The Primitive Church, p. 35; A. Schlatter, The Church in the New Testament Period, p. 14.

The promise to the disciples that they would "sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel"¹ is enigmatic, for it leaves unresolved the questions concerning what is meant by 'judging' and how the judgment of the disciples ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ relates to the judgment of Christ. But at least such a statement indicates a special and indissoluble association of the disciples with national Israel. Jewish Christendom knew that its Lord had confined His earthly ministry to the nation,² as He declared in the words "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel"³ and as even the apostle to the Gentiles confessed in calling Jesus διάκονος τῆς περιτομῆς .⁴ And the disciples previously had been explicitly directed to confine their ministry to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel,"⁵ while the last words of the pre-ascended Christ still put the premium on the Church's witnessing first of all

¹Matt. 19.28, Lk. 22.30.

²Only three cases of extra-Jewish relations are recorded of Jesus in the Synoptics: the Centurion, the Syro-Phoenician woman and probably the Gadarene demoniac. The Fourth Gospel can add only the incident of the Greek worshippers (proselytes?) who sought Jesus and the friendly contact with the Samaritans. While His teaching (e.g., Matt. 8.11-12, Lk. 13.28-29; Matt. 25.31-46; Jn. 10.16; Jn. 12.32) and certainly His work foreshadowed a universal extension of the Gospel, His actual extra-Jewish contacts appear sporadic and almost accidental. C. H. Dodd has interestingly remarked: "His concentration upon Israel is the more marked because, according to a well-attested saying, He divined that He would have found a more ready response in Tyre and Sidon" (History and the Gospel, p. 131). Cf. J. Jeremias, "The Gentile World in the Thought of Jesus," Studiorum Novi Testament Societas, Bull. III, pp. 18-28, and B. H. Branscomb, Jesus and the Law of Moses, pp. 93-94, regarding Jesus and the Gentiles.

³Matt. 15.24. ⁴Rom. 15.8. ⁵Matt. 10.6.

"in Jerusalem and in all Judaea."¹ Thus theologically, as well as nationally, their interests were directed almost exclusively to their own people.

This is not to deny their recognition of the appropriateness of a Gentile mission --- nor even of the existence of a non-Mosaic Gentile Church.² If the Acts record can be trusted at all, the preaching of the Jerusalem Church in the early years contained the universalistic note struck by Peter: "The promise is to you and your children and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto Him."³ Likewise, the Jerusalem Church appears to have given its official approval to the conversion of Cornelius,⁴ the proclamation of the Gospel in Samaria,⁵ the existence of the church at Antioch⁶ and the message of Paul.⁷ But we must recognise that in spite of this, the Jerusalem Christians felt it to be their special commission to bring the grace of God which is in Christ Jesus to men and women of their own nation and thus lead Israel back to God by gathering her around her Messiah. The fact that they were the true Israel, the faithful remnant, meant that they possessed a primary responsibility for their brethren *κατὰ σάρκα* . "Come out

¹Acts 1.8.

²Cf. F. J. A. Hort, Judaistic Christianity, pp. 41-42; A. Schlatter, The Church of the New Testament Period, p. 20.

³Acts 2.39. ⁴Acts 11.18. ⁵Acts 8.14ff.

⁶Acts 11.22ff. ⁷Gal. 2.9.

from among them and be separate"¹ was not a maxim of the Christian mission in Jerusalem. Even Peter's "save yourselves from this perverse generation"² was not meant in the sense of withdrawal, but of repentance. While the Jerusalem Church realised its own distinctiveness and the fact that the Gospel was meant to have a broad application, it also felt its responsibility to be to its own nation.

Its Relations Within the Nation

We cannot leave the subject of Christianity in Jerusalem without some word concerning how Jewish Christianity fared within the nation. While it is true that many details of its history are very uncertain, yet the broad outline seems fairly clear.

In its earliest days. -- As has been noted, both Am-haarez and strict Jewish Christianity continued in the national rites and customs in much the same manner as they had done before their conversion, while the Hellenists allowed their new faith to change their practice in relation to the Law. It was this fidelity to the Law on the part of the native Palestinian Christians which kept Christianity from being "strangled in the cradle,"³ for, while "at a later time their fidelity to the Law was to prove the chief hindrance to the progress of Christianity, . . . it is only fair

¹II Cor. 6.17. Cf. Isa. 52.11, Jer. 51.45, Heb. 13.13, Rev. 18.4.

²Acts 2.40.

³E. F. Scott, The First Age of Christianity, p. 118.

to remember that in the first days it served a great purpose."¹ That same tolerance of thought which allowed Jesus to teach in the open air, in the synagogues² and in the courts of the Temple³ seems also to have been directed towards His followers in those early days of the Church's existence. Judaism had trained its adherents to demand orthodoxy of practice, but not necessarily orthodoxy of theology.⁴ Thus, as long as Jesus' followers continued in the national practices, it seems that the populace willingly tolerated --- and even listened to --- the new theology of the Jewish believers. Official Judaism cannot be viewed as so willingly condoning the views of the Christians as were the people; but the officialdom of the nation was unable to present a strong opposition to this new theology, being torn within by party strife, subject to the higher governing power of Rome and restrained by the voice of the people. The Pharisees must have been always in opposition to the Messianic claims of the Church and must have been at least a bit suspicious of the new movement's keeping of the Law. But

¹Ibid., pp. 117-118. Cf. also Scott, The Beginnings of the Church, pp. 116-119.

²Cf. I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, pp. 12-13.

³The Synoptics are agreed that He taught "daily" in the Temple when He was in Jerusalem (Matt. 26.55, Mk. 14.49, Lk. 22.53; Lk. 19.47), and there are frequent references to His teaching given there (e.g., Mk. 12.35; Lk. 20.1, 21.37; Jn. 7.14, 7.28, 8.20).

⁴K. Lake, viewing this situation from the Jewish perspective, says: "Judaism was more of a life, and less of a creed, than Christianity has ever been. Provided a Jew worshipped the true God and lived according to the Law, he could believe or teach any nonsense he liked. Sensible men might exclude him from their society, but he was not outside the Synagogue of Israel" (Paul: His Heritage and Legacy, pp. 35-36).

they were steeped in a tradition of moderation¹ and unwilling to join their hated Sadducian rivals in a suppression of a 'misguided' but law-abiding group of people who were in many ways closer to Pharisaism than to the position of the Sadducees. The Sadducees would probably have welcomed the opportunity to persecute the followers of Christ; but, though they had within their ranks the titular rulers of the people, they could not fully express their desires because of the toleration of the people, the moderation of the Pharisees and the desire of the Roman government over them for peace in the land. Thus, because of both the early church's toleration of the Law and the nation's toleration of all its law-abiding citizens, the early believers in Jerusalem seem to have been left relatively free to pursue their own course.² Undoubtedly economic and social pressures were constantly brought to bear upon them from different sources, but official and national enmity seem to have broken out in these earliest days only sporadically and under certain conditions.

The rising persecution. -- While the Christology of the early church at Jerusalem was the real issue which distinguished it from Judaism, it was the attack of the Hellenistic Christians upon externalism and scrupulous law-observance which publicised the fact of that separateness. In the Hellenists' renunciation of strict

¹See supra. p. 42, n. 2.

²Cf. W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 1-3.

law-abiding, the Pharisees came to realise that the worst of their fears were well-founded and the two groups of Pharisees and Sadducees were brought together in a united effort to stamp out this Diaspora-like liberalism and to punish those offenders who had attempted to pollute the Holy City under the guise of religion. Thus the Jerusalem Church suffered its first official persecution in the death of Stephen and the Inquisition which followed. That persecution seems to have been directed primarily against the Hellenists themselves, though probably also the native Christians felt its effect because of their countenancing of the Hellenistic heresy. The Jewish leaders evidently took advantage of a momentary abeyance of Imperial authority in Jerusalem, and possibly in Judaea as well, in order to carry out their plans.¹ But with the returning control of Rome, the continuing law observance of the native Christians and the loss of the leader of the Sanhedrin's forces to the very cause he was persecuting,² official Jewish antagonism to the Jerusalem Church was held in check. On the wave of this anti-Christian feeling, Herod sought to gain favour with the Jewish officialdom under him by instigating his own persecution against the Christians.³ And he did succeed in killing James the brother of John. But the Roman desire for peace prevailed. The

¹Cf. ibid., pp. 41-43 and 52, n. 14. See Eusebius, E.H., II. 23.2.

²W. L. Knox says that since Paul figured so prominently in this persecution, "it may be conjectured that his withdrawal would in any case have led to its abandonment" (ibid., p. 60, n. 50).

³Acts 12.1ff.

Jewish Church had learned a bitter lesson regarding how it must conduct itself if it was to continue in its appointed mission, and from this time, by the use of wise caution and because of the Imperial desire for peace and order, it managed to avert an open break with the nation for almost a quarter of a century.

But in the rising tide of Jewish nationalism, the moderation of the Pharisees held less of a sway in the nation and the toleration of the people was growing thin. Sadducees and Zealots were more and more speaking for the people, while the church at Jerusalem was undoubtedly coming more and more into disfavour for its countenancing the law-free gospel of Paul. In the year 62 A.D., during the interim between one Roman governor and the arrival of his successor, the High Priest Annas took the opportunity to rid himself of the leader of the Christian community, James.¹ It is significant that the Pharisees so objected to this act as to cause Annas to be deposed by the Roman government. But the tide of nationalism was moving decidedly against the welfare of the Jewish Christians. Whether they left Jerusalem to take up residence in the transjordanian town of Pella primarily because of the death of James, the rising tide of antagonism against them or the approach of the Roman armies, or because of all these factors, and exactly when they left, are questions that are strongly debated. Certainly they would not have

¹Cf. H. Danby, The Jew and Christianity, p. 15.

left Jerusalem until they felt it to be absolutely necessary, but just when that point was reached is not clear.¹ At least by 68 A.D. they found that this dual loyalty to both Jesus and their nation was brought to the point of an either/or decision by both the leaders and the populace of the nation, and they were forced to leave their nation and stand aside in its conflict with Rome. This was the decisive step which split their endeavour to be both earnest Christians and practising Jews.² And in the fall of the city and the sanctuary, that decision to leave the nation was decisively sealed. As Harnack has said:

No Christian, even supposing he were a simple Jewish Christian, could view the catastrophe which befell the Jewish state, with its capital and sanctuary, as anything else than the just punishment of the nation for having crucified the Messiah. Strictly speaking, he ceased from that moment to be a Jew; for a Jew who accepted the downfall of his state and temple as a divine dispensation, thereby committed national suicide.³

Undoubtedly the fall of Jerusalem broke the last link for many Jewish Christians with their nation and shoved them into the stream of catholic Christianity. And yet, almost illogically it seems, human feelings linked to a powerful tradition caused some at least to attempt a reconciliation with their nation. Theirs was not an easy situation. After the revival of Judaism at Jamnia, the

¹Cf. J. Jocz, The Jewish People and Jesus Christ, pp. 165-166, for a review of opinions ranging from immediately after the death of James in 62 A.D. (Jocz's) to 68 A.D. (Harnack's).

²H. Danby says that in this step "Christianity thereby became a faith for the Gentiles" (The Jew and Christianity, p. 19).

³A. Harnack, The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, Vol. I, p. 63.

Christians were denounced as 'minim' --- heretics.¹ And now they were hated not only for their theological heresies, but also for their disloyalty to the nation. In a desire to institute religious unity amidst national chaos, Gamaliel II, about 80 A.D., revised the 18 Benedictions so that the 'minim' would automatically exclude themselves from the fellowship of the synagogues rather than be forced to confess that which would mean a denunciation of Christ.² And in the Jewish revolt of 132-135 A.D., the remnants of Jewish Christianity were again confronted with 'the acid test' concerning their loyalty: either the nation, which this time included the Messianic claims of Simon ben Kosebah,³ or Christ. And this time, for those who chose Christ there was no possibility of a return to the nation. Jewish Christianity, except as its tenets continued on

¹For treatments of the "minim" in Talmudic literature advocating that they were Jewish Christians, see: R. T. Herford, Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, pp. 155-156, 365-381; J. Jocz, The Jewish People and Jesus Christ, pp. 45-57, 174-190; D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 142, 444.

²b. Ber. 28b; b. Meg. 17b. See R. T. Herford, Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, pp. 127-135, for a discussion regarding the date of the 18 Benedictions.

³In the Wadi Murabbaat texts, this appears as the Hebrew form of the name which his Aramaic speaking friends seemed to have changed to Bar Kokhba (Cocheba), 'Son of the Star', and his enemies to Bar Kozebah, 'Son of the Lie'; see M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 58, and A. Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes, p. 10. According to Justin Martyr, ben Kosebah took vengeance on the Christians when they refused to deny Jesus as their Messiah: "For in the Jewish war which lately raged, Barchochebas, the leader of the revolt of the Jews, gave orders that Christians alone should be led to cruel punishments, unless they would deny Jesus Christ and utter blasphemy" (First Apology, XXXI; trans. M. Dods, et. al., Ante-Nicene Christian Library).

in the Nazarene sect and as some of its doctrines found expression in the Ebionite sect and seem to have influenced the formation of Islam, received its death-blow in the 70 A.D. destruction of Jerusalem and its burial in the Messianic claims of ben Kosebah. Hereafter a Gentile bishop presided in Jerusalem.¹

¹Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, IV. 6. 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, The. 2 vols. Translated with introductions and notes under the editorship of R.H. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Babylonian Talmud, The. 35 vols. Translated with notes under the editorship of I. Epstein. London: Soncino Press, 1936-1952.
- Biblia Hebraica. Edited by R. Kittel. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1951.
- Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, The. Translated with notes by W.H. Brownlee. B.A.S.O.R. -- S.S. Nos. 10 - 12. New Haven, Conn.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951.
- Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, The. 2 vols. Edited by M. Burrows, J. Trever, W.H. Brownlee. New Haven, Conn.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950-1951.
- Epictetus. 2 vols. Translated by W.A. Oldfather. (The Loeb Classical Library) London: W. Heinemann, 1926-1928.
- Midrash, The. 10 vols. Translated with notes under the editorship of H. Freedman and M. Simon. London: Soncino Press, 1939.
- Mishnah, The. Translated with notes by H. Danby. Oxford: Clarendon, 1933.
- Novum Testamentum Graece. Edited by D.E. Nestle. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1950.
- Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint, The. 3 vols. Edited by H.B. Swete. Cambridge: The University Press, 1887.
- Philo. 9 vols. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. (The Loeb Classical Library) London: W. Heinemann, 1929-1940.
- Philonis Alexandrini Opera. 7 vols. Edited by L. Cohn and P. Wendland, with Index vol. by I. Leisegang. Berlin: G. Reimeri, 1896-1926.
- Pirke Aboth. Edited with introduction, translation and commentary, by R.T. Herford. New York: The Jewish Institute, 1925.
- Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer. Translated by G. Friedlander. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1916.
- Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect, The. Translated with notes by T.H. Gaster. London: Secker & Warburg, 1957.

- Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch, The. 2 vols. Translated by J.W. Etheridge. London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862.
- Tosefta, Die. Edited and translated by W. Windfuhr. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933 - .
- Works of Flavius Josephus, The. 4 vols. Translated by W. Whiston. London: T. Tegg, 1825.
- Zadokite Documents, The. Edited with translation and notes by C. Rabin. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.
- Note: Incidental references to classical writers are usually to be found in The Loeb Classical Library, while references to the Church Fathers are found in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library.

Secondary Sources

- Abrahams, I. Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels. Cambridge: The University Press, 1917.
- Achelis, H. Das Christentum in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. Vol. I. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1912.
- Anderson, S. "Freedom in Christ According to Paul the Apostle." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1955.
- Baab, O. J. The Theology of the Old Testament. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1949.
- Bacher, W. "Gamaliel I." J.E., Vol. V, pp. 558-559.
- _____. "Hillel," J.E., Vol. VI, pp. 397-400.
- Bainton, R.H. "The Development and Consistency of Luther's Attitude to Religious Liberty," H.T.R., Vol. XXII, No. 2 (April, 1929), pp. 107-149.
- Barbour, R. A. S. "Loyalty and Law in New Testament Times," S.J.T., Vol. XI, No. 4 (Dec., 1958), pp. 337-351.
- Barclay, W. The Mind of St. Paul. London: Collins, 1958.
- Barrett, C. K. The Epistle to the Romans. London: A. & G. Black, 1957.
- _____. "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles," Studia Paulina (In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan). Haarlem: Bohn, 1953.
- Barth, K. Christ and Adam. Translated by T.A. Smail. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1956.
- _____. The Epistle to the Romans. Translated by E.C. Hoskyne, London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

- Bauernfeind, O. "Die Begegnung zwischen Paulus und Kephas Gal. 1.18-20," Z.N.W., Vol. XLVII (1956), pp. 268-276.
- Baumgarten, J.M. "Sacrifice and Worship Among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls," H.T.R., Vol. XLVI, No. 3 (July, 1953), pp. 141-159.
- Baur, F. C. Paul, His Life and Works. 2 vols. Vol. I translated by E. Zeller, Vol. II translated by A. Menzies. London: Williams and Norgate, 1875.
- Berlin, I. Two Concepts of Liberty. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Best, E. One Body in Christ. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.
- Bevan, E. Hellenism and Christianity. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1921.
- Biber, C. "Freedom," Vocabulary of the Bible. Edited by J.J. von Allmen and translated by Allcock, et al. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.
- Black, M. "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," S.J.T., Vol. VII, No. 2 (June, 1954), pp. 170-179.
- Blackman, E.C. "The Hellenists of Acts vi. 1," E.T., Vol. XLVIII, No. 11 (Aug., 1937), pp. 524-525.
- Bläser, P. P. Das Gesetz bei Paulus. Münster: Aschendorff, 1941.
- Bloch, J. On the Apocalyptic in Judaism. Philadelphia: The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1952.
- Bornkamm, G. Das Ende des Gesetzes. München: C. Kaiser, 1952.
- _____. Gesetz und Schöpfung in Neuen Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1934.
- _____. Jesus von Nazareth. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1956.
- Bousset, W. Kyrios Christos. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921.
- _____. Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (2nd. ed.). Berlin: Reuther und Reichard, 1906.
- Bowman, J. "The Pharisees," E.Q., Vol. XX, No. 2 (April, 1948), pp. 125-146.
- Bowman, J. W. The Gospel from the Mount. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957.
- _____. The Intention of Jesus. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1943.
- Brandon, S. G. F. "The Crisis of 70 A.D.," H.J., Vol. XLVI (Oct. 1947 - July 1948), pp. 221-228.
- _____. The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church. London: S.P.C.K., 1951.

Branscomb, B.H. Jesus and the Law of Moses. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.

Bratsiotis, P. I. "Paulus und die Einheit der Kirche," Studia Paulina (In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan). Haarlem: Bohn, 1953.

Brownlee, W. H. "Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," B.A., Vol. XIV, No. 3 (Sept., 1951), pp. 54-76.

_____. "A Comparison of the Covenanters of the Dead Sea Scrolls with Pre-Christian Jewish Sects," B.A., Vol. XIII, No. 3 (Sept., 1950), pp. 50-72.

_____. "Emendations of the Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and Some Notes Concerning Habakkuk Midrash," J.Q.R., Vol. XLV, No. 3 (Jan., 1955), pp. 198-218.

_____. "John and the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by K. Stendahl. London: S.C.M. Press, 1958.

Bruce, F. F. The Acts of the Apostles. London: Tyndale Press, 1951.

_____. The Speeches in the Acts. London: Tyndale Press, 1942.

Brunner, E. "Der Apostel Paulus," Paulus-Hellas-Oikumene. Athens: The Student Christian Association of Greece, 1951.

_____. The Divine Imperative. Translated by O. Wyon. London: Lutterworth Press, 1937.

_____. Man in Revolt. Translated by O. Wyon. London: Lutterworth Press, 1939.

Broydé, I. "The 613 Commandments," J.E., Vol. IV. pp. 181-186.

Büchsel, F. "'In Christus' bei Paulus," Z.N.W., Vol. XLII (1949), pp. 141-158.

Bultmann, R. "Christ the End of the Law," Essays: Philosophical and Theological. Translated by J. C. G. Greig. London: S. C. M. Press, 1955.

_____. "Grace and Freedom," Essays: Philosophical and Theological. Translated by J. C. G. Greig. London: S. C. M. Press, 1955.

_____. Jesus and the Word. Translated by L. P. Smith and E. Huntress. London: I. Nicholson & Watson, 1935.

_____. "Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus," Z.N.W., Vol. XXIII, Heft 1/2 (1924), pp. 123-140.

_____. "Römer 7 und die Anthropologie des Paulus," Imago Dei (Festschrift für Gustav Krüger). Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1932.

_____. Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.

- _____. Theology of the New Testament. Vol. I. Translated by K. Grobel. London: S. C. M. Press, 1952.
- Burkitt, F. C. Christian Beginnings. London: University of London, 1924.
- _____. "What Christians Think of Jews," H.J., Vol. XXVIII, No. 2 (Jan. 1930), pp. 261-272.
- Burrows, M. The Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: Viking Press, 1956.
- _____. More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Secker & Warburg, 1958.
- Burton, E. D. The Epistle to the Galatians (I.C.C.). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921.
- Buttenwieser, M. "Messiah," J.E., Vol. VIII, pp. 505-512.
- Cadbury, H.J. The Book of Acts in History. London: A. and C. Black, 1955.
- Callaway, J.S. "Paul's Letter to the Galatians and Plato's 'Lysis'," J.B.L., Vol. LXVII, Pt. IV (Dec., 1948), pp. 353-355.
- Calvin, J. Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Translated by F. Sibson. London: L. B. Seeley and Sons, 1834.
- Carrington, P. The Early Christian Church. Vol. I. Cambridge: The University Press, 1957.
- Cary-Elwes, C. Law, Liberty and Love. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1949.
- Chadwick, H. "All Things to All Men," N.T.S., Vol. I (1954-1955), pp. 261-275.
- Chajes, Z.H. The Student's Guide Through the Talmud. Translated by J. Shachter. London: East and West Library, 1952.
- Child, R. L. "St. Paul's Doctrine of Grace and Freedom," Studies in History and Religion. Edited by E. A. Payne. London: Lutterworth Press, 1942.
- Cohen, A. Everyman's Talmud. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1932.
- Cross, F. M., Jr. The Ancient Library of Qumran. London: Duckworth, 1958.
- Cullmann, O. "Authorities," Vocabulary of the Bible. Edited by J. J. von Allmen, translated by Allcock, et al. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.
- _____. Baptism in the New Testament. Translated by J. K. S. Reid, London: S. C. M. Press, 1950.

- _____. Christ and Time. Translated by F. V. Filson. London: S. C. M. Press, 1951.
- _____. The Earliest Christian Confessions. Translated by J. K. S. Reid. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.
- _____. "'KYRIOS' as Designation for the Oral Tradition concerning Jesus," S.J.T., Vol. III, No. 2 (June, 1950), pp. 180-197.
- _____. "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by K. Stendahl. London: S. C. M. Press, 1958.
- _____. The State in the New Testament. London: S.C.M. Press, 1957.
- Daiches, S. Aspects of Judaism. London: G. Routledge & Sons, 1928.
- Danby, H. The Jew and Christianity. London: Sheldon Press, 1927.
- Daube, D. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London: Athlone Press, 1956.
- Davidson, A. B. The Theology of the Old Testament. Edited by S. D. F. Salmond. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904.
- Davies, W.D. "The Jewish Background of the Teaching of Jesus: Apocalyptic and Pharisaism," E.T., Vol. LIX, No. 9 (June, 1948), pp. 233-237.
- _____. "A Note on Josephus, Antiquities 15:136," H.T.R., Vol. XLVIII, No. 3 (July, 1954), pp. 135-140.
- _____. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.
- _____. "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by K. Stendahl. London: S.C.M. Press, 1958.
- _____. Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952.
- Deissmann, A. Bible Studies. Translated by A. Grieve. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901.
- _____. "Elements," Encyclopaedia Biblica. Edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black. London: A. and C. Black, 1901.
- _____. Light from the Ancient East. Translated by L. R. M. Strachen. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910.
- _____. Die neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu'. Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1892.

- _____ . Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History. Translated by W. E. Wilson, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926.
- _____ . The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul. Translated by W. E. Wilson, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923.
- Denney, J. The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1917.
- _____ . The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. London: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.
- Dibelius, M. Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1909.
- _____ . Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. Translated by M. Ling. London: S.C.M. Press, 1956.
- Dibelius, M. and Kümmel, W. G. Paul. Translated by F. Clarke. New York: Longmans, Green, 1953.
- Dodd, C. H. The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936.
- _____ . The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- _____ . " ENNOMOS XPISTOY ," Studia Paulina (In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan). Haarlem: Bohn, 1953.
- _____ . The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (M.N.T.C.). London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1933.
- _____ . Gospel and Law. Cambridge: The University Press, 1951.
- _____ . History and the Gospel. London: Nisbet, 1938.
- _____ . "Jesus as Teacher and Prophet," Mysterium Christi. Edited by G. K. A. Bell and A. Deissmann. New York: Longmans, Green, 1930.
- _____ . The Meaning of Paul for Today. London: Fontana, 1958.
- _____ . The Mind of Paul: A Psychological Approach. Manchester: The Manchester University Press and the Librarian, The John Rylands Library, 1934.
- _____ . New Testament Studies. Manchester: The University Press, 1953.
- _____ . "The Primitive Catechism and the Sayings of Jesus," New Testament Essays. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959.
- _____ . The Mind of Paul: Change and Development. Manchester: The Manchester University Press and the Librarian, The John Rylands Library, 1934.

- Drummond, J. Philo Judaeus. 2 vols. London: Williams & Norgate, 1888.
- Duncan, G.S. The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians (M.N.T.C.). London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. The Dead Sea Scrolls. Translated by E. M. Rowley. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952.
- _____. The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes. Translated by R. D. Barnett. London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1954.
- Easton, B.S. Christ in the Gospels. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1930.
- Elliott-Binns, L. E. Galilean Christianity. London: S. C. M. Press, 1956.
- Ellis, E. E. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- Enslin, M. S. The Ethics of Paul. New York: Harper & Bros., 1930.
- Filson, F. V. St. Paul's Conception of Recompense. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1931.
- Findlay, G. G. The Epistle to the Galatians. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1891.
- Finkelstein, L. The Pharisees, The Sociological Background of Their Faith. 2 vols. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1946.
- _____. "The Book of Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halaka," H.T.R., Vol. XVI, No. 1 (Jan., 1923), pp. 39-61.
- _____. "The Pharisees: Their Origin and Their Philosophy," H.T.R., Vol. XXII, No. 3 (July, 1929), pp. 185-261.
- _____. "The Oldest Midrash: Pre-Rabbinic Ideals and Teachings in the Passover Haggadah," H.T.R., Vol. XXXI, No. 4 (Oct., 1938), pp. 291-317.
- Foakes-Jackson, F. J. The Acts of the Apostles (M.N.T.C.). London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1931.
- _____. The Life of Saint Paul. London: J. Cape, n.d.
- Foakes-Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K. (ed.). The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I. 5 vols. London: Macmillan, 1920-1933.
- Friedländer, M. The Jewish Religion. London: Shapiro, Vallentine, 1922.

- Fulton, A. A. "Schweitzer on the Mysticism of Paul: A Criticism," E.Q., Vol. XX, No.3 (July, 1948), pp. 172-183.
- Gardner, P. The Religious Experience of Saint Paul. London: Williams & Norgate, 1913.
- Gaugler, E. Der Römerbrief. Vol. I. Zürich: Zwingli, 1945.
- Geyser, A. S. "Paul, The Apostolic Decree and the Liberals in Corinth," Studia Paulina (In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan). Haarlem: Bohn, 1953.
- Gifford, E. H. The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. London: J. Murray, 1886.
- Ginzberg, L. "Akiba ben Joseph," J.E., Vol. I, pp. 304-310.
- _____. "Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings," J.B.L., Vol. XLI, Pts. I and II (1922), pp. 115-136.
- Glatzer, N.N. "Hillel the Elder in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by K. Stendahl. London: S.C.M. Press, 1958.
- Glover, T. R. Paul of Tarsus. London: S.C.M. Press, 1925.
- Goodenough, E. R. By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935.
- Goodspeed, E. J. "Ephesians and the First Edition of Paul," J.B.L., Vol. LXX, Pt. IV (Dec., 1951), pp. 285-291.
- _____. The Key to Ephesians. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956.
- Gore, C. St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Vol. I. London: J. Murray, 1900.
- Grafe, E. Die Paulinische Lehre vom Gesetz. Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1893.
- Grässer, E. "Freiheit und apostolisches Wirken bei Paulus," Evangelische Theologie, Vol. XV, No. 7 (July, 1955), pp. 333-342.
- Grundmann, W. "Gesetz, Rechtfertigung und Mystik bei Paulus," Z.N.W., Vol. XXXII, Heft 1 (1933), pp. 52-65.
- Gutbrod, W. " νόμος " Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Edited by G. Kittel. Vol. IV. pp. 1016-1084. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935.
- Harnack, A. The Acts of the Apostles. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. London: Williams & Norgate, 1909.

- _____ . The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. London: Williams & Norgate, 1911.
- _____ . Luke the Physician. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. London: Williams & Norgate, 1907.
- _____ . The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. Vol. I. Translated by J. Moffatt, London: Williams & Norgate, 1908.
- _____ . What is Christianity? Translated by T. B. Saunders. London: Williams & Norgate, 1901.
- Harris, R. "Did St. Paul quote Euripides?" E.T., Vol. XXXI, No. 1 (Oct. 1919), pp. 36-37.
- _____ . Testimonies. Cambridge: University Press, 1916.
- Harrison, P.N. The Problem of the Pastorals. Oxford: University Press, 1922.
- Hatch, W. H. P. The Pauline Idea of Faith in its Relation to Jewish and Hellenistic Religion. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917.
- _____ . "The Pauline Idea of Forgiveness," Studies in Early Christianity. Edited by S. J. Case. New York: Century, 1928.
- _____ . "τὰ στοιχεῖα in Paul and Bardaisan," J.T.S., Vol. XXVIII, No. 110 (Jan., 1927), pp. 181-182.
- Headlam, A.C. St. Paul and Christianity. London: J. Murray, 1913.
- Hebert, A. G. "'Faithfulness' and 'Faith'," Theology, Vol. LVIII, No. 424 (Oct., 1955), pp. 373-379.
- _____ . "Hypocrite," A Theological Word Book of the Bible. Edited by A. Richardson. London: S.C.M. Press, 1950.
- Herford, R. T. Christianity in Talmud and Midrash. London: Williams & Norgate, 1903.
- _____ . "The Law and Pharisaism," Judaism and Christianity. Vol. III. Edited by E. I. J. Rosenthal. London: Sheldon Press, 1938.
- _____ . Pharisaism. London: Williams & Norgate, 1912.
- _____ . The Pharisees. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1924.
- _____ . Talmud and Apocrypha. London: Soncino Press, 1933.
- Hirsch, E. "Zwei Fragen zu Galater 6," Z.N.W., Vol. XXIX, Heft 3/4 (1930), pp. 192-197.

- Hirsch, E. G. "God," J.E., Vol. VI, pp. 1-15.
- _____. "Proselyte," J.E., Vol. X, pp. 220-224.
- Honeyman, A. M. "Matthew V. 18 and the Validity of the Law," N.T.S., Vol. I (1954-1955), pp. 141-142.
- Hooke, S. H. "Christianity and the Mystery Religions," Judaism and Christianity. Vol. I. Edited by W. O. E. Oesterley. London: Sheldon Press, 1937.
- Hort, F. J. A. Judaistic Christianity. London: Macmillan, 1894.
- Hunter, A. M. The Epistle to the Romans. London: S.C.M. Press, 1955.
- _____. Interpreting Paul's Gospel. London: S.C.M. Press, 1954.
- _____. Paul and his Predecessors. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1940.
- Inge, W. R. Christian Ethics and Modern Problems. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.
- _____. Christian Mysticism. London: Methuen, 1921.
- Inglis, G. J. "The Problem of St. Paul's Conversion," E.T., Vol. XL, No. 5 (Feb., 1929), pp. 227-231.
- Jeremias, J. "The Gentile World in the Thought of Jesus," Studiorum Novi Testament Societas, Bull. III (1952), pp. 18-28.
- _____. "The Qumran Texts and the New Testament," E.T., Vol. LXX, No. 3 (Dec., 1958), pp. 68-69.
- Jessop, T. E. Law and Love; A Study of the Christian Ethic. London: S.C.M. Press, 1940.
- Jocz, J. The Jewish People and Jesus Christ. London: S.P.C.K., 1949.
- Johnson, S. E. "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by K. Stendahl. London: S.C.M. Press, 1958.
- _____. "Paul and the Manual of Discipline," H.T.R., Vol. XLVIII, No. 3, (July, 1955), pp. 157-165.
- de Jonge, M. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953.
- Kennedy, H. A. A. Philo's Contribution to Religion. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919.

- _____. St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913.
- _____. The Theology of the Epistles. London: Duckworth, 1919.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. "Galatians 1:18 ἸΣΤΟΡΗΑΙ ΚΗΘΑΝ," New Testament Essays. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959.
- Klausner, J. From Jesus to Paul. Translated by W. F. Stinespring. New York: Macmillan, 1943.
- _____. Jesus of Nazareth. Translated by H. Danby. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1925.
- _____. The Messianic Idea in Israel. Translated by W. F. Stinespring. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1956.
- Knox, J. Chapters in a Life of Paul. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1950.
- Knox, W. L. "Abraham and the Quest for God," H.T.R., Vol. XXVIII, No. 1 (Jan., 1935), pp. 55-60.
- _____. St. Paul. Edinburgh: P. Davies, 1932.
- _____. St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem. Cambridge: The University Press, 1925.
- _____. St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles. Cambridge: The University Press, 1939.
- _____. Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity. London: Oxford University Press, 1944.
- Kohler, K. "Conversion," J.E., Vol. IV, pp. 249-252.
- _____. "Eschatology," J.E., Vol. V, pp. 209-218.
- _____. "Faith," J.E., Vol. V, p. 326.
- _____. "Judaism," J.E., Vol. VII, pp. 359-368.
- _____. "Nomism," J.E., Vol. IX, pp. 326-330.
- _____. "Saul of Tarsus," J.E., Vol. XI, pp. 79-87.
- Kuhn, K.G. "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament," Z.T.K., Vol. XLVII, Heft 2 (1950), pp. 196-213
- _____. "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by K. Stendahl. London: S.C.M. Press, 1958.

- _____. "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by K. Stendahl. London: S.C.M. Press, 1958.
- _____. "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by K. Stendahl. London: S.C.M. Press, 1958.
- Kümmel, W. G. "Jesus und der jüdische Traditionsgedanke," Z.N.W., Vol. XXXIII, Heft 2/3 (1934), pp. 105-130.
- _____. Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1929.
- Lake, K. The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul. London: Rivingtons, 1911.
- _____. Paul: His Heritage and Legacy. London: Christophers, 1934.
- Lamp, G. W. H. "The Reasonableness of Typology," Essays on Typology. London: S.C.M. Press, 1957.
- Leuba, J. L. "Law: N.T.," Vocabulary of the Bible. Edited by J. J. von Allmen, translated by Allcock, et al. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.
- Liddon, H. P. St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. London: Longmans, Green, 1893.
- Lietzmann, H. The Beginnings of the Christian Church. Translated by B.L. Woolf. London: I. Nicholson and Watson, 1937.
- _____. An die Galater (N.H.T.). Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923.
- _____. An die Korinther I, II (H.N.T.). Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923.
- _____. An die Römer (H.N.T.). Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1906.
- Lightfoot, J. B. Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon. London: Macmillan, 1900.
- _____. Epistle to the Galatians. London: Macmillan, 1890.
- Ljungman, H. Das Gesetz Erfüllen. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1954.
- Loewe, H. "Pharisaism," Judaism and Christianity. Vol. I. Edited by W. O. E. Oesterley. London: Sheldon Press, 1937.
- Lofthouse, W. F. "The Old Testament and Christianity," Record and Revelation. Edited by H. W. Robinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.
- Lohmeyer, E. Grundlagen der Paulinischen Theologie. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1928.

- Loisy, A. The Birth of the Christian Religion. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1948.
- _____. "The Christian Mystery," H.J., Vol. X, (1911-1912), pp. 45-64.
- Lowe, J. "An Examination of Attempts to Detect Developments in St. Paul's Theology," J.T.S., Vol. XLIII (1941), pp. 129-142.
- Lütgert, W. Gesetz und Geist. Güttersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1919.
- Luther, M. St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. Translation based on the Middleton text, prepared by P. S. Watson. London: J. Clarke, 1953.
- _____. "On the Councils and the Churches," Works of Martin Luther, Vol. V. Translated by C. M. Jacobs. Philadelphia: A. J. Holman, 1931.
- _____. "A Treatise on Christian Liberty," Works of Martin Luther, Vol. II. Translated by W. A. Lambert. Philadelphia: A. J. Holman, 1916.
- Machen, J. G. The Origin of Paul's Religion. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1921.
- MacGregor, G. H. C. "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought," N.T.S., Vol. I (1954-1955), pp. 17-28.
- MacGregor, W. M. Christian Freedom. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914.
- Manson, W. Jesus the Messiah. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1943.
- _____. "Notes on the Argument of Romans (Chapters 1-8)," New Testament Essays. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959.
- Manson, T. W. "Jesus, Paul, and the Law," Judaism and Christianity, Vol. III. Edited by E.I.J. Rosenthal. London: Sheldon Press, 1938.
- Marchant, G. J. C. "The Body of Christ," E.Q., Vol. XXX, No. 1 (Jan. - March, 1958), pp. 3-17.
- Marcus, R. Law in the Apocrypha. New York: Columbia University Press, 1927.
- Marmorstein, A. The Doctrine of Merits in the Old Rabbinical Literature. London: Jews' College, 1920.
- _____. "Paulus und die Rabbinen," Z.N.W., Vol. XXX, Heft 3/4 (1931), pp. 271-285.
- Mayor, J. B. The Epistle of St. James. London: Macmillan, 1892.
- Menoud, P. H. "The Western Text and the Theology of Acts," Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, Bull. II (1951), pp. 19-32.

- Metzger, B. M. "Considerations of Methodology in the Study of the Mystery Religions and Early Christianity," H.T.R., Vol. XLVIII, No. 1 (Jan., 1955), pp. 1-20.
- _____. "A Reconsideration of Certain Arguments Against the Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles," E.T., Vol. LXX, No. 3 (Dec., 1958), pp. 91-94.
- Meyer, E. Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums. Vols. I & III. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta, 1925.
- Michaeli, F. "Law: O.T.," Vocabulary of the Bible. Edited by J. J. von Allmen. Translated by Allcock, et al. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.
- Michaelis, W. "Judaistische Heidenchristen," Z.N.W., Vol. XXX, Heft 1 (1931), pp. 83-89.
- _____. "Pastoralbriefe und Wortstatistik," Z.N.W., Vol. XXVIII, Heft 1, (1929), pp. 67-76.
- Michel, O. Paulus und seine Bibel. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1929.
- _____. "Wie spricht Paulus über Frau und Ehe?" Theologische Studien und Kritiken, Vol. CX, Heft 2 (1933), pp. 215-228.
- Milik, J. T. "Le Testament de Lévi en Araméen," R.B., Vol. LXII (1955), pp. 398-406.
- _____. Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea. Translated by J. Strugnell. London: S.C.M. Press, 1959.
- Mitton, C. L. The Epistle to the Ephesians; Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.
- _____. "The Law and the Gospel," E.T., Vol. LXVIII, No. 10 (July, 1957), pp. 312-315.
- _____. "Romans vii Reconsidered," E.T., Vol. LXV. Pt. I: No. 3 (Dec., 1953), pp. 78-81. Pt. II: No. 4 (Jan., 1954), pp. 97-99. Pt. III: No. 5 (Feb., 1954), pp. 132-135.
- Moffatt, J. "Discerning the Body," E.T., Vol. XXX, No. 1 (Oct., 1918), pp. 19-23.
- _____. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (M.N.T.C.). London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938.
- _____. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament (3rd. ed.). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918.
- _____. "Righteousness," H.D.A.C., Vol. II, pp. 370-393.
- Montefiore, C. G. Judaism and St. Paul. London: M. Goschen, 1914.

- _____. "The Old Testament and Judaism," Record and Revelation. Edited by H. W. Robinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.
- _____. Rabbinical Literature and Gospel Teachings. London: Macmillan, 1930.
- _____. The Synoptic Gospels. 3 vols. London: Macmillan, 1909.
- Montefiore, C. G. and Loewe, H. (ed.). A Rabbinic Anthology. London: Macmillan, 1938.
- Moore, G. F. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-1930.
- Morgan, W. The Religion and Theology of Paul. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1917.
- Moule, C. F. D. "Once More, Who Were the Hellenists?" E.T., Vol. LXX, No. 4 (Jan., 1959), pp. 100-102.
- _____. "The Use of Parables and Sayings as Illustrative Material in Early Christian Catechesis," J.T.S., Vol. III, Pt. I (April, 1952), pp. 75-79.
- Mowinckel, S. He that Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism. Translated by G. W. Anderson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956.
- Müller, F. "Zwei Marginalien in Brief des Paulus an die Römer," Z.N.W., Vol. XL (1941), pp. 249-254.
- Müller, M. "Freiheit: Über Autonomie und Gnade von Paulus bis Clemens von Alexandrien," Z.N.W., Vol. XXV, Heft 3/4 (1926), pp. 177-236.
- Munck, J. Christus und Israel. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1956.
- _____. "Israel and the Gentiles in the New Testament," J.T.S., Vol. II, Pt. I (April, 1951), pp. 3-16.
- _____. Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1954.
- Nissiotis, A. "Paul as Interpreter of the Old Testament," Paulus-Hellas-Oilumene. Athens: The Student Christian Association of Greece, 1951.
- Nock, A. D. "Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background," Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation. Edited by A. E. J. Rawlinson. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928.
- _____. St. Paul. London: T. Butterworth, 1938.

- Nösgen, D. K. F. Deissmanns "Paulus" für Theologen und Laien beleuchtet. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1912.
- Nygren, A. Agape and Eros. Translated by P. S. Watson. London: S.P.C.K., 1953.
- _____. Commentary on Romans. Translated by C. C. Rasmussen. London: S.C.M. Press, 1952.
- Oepke, A. " ἐν ," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Vol. II. Edited by G. Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. "The Exegesis of the Old Testament," Record and Revelation. Edited by W. H. Robinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.
- _____. The Jews and Judaism during the Greek Period. London: S.P.C.K., 1941.
- Parkes, J. Jesus, Paul and the Jews. London: S.C.M. Press, 1936.
- _____. Judaism and Christianity. London: V. Gallancz, 1948.
- Peake, A. S. A Critical Introduction to the New Testament. London: Duckworth, 1909.
- _____. "Law," H.D.C.G., Vol. II, pp. 11-15.
- _____. Paul and the Jewish Christians. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1929.
- _____. The Quintessence of Paulinism. Manchester: Published for the John Rylands Library at the University Press, 1918.
- Pfleiderer, O. Paulinism. 2 vols. London: Williams & Norgate, 1877.
- Pherigo, L. P. "Paul's Life After the Close of Acts," J.B.L., Vol. LXX, Pt. IV (Dec., 1951), pp. 277-284.
- van der Ploeg, J. The Excavations at Qumran. Translated by K. Smyth. London: Longmans, Green, 1958.
- Pope, R.M. "The Greek Style of St. Paul," E.T., Vol. XLIX, No. 12 (Sept., 1938), pp. 534-536.
- Preiss, T. Life in Christ. Translated by H. Knight. London: S. C. M. Press, 1954.
- Prentice, W. "St. Paul's Journey to Damascus," Z.N.W., Vol. XLVI, Heft 3/4 (1955), pp. 250-255.
- Rabin, C. Qumran Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957.

- Ramsay, W. M. A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1899.
- _____. St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908.
- _____. "Tarsus," H.D.B., Vol. IV, pp. 685-689.
- Reicke, B. "Der geschichtliche Hintergrund des Apostelkonzils und der Antiochia-Episode," Studia Paulina (In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan). Haarlem: Bohn, 1953.
- _____. "The Law and this World according to Paul," J.B.L., Vol. LXX, Pt. IV (Dec., 1951), pp. 259-276.
- _____. "Traces of Gnosticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls?" N.T.S., Vol. I, (1954-1955), pp. 137-141.
- Reitzenstein, R. Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen (3rd. ed.). Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927.
- Ridderbos, H. N. The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1953.
- Riesenfeld, H. The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings. London: A.R. Mowbray, 1957.
- Robertson, A. and Plummer, A. First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (I.C.C.). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911.
- Robinson, H.W. The Christian Doctrine of Man. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911.
- _____. "Law and Religion in Israel," Judaism and Christianity, Vol. III. Edited by E.I.J. Rosenthal. London: Sheldon Press, 1938.
- _____. "The Theology of the Old Testament: The Characteristic Doctrines," Record and Revelation. Edited by H. W. Robinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.
- Robinson, J. A. T. The Body. London: S. C. M. Press, 1957.
- Ropes, J. H. "The Epistle to the Romans and Jewish Christianity," Studies in Early Christianity. Edited by S. J. Case. New York: Century, 1928.
- _____. The Singular Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929.
- Rowley, H. H. "The Unity of the Old Testament," Bulletin of The John Rylands Library, Vol. XXIX, (1945-1946), pp. 326-358.
- _____. The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952.

- Sandmel, S. "Abraham's Knowledge of the Existence of God," H.T.R., Vol. XLIV, No. 3 (July, 1951), pp. 137-139.
- Sanday, W. "Paul," H.D.C.G., Vol. II, pp. 886-892.
- Sanday, W. and Headlam, A. C. The Epistle to the Romans (I.C.C.). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1900.
- Schechter, S. Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. New York: Macmillan, 1909.
- _____. Studies in Judaism. London: A. and C. Black, 1896.
- Schlatter, A. The Church in the New Testament Period. Translated by P. P. Levertoff. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.
- Schlier, H. "ἐλεύθερος, ἐλευθερώ, ἐλευθερία, ἐπελεύθερος," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Edited by R. Kittel. Vol. II, pp. 484-500. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935.
- _____. "Über das vollkommene Gesetz der Freiheit," Festschrift Rudolf Bultmann. Edited by E. Wolf. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1949.
- Schmithals, W. Die Gnosis in Korinth. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956.
- _____. "Die Häretiker in Galatien," Z.N.W., Vol. XLVII (1956), pp. 25-67.
- Schoeps, H. J. Paulus. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959.
- _____. Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1949.
- Scholem, G. G. Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism. New York: Schocken, 1941.
- Schonfield, H. J. "Should 'Things Strangled' be omitted from Acts xv. 29?" E.T., Vol. XLI, No. 3 (Dec., 1929), pp. 128-129.
- Schrenk, G. and Quell, G. "δικαιοσύνη," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Edited by G. Kittel. Vol. II, pp. 176-229. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935.
- Schubert, K. "The Sermon on the Mount and the Qumran Texts," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by K. Stendahl. London: S.C.M. Press, 1958.
- Schultz, H. Old Testament Theology. Vol. II. Translated by J. A. Paterson. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892.
- Schürer, E. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (2nd. ed. rev.). 5 vols. Translated by J. MacPherson, S. Taylor, P. Christie. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890.

- _____. "Alexandrians in Jerusalem," J.E., Vol. I, pp. 371-372.
- Schweitzer, A. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. Translated by W. Montgomery. London: A. and C. Black, 1931.
- _____. Paul and his Interpreters. Translated by W. Montgomery. London: A. and C. Black, 1912.
- Scott, C. A. A. Christianity According to St. Paul. Cambridge: The University Press, 1927.
- Scott, E. F. The Beginnings of the Church. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1914.
- _____. The Ethical Teaching of Jesus. New York: Macmillan, 1924.
- _____. The First Age of Christianity. London: G. Allen & Urwin, 1926.
- _____. The Gospel and Its Tributaries. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928.
- _____. Man and Society in the New Testament. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1947.
- _____. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. London: S.C.M. Press, 1947.
- Sencourt, R. "What is Mysticism?" H.J., Vol. XLIII (Oct. 1944-July 1945), pp. 42-47.
- Siegfried, C. Philo von Alexandria. Jena: H. Dufft, 1875.
- _____. "Philo Judaeus," J.E., Vol. X, pp. 6-15.
- Simon, M. St. Stephen and the Hellenists. New York: Longmans, Green, 1958.
- Skinner, J. "Righteousness in O. T.," H.D.B., Vol. IV, pp. 272-281.
- Stacey, W. D. The Pauline View of Man. London: Macmillan, 1956.
- Stauffer, E. New Testament Theology. Translated by J. Marsh. London: S.C.M. Press, 1955.
- Stendahl, K. "An Introduction and a Perspective," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by K. Stendahl. London: S.C.M. Press, 1958.
- Stevens, G. B. The Pauline Theology. London: Dickenson, 1892.
- _____. "Righteousness in N. T.," H.D.B., Vol. IV, pp. 281-284.
- Stewart, J. S. A Man in Christ. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.

- _____. "On a Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology," S.J.T., Vol. IV, No. 3 (Sept., 1951), pp. 292-301.
- Stewart, R. A. The Earlier Rabbinic Tradition. London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1949.
- Strachan, R. H. The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (M.N.T.C.). London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- Strack, H. L. Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1931.
- Strack, H. L. and Billerbeck, P. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. München: C. H. Beck, 1926-1928.
- Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels. London: Macmillan, 1924.
- _____. The Primitive Church. London: Macmillan, 1930.
- Swete, H. B. An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. Cambridge: The University Press, 1900.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought. London: Macmillan, 1900.
- _____. The Septuagint and Jewish Worship. London: Oxford University Press, 1921.
- Thornton, L. S. The Common Life in the Body of Christ. London: Dacre Press, 1941.
- Torrance, T. F. "One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith," E.T., Vol. LXVIII, No. 4 (Jan., 1957), pp. 111-114.
- Unnik, W. C. v. Tarsus of Jerusalem, De Stadt van Paulus' Jeugd. Amsterdam: Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1952.
- de Vaux, R. "A Propos des Manuscrits de la Mer Morte," R.B., Vol. LVII (1950), pp. 417-429.
- Weber, F. Jüdische Theologie. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1897.
- Weiss, J. Paul and Jesus. Translated by H. J. Chaytor. London: Harper & Bros., 1909.
- _____. Die Christliche Freiheit nach der Verkündigung des Apostels Paulus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902.
- _____. The History of Primitive Christianity, 2 vols. Completed by B. Knopf; translated by four friends, edited by F. C. Grant. London: Macmillan, 1937.
- _____. Der erste Korintherbrief. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.
- Wernle, P. The Beginnings of Christianity. Vol. I. Translated by G. A. Bienemann. London: Williams & Norgate, 1903.

- Wieder, N. "The Idea of a Second Coming of Moses," J.Q.R., Vol. XLVI, No. 4 (April, 1956), pp. 356-366.
- _____. "The 'Law-Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses," The Journal of Jewish Studies. Vol. IV, No. 4 (1953), pp. 158-175.
- Williams, A. L. Talmudic Judaism and Christianity. London: S.P.C.K., 1933.
- _____. "'My Father' in Jewish Thought of the First Century," J.T.S., Vol. XXXI, (Oct., 1929), pp. 42-47.
- Wilson, R.M. "Nomos: The Biblical Significance of Law," S.J.T., Vol. V. No. 1 (March, 1952), pp. 36-48.
- Windisch, H. Die Frömmigkeit Philos. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1909.
- _____. "Das Problem des paulinischen Imperativs," Z.N.W., Vol. XXIII, Heft 3/4 (1924), pp. 265-281.
- _____. The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount. Translated by S. M. Gilmour. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1951.
- Wood, H. G. "The Conversion of St. Paul: Its Nature, Antecedents and Consequences," N.T.S., Vol. I (1954-1955), pp. 276-282.
- Woolcombe, K. J. "The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology," Essays on Typology. London: S.C.M. Press, 1957.
- Wrede, W. Paul. Translated by E. Lummis. London: P. Green, 1907.
- Yadin, Y. The Message of the Scrolls. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1957.
- Yun, S. B. Römer 7, 25 und der Pneumatikos. Seoul, Korea: Tong, 1958.
- Zeitlin, S. "The Apocrypha," J.Q.R., Vol. XXXVII, No. 3 (Jan., 1947), pp. 219-248.
- _____. "Jewish Apocryphal Literature," J.Q.R., Vol. XL, No. 3 (Jan., 1950), pp. 223-250.