Clemson University
TigerPrints

Publications Philosophy & Religion

2022

The Pauline Tradition

Benjamin L. White

Follow this and additional works at: https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/phil_pubs

Part of the Christianity Commons

CHAPTER FOUR

The Pauline Tradition

BENJAMIN L. WHITE

The task of Pauline biography—the tracing of Paul as a historical actor through space and time—is complex, complicated, and, perhaps most important, central for any description of Christian origins. Its complexity derives from the nature of the genre. Any Pauline biography worth its salt necessarily includes, beyond mere chronology, a narration of geographical movements; cultural and religious formations of a diaspora Jew; developments of thought about God, Judaism, the nations, Torah, the Christ, and the self; relational intersections with other religious actors and groups around the Mediterranean; and micro-histories of relationships with individual assemblies of Christ followers. Alongside this multi-faceted historiographical *telos*, careful consideration must be given to what kind of data are available for the task. First, we need to establish which data count for the reconstruction of the apostle's life. Second, we must distinguish between first-, second-, and third-order data, assigning weights to the various types. Third, we are required to decide, based on the quality of the data, what can be said and with what degree of confidence. Finally, we must judiciously consider whether the data grant us, in the end, access to the "real" or "historical" Paul (which are too often taken to be one and the same).[1] As the sheer multiplicity of such considerations attests, the task also requires preliminary theorization of Paul's place in the Roman world so as to narrow the field of possibility to a manageable body of data whence one can even begin to make such decisions. It is at this most historiographically foundational level that Pauline biography becomes complicated, for we must be honest about how few data have been allowed to speak for him in the regnant historiographical paradigm.

The regnant paradigm in Pauline studies construes a fundamental distinction between "Paul" and Paul, or the "canonical Paul" on the one hand and the "historical Paul" on the other, by which is often meant something like "the real Paul." The "canonical Paul" in this paradigm is the product of a distorting "Pauline tradition," not a proper rendering of the man himself. The practices for shedding Paul's canonical entrapments, thereby allowing the "real" Paul to emerge, are described just below. It should be noted first, however, that this parsing of the so-called historical Paul has consequences not only for our understanding of Christ's apostle to the nations, but also for our understanding of the development of early Christianity as a whole. As the academic study of the latter has advanced as a discipline over the past 200 years, the reconstruction of its first half-century has depended largely on Paul's literary remains. Aside from authentic letters of Paul, very little if any

[1]Note Leif Vaage's insistence in Chapter 2 of this volume that the "historical Paul" we reconstruct on the basis of the extant data must be distinguished from the "real Paul," who no longer exists.

other literature from the early Christ movement can firmly be dated to this period, while no material traces of it remain either. As such, the stakes for handling the earliest Pauline materials have been high, both on account of the cultural role that Paul has played in the post-Reformation West and because the canonical Pauline Epistles provide rich documentary evidence for the theological, ethical, social, economic, and ritual practices and beliefs of the earliest Christ followers. The task of Pauline biography is thus central to our understanding of the broader historical development of Christ faith.

While the canonical Pauline Epistles do provide rich primary evidence for Paul, his assemblies, his co-workers, and his opponents, these texts differ in large and small ways both in substance and in style. The supposedly imminent eschatology of 1 Thess 5:1–11, for example, has seemed quite different from the more prolonged series of eschatological indicators provided in 2 Thess 2:1–12.[2] The average sentence length of Ephesians is twice that of 1 Corinthians.[3] The now regnant framework for dealing with these various kinds of Pauline diversity begins by positing different authors among the epistles, particularly given that apostolic pseudepigraphy was a common, early phenomenon.[4] Some are authentic, while others falsely bear Paul's name. The motivations for ancient authors to write in the guise of an apostle have been variously explained and need not detain us here.[5] It is the separation of Paul from "Paul" as a historiographical first move that is of primary concern. The strategy had its origins in early nineteenth-century German Protestant scholarship and was quintessentially expressed in the work of Ferdinand Christian Baur, the Tübingen historian and theologian who wed the increasingly source-critical and positivist historiographical practices of the historians Barthold Georg Niebuhr and Leopold von Ranke with the philosophical system of G. W. F. Hegel to produce a powerful new story of the development of early Christianity.[6] While Baur's rigid Hegelian scheme for assigning early Christian texts to either Petrine or Pauline factions or their early Catholic synthesis has had few proponents, the basic historiographical framework remains more or less in place: to discern which epistles are unquestionably authentic (for Baur, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians, the *Hauptbriefe*) and then build a Pauline biography from these occasional data points, bypassing, to the degree that it is possible, the accretions of tradition and canon, the latter represented both by Pauline pseudepigrapha and the secondary, harmonizing, and thus tendentious Acts, which displays its own various kinds of difference with the "authentic" letters of Paul. For example, was Timothy present with Paul in Athens or not? It depends on whether one follows 1 Thessalonians 3:1–2 (yes) or Acts 17:14–18:5 (no).

[2]Cf. Helmut Koester, "From Paul's Eschatology to the Apocalyptic Schemata of 2 Thessalonians," in *The Thessalonian Correspondence*, ed. Raymond F. Collins, BETL 87 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), 441–58; Bart D. Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 163–66.

[3]Cf. Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 184–85; A. Q. Morton, *Literary Detection: How to Prove Authorship and Fraud in Literature and Documents* (New York: Scribner, 1978), 172–73; C. Leslie Mitton, *The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), 9–11.

[4]Note the numerous texts authored under the names of the apostles in the classic volumes by Wilhelm Schneemelcher, ed., *New Testament Apocrypha*, trans. R. McL. Wilson, rev. ed., 2 vols. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992).

[5]Cf. Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 97–121.

[6]On Baur's historiography, see Benjamin L. White, *Remembering Paul: Ancient and Modern Contests over the Image of the Apostle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 21–27.

The demarcation of some of the Pauline Epistles as authentic and others as pseudepigraphic has allowed even more to be known about this murky first half-century of early Christ faith. There are now data points from the 40s to the 50s (the authentic epistles) and from the 60s to the 90s or even later (the inauthentic epistles). On this basis, the evolution—or devolution, depending on one's view—of early Christianity can be narrated apart from Acts by fixing the epistles on this longer timeline and situating other early Christian literature within it. What results from this source taxonomy is a framework for discerning anachronisms—a kind of literary stratigraphy—independent of the final shape of the canon. Much, then, of what we have come to know as scholars about the first half-century of Christ-following is remarkably dependent on how the Pauline evidence is handled.

In the regnant paradigm, the early Pauline tradition is viewed at best as secondary data for thinking about the historical Paul (in the case of canonical pseudepigrapha or Acts), or at worst as completely irrelevant for the biographical task (non-canonical Pauline traditions from the second century). In this chapter I take aim at this now conventional approach, pointing out the significant problems with its historiographical assumptions and procedures, and make a case for the *primary* relevancy of the Pauline tradition, broadly construed, for thinking about Paul as a historical actor. I propose here nothing less than a complete reorientation of how we practice Pauline biography, both in terms of a broadening of the evidence that might count as foundational for describing Paul and a lessening of the degree of certainty with which we think we can know Paul—the problem of Pauline immediacy—from the outset.

PRESENT PRACTICES AND THEIR PROBLEMS

In saying that F. C. Baur's basic historiographical framework for writing Pauline biography still holds, I mean that it can be clearly seen in the way that Pauline biographies continue to be written. Take, for instance, Douglas Campbell's recent and quite methodologically self-conscious *Framing Paul: An Epistolary Biography*.[7] Campbell argues for ten authentic letters of Paul (excluding the Pastorals) and arranges them in a unique chronological order, spanning from 40 to 52 CE. Questions of coherence, contingency, and development in Paul's thinking—a key part of any Pauline biography—can only be answered, according to Campbell, after an epistolary framework is in place.[8] Before we can talk about the "Lutheran Paul," the "New Perspective on Paul," "Paul within Judaism," or "Paul and Empire," we must discern the boundaries of our vision. Campbell suspects that Protestant theology stands not only behind many of our prominent ways of reading Paul, but also ultimately behind the current seven-letter "consensus"—a position that I have argued for as well.[9] He thus relitigates the question of authorship for the Pauline Epistles with as little consideration given to questions of theological coherence as possible in an attempt to develop a relatively secure framework for doing Pauline biography. Acts is largely absent from *Framing Paul* and is clearly secondary for Campbell, although he does indicate that he harbors no initial prejudices against its basic historical accuracy.[10] Although in this

[7]Douglas A. Campbell, *Framing Paul: An Epistolary Biography* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014). For an overview of Campbell's approach and conclusions, see Chapter 18 in this volume.
[8]Campbell, *Framing Paul*, 1–13.
[9]Campbell, *Framing Paul*, 14; cf. White, *Remembering Paul*, 27.
[10]Campbell, *Framing Paul*, 20–26.

matter he departs from the legacy of Baur, Campbell sits squarely within the dominant mode in making determinations about which epistles are authentic as a historiographical first move.

In this dominant paradigm, several kinds of arguments are utilized for unmasking Pauline pseudepigrapha. First, scholars have questioned whether certain epistles fit within the Pauline chronology established in Acts—a strange consideration when in this general framework the witness of Acts has already been sidelined as secondary. Second, substantive differences among the letters, as we have mentioned, are viewed as evidence of difference in authorship, although it is of course a matter of speculation as to how elastic Paul's thinking on any given issue might have been over the course of two to three decades of ministry, to say nothing of his evident collaboration with co-workers and scribes throughout this period. Third, pseudonymity is indicated by the presence of anachronisms. Yet arguments based on anachronisms in the Pauline Epistles have always seemed circular. When talking about the earliest preserved Christ-believing author, whose literary remains, however we arrange them, provide the anchor for any developmental narrative of early Christianity, how can an anachronism be spotted without judgments already having been made about which texts are authentic? For this reason, as a historiographical starting place in the separation of Paul from "Paul," appeals to anachronism cannot provide much leverage. Indeed, most of the alleged anachronisms in "pseudo-Pauline" texts have been spotted by those who somehow already presume to know the "real" Paul. A particularly flagrant instance of this circularity exists, for example, when interpreters claim that the "overseers" (ἐπίσκοποι) and "deacons" (διάκονοι) in 1 Timothy and Titus are evidence of a later, post-Pauline development in ecclesial structure in light of the evidence for a less hierarchical structure in the authentic 1 Corinthians. Beyond its presumed authenticity, 1 Corinthians is also judged in this case to indicate an unchanging Pauline norm for the organization of his assemblies. But what about Paul's address to the "overseers" (ἐπίσκοποι) and "deacons" (διάκονοι) of Philippi at the outset of this similarly "undisputed" Pauline Epistle (Phil 1:1)? Paul *must* have envisioned some less rigid structure than what we have in 1 Timothy and Titus, we are told, because Paul did not write 1 Timothy and Titus! But how does one know he did not write 1 Timothy and Titus? Because these letters attest a structure of church governance unparalleled in the authentic epistles![11]

Given the inherently subjective nature of these three considerations, a fourth argument—the appeal to differences in vocabulary and style between the epistles—has, since the time of Friedrich Schleiermacher's work on 1 Timothy (1807), functioned as the rhetorical trump card in the dominant mode.[12] Its strength owes much to the aura of methodological impartiality: *Hapax legomena* (words appearing only once in the canonical Pauline Epistles) can be counted, as can average word length, or average sentence length, or average occurrences of καί (the Greek word for "and") per sentence, or any other feature or set of features taken to reflect an individual's unchanging and unique style of

[11]As an example of this kind of circularity, see Margaret Y. MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-Historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings*, SNTSMS 60 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 217.

[12]Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Über den sogenannten ersten Brief des Paulos an den Timotheos: Ein kritisches Sendschreibung an J. C. Gass* (Berlin: Realschulbuch, 1807).

expression.[13] Quantification and a sense of objectivity, rooted in the "physics envy" of nineteenth-century German historiography, has become the foundation for the dominant mode.[14] In the first truly quantitative study of the Pauline Epistles in 1888, the mathematician William Benjamin Smith, writing under the pseudonym Conrad Mascol, stated that the goal of his measurement of forty non-notional linguistic features in the epistles was "by a simple mathematical device, to present the complex character of a style to the mind in a single direct vision, and thereby not only prevent the mind from losing itself in a multitude of conflicting special decisions, but coerce it to a single collective judgment."[15]

While contemporary stylometric studies of the Pauline Epistles have been more restrained in their claims, the rhetorical weight that arguments from style continue to bear in our discipline can be seen in how scholars dependent on these older and influential studies arrange their arguments for and against the authenticity of a given Pauline Epistle. In defending the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles, William Mounce's commentary (2000) offers a typical strategy.[16] Forty-seven pages are devoted to the question of authorship. The first four of these are devoted to the "historical problem." Then ten pages to the "theological problem." Then *twenty* pages to the final problem, "the linguistic problem," aimed mainly at the quantitative arguments made long ago by P. N. Harrison in his influential *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (1921).[17] Harrison had argued in great detail, and convincingly to many, that the high concentration of *hapax legomena* in the Pastoral Epistles, along with the absence of 112 Pauline "little words," were indications of their pseudonymity. The sequencing and relative space given to these various authorship problems by Mounce reflects the significance that the quantitative appeal to style has had in disambiguating Paul from "Paul." Mounce builds up to the problem that has come to count most decisively against the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles, preparing the way by dispensing first with less compelling arguments. Bart Ehrman is a good example of the legacy against which Mounce positions himself. In arguing for the spuriousness of the Pastoral Epistles in his *Forgery and Counterforgery* (2013), Ehrman leads with the stylometric evidence, fixing it first, and then allowing the other kinds of arguments to attach to it:

> It is important to stress that all of these various arguments are cumulative and all point in the same direction. The accumulation is not merely as strong as its weakest link. One argument after the other simply reinforces the one that precedes: the distinctive vocabulary, its non-Pauline character and force, the post-Pauline historical situation, the role of authorities in the church including written Gospel texts.[18]

Pauline studies as a scholarly discipline and its determinations on foundational historical questions like the date and authorship of the primary data seems then to be safeguarded

[13]For substantial histories of the stylometric analysis of the Pauline Epistles, see Jermo van Nes, *Pauline Language and the Pastoral Epistles: A Study of Linguistic Variation in the Corpus Paulinum*, Linguistic Biblical Studies 16 (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 7–75; Kenneth J. Neumann, *The Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles in the Light of Stylostatistical Analysis*, SBLDS 120 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 1–114.

[14]On "physics envy," see John Lewis Gaddis, *The Landscape of History: How Historians Map the Past* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 89.

[15]Conrad Mascol, "Curves of Pauline and Pseudo-Pauline Style," *Unitarian Review* 30 (1888): 452–60, 539–46.

[16]William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, WBC 46 (Nashville: Nelson, 2000).

[17]P. N. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (London: Oxford University Press, 1921).

[18]Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 205.

from "conflicting special decisions" (to use William Benjamin Smith's language)—by math! But is this the case? A simple survey of computer-assisted stylometric tests of authorship of the Pauline Epistles over the past half-century suggests that all might not be well in computational paradise. Since the time of A. Q. Morton's pioneering stylometric work with the computer in the 1960s, these studies, conducted by mathematicians, computer scientists, and biblical scholars, have resulted in a wide range of findings, with the authentic Pauline Epistles numbering thirteen (H. H. Somers; George Barr), twelve (Anthony Kenny), ten (Kenneth Neumann; Moshe Koppel and Shachar Seidman), seven or eight (David Mealand), six (Gerard Ledger), five (A. Q. Morton), and four (Greenwood).[19] One fairly recent study deploying multivariate correspondence analysis by two British computer scientists (Harry Erwin and Michael Oakes) makes no conclusions, except that *amanuenses* (Pauline secretaries) might be to blame for the differing textual signals.[20] It does, however, group the Pastorals as being closest to the *Hauptbriefe*, those four "chief letters" identified by Baur as authentically Pauline, a computational result that runs against many of the older studies.

Discerning the prospects and limitations of a particular mode of knowing strikes at the heart of our historiographical practices, particularly when those practices have developed a sense of "scientificity." The philosopher Michel de Certeau has described scientificity as a self-deceiving mode in which we think we can "disengage historiography from its dependence on the surrounding culture, out of which prejudgments and expectancies determine in advance certain postulates, units of study, and interpretations."[21] Because of their basis in math and complex computational algorithms, stylometric analyses for authorship attribution help to fuel this kind of scientificity in Pauline studies. But what lies underneath is often not science, but rather what Darrell Huff calls "statisticulating": "the unprincipled and statistically unjustified use of numbers to support a particular point."[22] The digital humanist Joseph Rudman has also warned of the constant temptation

[19]H. H. Somers, "Statistical Methods in Literary Analysis," in *The Computer and Literary Style: Introductory Essays and Studies*, ed. Jacob Leed, Kent Studies in English 2 (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1966), 128–40; George K. Barr, *Scalometry and the Pauline Epistles*, JSNTSup 261 (London: T&T Clark, 2004); Anthony Kenny, *A Stylometric Study of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986); Neumann, *Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles*; Moshe Koppel and Shachar Seidman, "Detecting Pseudepigraphic Texts Using Novel Similarity Measures," *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* 33 (2018): 72–81; David L. Mealand, "Positional Stylometry Reassessed: Testing a Seven Epistle Theory of Pauline Authorship," *NTS* 35 (1989): 266–86; David L. Mealand, "The Extent of the Pauline Corpus: A Multivariate Approach," *JSNT* 59 (1995): 61–92; Gerard R. Ledger, "An Exploration of Differences in the Pauline Epistles using Multivariate Statistical Analysis," *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 10 (1995): 85–97; A. Q. Morton, *The Authorship of the Pauline Epistles: A Scientific Solution*, University Lectures 3 (Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Press, 1965); A. Q. Morton and James McLeman, *Paul, The Man and the Myth: A Study in the Authorship of Greek Prose* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966); H. H. Greenwood, "St Paul Revisited—a Computational Result," *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 7 (1992): 43–47; H. H. Greenwood, "St. Paul Revisited—Word Clusters in Multidimensional Space," *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 8 (1993): 211–19.

[20]Harry Erwin and Michael Oakes, "Correspondence Analysis of the New Testament," in *Workshop on Language Resources and Evaluation for Religious Texts*, ed. Eric Atwell, Claire Brierley, and Majdi Sawalha (Istanbul, 2012), 30–37.

[21]Michel de Certeau, "History: Science and Fiction," in *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other*, Theory and History of Literature 17 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986), 208.

[22]Matthew Brook O'Donnell, "Linguistic Fingerprints or Style by Numbers? The Use of Statistics in the Discussion of Authorship of New Testament Documents," in *Linguistics and the New Testament: Critical Junctures*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, JSNTSup 168 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 207; referring to Darrell Huff, *How to Lie with Statistics* (New York: Penguin Books, 1991 [1954]), 94.

to "cherry-pick" at all stages of stylometric analysis.[23] The enticement to statisticulate and cherry-pick is particularly easy to succumb to when the corpus in question is of the culturally canonical variety, like the Pauline Epistles.

In many of the foundational stylometric studies of the Pauline Epistles one gets the sense that a particular "Paul" is being protected and the problem set up to guarantee a predetermined result. First, a small set of Pauline texts are assumed authentic from the get-go. These are normally either Romans, or Galatians, or the *Hauptbriefe* as a group—those texts essential to the Reformation's Paul.[24] Not even Campbell, who is sensitive to the ways in which theology has masked itself in the guise of science, justifies his assumption that 1 and 2 Corinthians and Romans are authentically Pauline. He offers no positive argumentation for their authenticity, as he does with other epistles. Second, these *obviously* Pauline texts, when measured, are taken to give us quantifiable access to an *unchanging* Pauline linguistic fingerprint—what many scholars of computational stylistics call a "stylome," or a linguistic signal.[25] The use of this term, however, already indicates too much. Numerous studies have shown that our linguistic signals change based on age, genre of communication, subject matter, and a variety of other contingencies; DNA sequences and fingerprints do not.[26] Third, cherry-picked features and divergences from the supposedly pure Pauline stylome are said to signal differences in authorship for texts that are too "ecclesiastical" or "traditional" or that exhibit too "realized" an eschatology for some often-romanticized notion of Paul, our earliest entry point into Christ faith. These terms often conceal an anti-Catholic polemic, which is unsurprising given the liberalizing German Protestants who established the present framework.[27] A similar suspicion exists in the other direction, when a more religiously conservative scholar takes the authorial claims of all the epistles for granted and never clearly defines the degree of stylistic difference that would be needed to discount the common authorship of the entire corpus.[28]

This conventional method for isolating the primary Pauline data does not, in the end, provide a firm basis for Pauline biography. There is no Cartesian foundation here. Even its supposed ace in the hole—the "mathematical" measurement of an authentic Pauline stylome—is long overdue for a meta-critique. The various kinds of reasoning endemic to the conventional method should not, of course, be removed from our methodological toolbelt; they are merely unable, in a vacuum, to provide initial leverage. Their proper place in the historiographical task comes later, only after a wider basis for discrimination has been established, which will require a broader set of primary data.

---

[23]Joseph Rudman, "Cherry-Picking in Nontraditional Authorship Attribution Studies," *Chance* 16 (2003): 26–32.

[24]See, for instance, A. Q. Morton's selection of Galatians as starting point. Morton was both a mathematician and a minister in the Church of Scotland. By starting with Galatians and selecting stylistic measures that were particularly characteristic of it, he allowed the "real" Paul to emerge as a man whose "ideas are large and pregnant enough to admit him to the company of the master thinkers" (*Paul, the Man and the Myth*, 110). Galatians and the *Hauptbriefe* were texts palatable for Morton's progressive form of Protestant Christianity, much as they were for Baur before him.

[25]See Hans van Halteren et al., "New Machine Learning Methods Demonstrate the Existence of a Human Stylome," *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics* 12 (2005): 65–77.

[26]For a summative study of stylochronometry, the development of style over time, see Constantina Stamou, "Stylochronometry: Stylistic Development, Sequence of Composition, and Relative Dating," *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 23 (2008): 181–99. On stylistic variation across genres and registers, cf. Douglas Biber, *Variation across Speech and Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

[27]Cf. Benjamin L. White, "The Traditional and Ecclesiastical Paul of 1 Corinthians," *CBQ* 79 (2017): 651–69.

[28]Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, is typical in this regard.

OUTLINE FOR A NEW APPROACH TO PAULINE BIOGRAPHY

How then should we begin the task of Pauline biography? I propose here an alternative preliminary framework—one that will, down the road, give due consideration to the authenticity of particular Pauline Epistles, but that commences with and gives significant weight to the early reception of Paul. In other words, I suggest flipping the dominant method on its head by *beginning* with the broad and diverse memorializations of Paul that we find in the century or so after his death—the very streams of early Pauline tradition that have been seen as so disfiguring of the "real" Paul in the regnant paradigm. I propose how we might judiciously assess the early Pauline tradition to discern what, broadly, it preserves about Paul beyond its various tendentious concerns, thereby providing a basic initial frame for conducting Pauline biography.

A *prima facie* case for starting here, with the early Pauline tradition, is not difficult to make. As Douglas Campbell has aptly opined, "There have not been many rigorously Cartesian historians."[29] I have also argued at length elsewhere for the epistemological and hermeneutical force of tradition.[30] Since the early nineteenth century, not only have efforts to separate Paul from "Paul" yielded inconclusive results, but the quest itself has been philosophically naive. Campbell explains, "Interpreters will have difficulty deriving and initially processing hypotheses without tradition, so tradition remains essential, but it is not unquestioned."[31] My historiographical proposal, then, is not to find the Archimedean point from which a *definitive* Pauline biography might be deduced. Such a thing does not exist. I merely assert that the most relevant traditions for hypothesizing about the historical Paul are not Lutheran, or Hegelian, or Rankean—those that were so formative for our *nineteenth*-century disciplinary forbears—but rather Lukan and Ignatian and Clementine and Marcionite, among others from the *second* century, including epistolary traditions like Papyrus 46, our earliest preserved collection of Pauline Epistles.

In this turn to early external evidence—that is, evidence outside the Pauline Epistles themselves—I do not have in mind merely charting "Who knew which epistles when?" as a way of framing questions about epistolary authenticity and dating.[32] This approach would be too narrow. Rather, between Paul's life and our literary evidence for his reception in the second century, a complex process of developing traditions about the apostle unfolded, sometimes independent of anything he wrote, particularly in its early stages. That development, which I will refer to hereafter as DEPT (the development of early Pauline traditions), proceeded as follows:

1. Initial impressions were formed about Paul through eyewitness encounters with him, which were then shared with others (oral history) and became part of wider collective memories. A variety of eyewitnesses produced oral testimonies about Paul: co-workers; followers; opponents; and general observers. These testimonies

[29]Campbell, *Framing Paul*, 17.
[30]White, *Remembering Paul*, 72–79.
[31]Campbell, *Framing Paul*, 17.
[32]On the role of external evidence for authorship attribution, see Harold Love, *Attributing Authorship: An Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 51–78. Even the stylometrists have cautioned that external evidence should take priority over internal criteria: David L. Hoover, "Quantitative Analysis and Literary Studies," in *A Companion to Digital Literary Studies*, ed. Ray Siemens and Susan Schreibman (Oxford: Blackwell, 2008), 517–33; Kenny, *A Stylometric Study of the New Testament*, 116–17.

would have included, over time, the variety of kinds of data about Paul outlined in the opening paragraph of this chapter.

2. Individual and collective accounts of Paul were, for a period of time, managed by Paul himself and by his reputational entrepreneurs with varying degrees of success.[33] On occasion, part of this management came in the form of a letter, as we find evidenced in 2 Corinthians.
3. Once out of the direct Pauline network, oral histories became oral traditions.[34]
4. The transmission of Pauline oral histories and traditions would have outpaced the dissemination of Pauline letters in many cases. But, where written and oral sources did come into contact, as was increasingly the case as the second century unfolded, they worked together to form even more complex imaginaries of the apostle. We should not assume, however, that hard-to-interpret Pauline letters became hermeneutically central for interpreting other oral and written traditions about Paul. In many instances the *reverse* would have been the case.[35]
5. Eventually, a collection of Pauline Epistles to assemblies was circulating widely. The impetus for this fuller collection of Pauline texts was, no doubt, an act of memorialization, although, as Brent Nongbri outlines in Chapter 5, the date, location, and contents of such a project have remained a matter of debate.
6. Literary evidence of this entire process begins with *1 Clement* (c. 90 CE) and its full breadth is on display in Irenaeus of Lyons (c. 180 CE) and Tertullian of Carthage (c. 200 CE), both in how they themselves treat the Pauline tradition and in their depictions of how their opponents work with it.

If this narrative of the DEPT is basically correct, then nothing less than a full and judicious vetting of all the available evidence for Paul up to and including Irenaeus and Tertullian (who gives us some access to Marcion's reception of Paul) is required for any serious work on Pauline biography. Moreover, the "epistolary Paul" was not the "real" Paul, as if the historical figure Paul could be thickly described through some few occasional letters. Even granting the authenticity of some Pauline epistles, we should bear in mind that these texts are not only tendentious in their self-referentiality—that is to say, they contain Paul's posturing—but also partial in two senses: as an incomplete record of bilateral communication, and as one facet, maybe even a fairly minor one, of apostolic activities that involved much in-person instruction, pneumatic demonstrations, and the performance of rites such as baptism, among other possibilities.[36] And it is not as if we

[33]On reputational entrepreneurship, see Gary Alan Fine, *Difficult Reputations: Collective Memories of the Evil, Inept, and Controversial* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001). Reputational entrepreneurs are "self-interested custodian[s]" (63) who selectively appeal to the past for the sake of their own and their community's present interests (17).

[34]On oral history vs. oral tradition, see Samuel Byrskog, *Story as History—History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History*, WUNT 123 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

[35]Note, for instance, how Irenaeus interprets Galatians alongside the controlling Acts: Benjamin White, "Paul and the Jerusalem Church in Irenaeus," in *Irenaeus and Paul*, ed. Todd D. Still and David E. Wilhite (London: T&T Clark, 2020), 225–43.

[36]On the tendentiousness of Pauline "autobiography," see Oda Wischmeyer, "Paulus als Ich-Erzähler: Ein Beitrag zu seiner Person, seiner Biographie und seiner Theologie," and Lukas Bormann, "Autobiographische Fiktionalität bei Paulus," in *Biographie und Persönlichkeit des Paulus*, ed. Eve-Marie Becker and Peter Pilhofer, WUNT 187 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 88–105, 106–24, respectively.

have Pauline autographs. Our earliest manuscripts of the Pauline Epistles date to the late second or early third century and thus are primarily evidence of Pauline reception from a period when there was intense reputational contestation over the apostle.[37] Our retrieval of Paul, then, must be sensitive to a whole range of data that might preserve traces of the man himself, up to the time of 𝔓46. So, while Campbell was absolutely correct to note that some tradition is required for hypothesizing about Pauline biography, it is strange that in *Framing Paul* he shows very little regard for the earliest Pauline traditions. Rather, his cautions against Cartesianism allow him to *assume* the authenticity of Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians as reproduced in the Nestle-Aland critical edition of the New Testament. This is both convenient and insufficient.

At least initially we should take under consideration all the data that mediate Paul to us up to the turn of the third century, without consideration of their canonical or sectarian status. They are our early Pauline *lieux de mémoire*, or "sites of memory," and fall into several types:[38]

1. Pauline narratives, canonical and non-canonical;
2. Pauline manuscripts (like 𝔓46) and other Pauline canons (Marcion's *Apostolikon*, the Muratorian Canon, Marcionite Prologues);
3. Marcion's particularly prominent reception of Paul;
4. Non-canonical Pauline pseudepigraphy, including *3 Corinthians* and the *Epistle(s) to the Laodiceans*;
5. References to Paul and significant allusions to or citations of Pauline epistles across the full spectrum of early Christ-believing literature.

Before we can decide how this data should be organized and sifted, we must offer thick descriptions of their individual receptions of Paul. On which earlier Pauline traditions are they dependent, either narrative or epistolary or both? What prominent images of the apostle do they portray? The former question helps us to construct a dense map of witnesses to particular places, events, and contacts in Paul's life, as well as to the use of individual letters of Paul at certain times and places. The latter pushes us to consider the hermeneutical center of various receptions of Paul and forces us to ask questions about what Paul was *really* up to in the minds of those who received him.

Given the DEPT as described above, we must also, before devising an approach for evaluating the data, articulate carefully how eyewitness memory, oral history, oral tradition, and collective remembering operate. Understanding these cognitive and communicative processes is not just germane to Historical Jesus scholarship. For too long the prospect of authentic Pauline writings has lulled us into thinking that the quest for the Historical Paul is fundamentally different from the quest for the Historical Jesus. In many important ways it is not.

---

[37]The dating of 𝔓46 is notoriously difficult on merely paleographical grounds. I find the studies by Edgar Ebojo, who has also taken into consideration other visual clues and observations about the production of the manuscript, and Don Barker, who has evaluated the larger "graphic stream" of the manuscript (rather than isolated letter forms), to be persuasive for a date between 175 and 225 CE. See Ebojo, "A Scribe and His Manuscript: An Investigation into the Scribal Habits of Papyrus 46 (P. Chester Beatty II—P. Mich. Inv. 6238)" (PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2014); Barker, "The Dating of New Testament Papyri," *NTS* 57 (2011): 571–82.

[38]See Pierre Nora, "Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*," *Representations* 26 (1989): 7–25, which explores the role that material "sites of memory" have in forging a normative past.

I have written extensively about the nature and process of early Pauline memorialization—about how we might read texts from the second century that mention Paul, narrate his life, or make use of Pauline literature as sites of memory.[39] I want to emphasize two points from that work here, which really only treated steps four through six of the DEPT. First, we are all situated within traditions of Pauline memory that predispose us to imagine Paul a particular way and that are underpinned by present and often ideological concerns. Certain portions of the early Pauline traditions have been "forgotten," others brought forward and made central, and the rest organized so as to produce a Paul useful for our own situations. These are the politics of Pauline memory, and the scholars who began making decisions about authentic and pseudo-Pauline Epistles in the nineteenth century did so, likewise, under the influence of a particular image of Paul, one handed down by local strains of Protestantism, whereby tendentious readings of Romans and Galatians provided the hermeneutical engine for thinking about what Paul was really up to as a unique religious genius.

Second, collective memory is *both* constructive *and* connective. It is aimed, as a resource, at the present. But it is precisely on account of its being a resource that it always possesses significant lineages with the past. The past constrains the degree of innovation, particularly in settings where there is not enough institutional control to prevent counter-traditions from developing to challenge novelties perceived to be aberrant. This was certainly the case with respect to apostolic memory in the long second century. Even the Ebionites' maliciously "invented" story (according to Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.16.8–9) about Paul's gentile birth in Tarsus, his subsequent conversion to Judaism to win the love of the high priest's daughter, and his eventual preaching against Judaism after she spurned him, was constrained by the early and broad tradition of Paul as apostle to (and really "among") the gentiles. The past is always present in varying degrees. If we historians, situated in our own mnemonic traditions, are to have any chance at wading through two-thousand years of Pauline memorializations and finding some that preserve significant material for reconstructing the so-called historical Paul, then we have a much better chance of finding them in the second century than in the sixteenth or the nineteenth or the twenty-first. The earlier the better.

To understand how the Pauline traditions preserved in the *literary* evidence of the long second century relate to the earlier *orally* transmitted stages of the DEPT, we must understand the fruit born from some recent Historical Jesus scholarship. Dale Allison has reminded us in his *Constructing Jesus* (2010) that memory, both individual and collective, is *gistified*.[40] Psychological research on memory shows over and over again that our brains are conditioned, despite their numerous mnemonic frailties, to retain generalizations of our experiences in a fairly faithful manner—to retain the big picture and drop the details. *Constructing Jesus* can be read as a kind of *mea culpa* for Allison, who laments the way he was initially trained to think about reconstructing the historical Jesus—first establish discrete logia or events as unquestionably authentic, stripped from any consideration of their immediate literary contexts, and then reimagine, against the grain, other contexts within which these isolated data-points might make better historical sense. The scientific literature on human memory, however, eventually forced him to reevaluate his historiographical first steps:

> I wish . . . to explicate my conviction that we can learn some important things about the historical Jesus without resorting to the standard criteria and without, for the most

[39]White, *Remembering Paul*, 70–107, esp. 95–96.
[40]Dale C. Allison Jr., *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010).

> part, trying to decide whether he authored this or that saying or whether this or that particular event actually happened as narrated.[41]

We are more likely to find the historical Jesus in the Synoptic tradition as a whole than in its discrete parts. Here Allison stands in contrast to the Jesus Seminar, a group of hyper-skeptical scholars who doubted the generally apocalyptic portrayal of Jesus in that tradition:

> If . . . Jesus was a "secular sage" little concerned with "the last things," as the Jesus Seminar collectively determined, then the Synoptic tradition, which everywhere depicts a *homo religiosus* and a man who frequently promotes an eschatological vision, is mnemonically defective in a massive way, so much so that we probably cannot justify using it to investigate the pre-Easter period, in which case we cannot persuade ourselves that Jesus was a secular sage uninterested in eschatology. Here skepticism skewers itself.[42]

Allison looks for broadly construed fixtures of the Jesus tradition that are "recurrently attested"—general impressions about Jesus that appear repeatedly in its earliest layers. He concludes:

> The first-century traditions about Jesus are not an amorphous mess. On the contrary, certain themes, motifs, and rhetorical strategies recur again and again throughout the primary sources; and it must be in those themes and motifs and rhetorical strategies—which, taken together, leave some distinct impressions—if it is anywhere, that we will find memory.[43]

"Memory" here signifies the retentive aspect of the mnemonic process, which has secured enough traces of the past to allow us to establish *generalized* facts about the teachings and life of Jesus with reasonable certitude.

The cognitive, psychological, and sociological studies upon which Allison builds his new approach are consonant with the findings from the anthropological literature on the nature of oral tradition. Whether analyzing episodic (personal) or semantic (collective) memory, the aggregate conclusion to be drawn is that the formation and transmission of memory, particularly in oral contexts, is a complex phenomenon comprised *at the same time* of fragility *and* permanence, of innovation *and* conservation, of present *and* past. The retentive aspect of memory is, in large part, the gist of the matter, not the details.[44] Some Historical Jesus scholars have over-emphasized one side of this coin or the other, although there appears to be increasing support for Allison's approach, which takes seriously both sides together.[45]

---

[41]Allison, *Constructing Jesus,* 10.

[42]Allison, *Constructing Jesus,* 15.

[43]Allison, *Constructing Jesus,* 15.

[44]See already the early findings of Frederic C. Bartlett, *Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932). On oral tradition, see Jan Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985).

[45]Foregrounding the fragility of human memory, see Bart D. Ehrman, *Jesus before the Gospels: How the Earliest Christians Remembered, Changed, and Invented Their Stories of the Savior* (New York: HarperCollins, 2016), although he concedes in numerous places that memory is *generally* reliable (e.g., 3, 19–20, 143–44, 290). Asserting the fundamental reliability of eyewitness memory, see Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017). For those more squarely in the middle, aligning with Allison, see Anthony Le Donne, *The Historiographical Jesus: Memory, Typology, and the Son of David* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009); Rafael Rodriguez, *Structuring Early Christian Memory: Jesus in Tradition, Performance and Text*, LNTS 407 (London T&T Clark, 2010).

Yet even for those Historical Jesus scholars who have taken the middle path and emphasize that the tradition, while defective in various ways, has delivered a *generally* faithful collective memory of Jesus of Nazareth, some criteria for constraining the diversity of Jesus traditions are required. For the Jesus tradition develops not only along the Synoptic path, but also the Johannine, the Thomasine, etc. The heralded "demise of authenticity" in the wake of Allison has not, in fact, done away with the need for reasonable criteria for wading through these extremely diverse traditions.[46] Rather, what we have come to understand about human memory and the nature of oral tradition should force us to *reevaluate* the coherence of some of the criteria, along with the nature and limits of what we are trying to establish through their use. Allison, for instance, is still operating with a general preference for the Synoptic tradition over the Johannine and Thomasine. Why? Perhaps it is because he holds it to be both earlier and more widely attested than the others. These are not unreasonable criteria for vetting the reliability of collective memory.[47]

Work is now afoot to articulate how historiographical criteria born in the positivist mode of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries might be reframed for an epistemology constrained by contours and gists rather than points and precision. Allison recommends, "The larger the generalization [about the life of Jesus] and the more data upon which it is based, the greater our confidence. The more specific the detail and the fewer the supporting data, the greater our uncertainty."[48] Identifying early, recurrently attested, general tendencies within a set of traditions is a good place to start. Even better are early, recurrently attested traditions that appear across the diverse spectrum of Christian groups.[49] Traditions that meet more of these criteria than others give us greater confidence that we have found in their sites of early Christian memory, whether about Jesus or Paul, real traces of the past. The stickiness of *these* particular aspects of the tradition are due to how quickly initial mnemonic activity at the individual and social levels becomes relatively fixed.[50]

I am not advocating for a precise method in sifting the early Pauline tradition, but a basic approach for weighing the diverse evidence. As Allison notes, greater consensus and certainty will exist among scholars at the level of generality. The most recurrently attested aspect of the early layer of the Pauline tradition, for instance, is that Paul engaged in a wide and far-flung mission to the gentiles. The Pauline Epistles (cf. 2 Tim 4:17), Acts (cf. Acts 13:47), *1 Clement* 5:7, and the *Acts of Paul* (*Mart. Paul* 3), among others, remember Paul as being in and out of numerous communities across a broad geographical expanse,

---

[46]On the "demise of authenticity," see Chris Keith and Anthony LeDonne, eds., *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity* (London: T&T Clark, 2012).

[47]Similarly, see Craig A. Evans and Greg Monette, "Jesus' Burial: Archaeology, Authenticity, and History," in *Jesus, Skepticism and the Problem of History: Criteria and Context in the Study of Christian Origins*, ed. Darrell L. Bock and J. Ed Komoszewski (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2019), 270–74.

[48]Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 14.

[49]Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, "Theses on the Nature of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung: A Proposal for a Paradigm Shift in Understanding the Quest," *JSHJ* 17 (2019): 27–28, argues for the plausibility of Hermann Reimarus's (1694–1768) political reconstruction of the life of Jesus based on its acceptance by "authors coming from very different ideological, religious and cultural backgrounds," which is evidence that Reimarus's view of Jesus "is not easily reducible to a mere 'projection' or to some kind of spurious ideological interest." Regardless of the merit of Bermejo-Rubio's argument in favor of Reimarus, it is an interesting line of argumentation—what I call "multiple ideological attestation"—that can also be applied to much earlier reconstructions of the life of Jesus, or of Paul.

[50]Cf. Bartlett, *Remembering*, 63–94; Barry Schwartz, "Social Change and Collective Memory: The Democratization of George Washington," *American Sociological Review* 56 (1991): 221–36.

often staying in any city for only a short period of time. This broad impression about Paul within the complex, multi-layered Pauline traditions of the late first and early second centuries bears the highest likelihood of capturing something accurate about Paul the historical figure. At this point we do not need to know that he visited a particular city on a precise date to establish the general picture.

At this level of abstraction, however, we have not said much. So, we will want to go further. We must then articulate more precise images of the apostle that can begin to populate a plausible metanarrative.[51] This should be done without having to secure particular episodes or streams of thought. For the Jesus tradition, Allison establishes with a high degree of probability that Jesus "promoted an apocalyptic eschatology," without "trying to establish that he formulated any of the relevant sayings."[52] The details of the tradition are useful in the process of image formation, but no individual detail is required.

It is not in the purview of this chapter to describe the numerous ways we might complement our broadest Pauline stroke with finer touches. One example should be sufficient for clarifying the approach. The scholarly debate about the degree to which Paul remained "within Judaism" after his adherence to Jesus Christ—a question normally limited to evidence from the occasional, and often obscure, "authentic" Pauline Epistles—would benefit from a turn to the early Pauline tradition. As Isaac Oliver has recently reminded us, the Paul of canonical Acts continues to position himself within Judaism in significant ways even after his encounter with the risen Christ.[53] He has Timothy circumcised (Acts 16:3), celebrates Pentecost (Acts 20:16), takes a Nazarite vow (Acts 21:26), speaks in a "Hebrew dialect" (Acts 21:40), calls himself a Pharisee (Acts 23:6), refers to his fellow Jews as "my people" (Acts 24:17; 28:19), and marks time by Yom Kippur (Acts 27:9). Paul's *modus operandi* in Acts is "to the Jew first, but also to the Greek" (Rom 1:16; 2:9–10) as he enters cities of the diaspora and proclaims the risen Messiah in their synagogues. Canonical Acts is not alone, however, in portraying Paul as a practicing Jew who saw his fellow Jews as being within close orbit of his ministry. The *Martyrdom of Paul*, independent of Acts, portrays the apostle, in the final breaths before his execution, facing east and praying "in the Hebrew dialect" to "the fathers" (*Acts Paul* 11.5). Papyrus 46 (𝔓46) contains Hebrews in second position after Romans. Clearly its scribe and likely the scribe of the manuscript from which it was copied viewed Paul's calling to "all the nations" (Rom 1:5) as naturally including those of Jewish birth (Heb 1:1: "our fathers"). The Muratorian Fragment says that Paul took Luke around with him as one "zealous for the Law" (5). This line has been variously amended and interpreted by scholars, but perhaps we should take it at face value: the Muratorian Fragment remembers Paul's close associate, the author of Acts, as Torah-observant (whether as a Jew or a gentile the text does not disclose).

These texts help to balance out the sometimes lazy generalization of a disappearing Jewish Paul in the second century—a purported disappearance attributed alternatively to Marcion, the Ebionites, or the rising anti-Judaism of what would become orthodox

[51]James Fentress and Chris Wickham (*Social Memory* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1992], 72) have described this process of image construction: "Remembering in visual images, syntactically linked and articulated in a causal and logical relation, we make up little stories. This is a 'mnemotechnique' we constantly use without being aware of it."

[52]Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 231.

[53]Isaac Oliver, "The 'Historical Paul' and the Paul of Acts: Which Is More Jewish?," in *Paul the Jew: Rereading the Apostle as a Figure of Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Garbriele Boccaccini and Carlos A. Segovia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016), 51–71.

Christianity. Strikingly, their portrayal of a decidedly Jewish Paul cuts against the grain of this rising anti-Judaism. Here we ought to ask whether a repurposed “criterion of dissimilarity” might be relevant for wading through the Pauline tradition.[54] Rather than leveraging it in the service of discrete data, as has been so often done in Historical Jesus scholarship, might we not use it as *an* (not *the*) aide in sorting through the mnemonic bricolage of the early Pauline tradition as we seek to describe that retentive aspect of collective memory that exists alongside its innovative aspects?

Paul *appears* within Judaism in so many of his early receptions, I would argue, precisely because he *was* a Jew, and he was remembered as such, long after his calling to announce the gospel of the Jewish God’s son to all the nations, including his own, even as Jewishness was increasingly construed as the disinherited sibling of Christianity. I do not wish, at least at this stage, to isolate this or that event in Acts, or the *Martyrdom of Paul*, as being historically probable, or to claim that a Jewish Paul makes his authorship of Hebrews any more likely, but only to argue that the broad impression left by the data raised here means something, not just for our understanding of the second century, but also for the first. This widely attested impression provides a mnemonic framework for interpreting the Pauline Epistles and sets some expectations for the evaluation of their authenticity. In this way they are perhaps more hermeneutically significant than even the epistles themselves in imagining the life of Paul.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has argued for a new historiographical approach to Pauline biography—an approach that begins not with scientifistic and ultimately subjective decisions about the authorship of the Pauline Epistles, rooted in our own modern receptions of the apostle and coupled with Cartesianism, but with a mapping and vetting of the receptions of Paul from the long second century. The goal is not to find the Archimedean point for leveraging a definitive Pauline biography, but to find the proper set of traditions and tools from which we should begin our task. Decisions about the authenticity of particular epistles will need to be made along the way, but only after we have understood how oral histories about Paul developed and were transmitted over the course of a century, beginning in his own lifetime, and how we might evaluate our literary evidence for the DEPT in the second century in relation to the retentive aspect of collective memory. Here we will begin to develop some expectations about what Paul could or could not have written.

What kind of Paul might we find if we do not initially privilege a few passages from a few epistles as demarcating the “real” Paul? That remains to be seen, although I have some intuitions. I think that we will find in the gist memory of early Christ faith a Paul who is more Jewish, as I have noted, more encratic (1 Corinthians is the earliest and most widely attested letter of Paul in the long second century), more numinous, and more “ecclesiastical” than the Paul whom we have found so firmly lodged in our imaginations in the post-Reformation West. What this ultimately means, of course, is that Pauline studies will have to take on an orientation toward the fecund second century. We can only find Paul from within the tradition.

[54]The criteria of dissimilarity and embarrassment (or sometimes double dissimilarity) continue to be defended by Historical Jesus scholars of quite different ideological commitments. Cf. Bermejo-Rubio, “Theses on the Nature of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung,” 23, 33; Daniel B. Wallace, “Textual Criticism and the Criterion of Embarrassment,” in Bock and Komoszewski, *Jesus, Skepticism and the Problem of History*, 93–124.