

INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR Michael R. Greenwald

TITLE "Jewish Approaches to Paul"

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. ☐ D.H.L. ☐ Rabbinic ☒

Master's [] Prize Essay []

1. May circulate []) Not necessary
2. Is restricted [☒] for 10 years.) for Ph.D. thesis

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis.
- | | |
|---------------|--------------|
| <u> </u> | X |
| yes | no |

May 13, 1975
Date

Herb R. Greenwald
Signature of Author

Library
Record

Microfilmed 7/11/75
Date

Moira Sterner
Signature of Library Staff Member

Jewish Approaches to Paul

Michael B. Greenwald

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

June, 1975

Refered, Prof. Samuel Sandmel

Digest of
Jewish Approaches to Paul
Michael R. Greenwald

This thesis is a survey of the scholarship on Paul written by Jews in Hebrew and English, concentrating particularly on Montefiore, Klausner, Sandmel, and Schoeps. I attempt to discern their conclusions on particular aspects of Pauline studies and the methodologies used in deriving those conclusions. I also attempt to discover any underlying motives in the writings of these men and see if there are any trends evident in Jewish scholarship on Paul.

I begin, therefore, with a review of that scholarship and the basic problems of Pauline studies: the paucity and contradictoriness of the sources, the conflict between the Greek and Jewish worlds of thought, and the difficulty in understanding exactly what Paul is trying to say.

The sources themselves are then dealt with in some detail: the problems confronting the student in using them and their status, in terms of their acceptance, among Jewish scholars. No attempt is made to treat the Epistles as they would be treated in a basic introduction to Pauline literature.

I then attempt to portray the details of Paul's life insofar as they are known for certain, and to bring to light some of the difficulties in handling Paul's Pharisaism.

The thought of Paul is treated topically, progressing from Paul's pre-suppositions regarding the nature of man,

sin, and salvation to his specific doctrines of the Christ, the Law of Moses, the sacraments, faith, and the election of Israel. This is followed by a brief discussion of Paul's ethical assumptions.

In conclusion, I find that there are two major characteristics in Jewish writings on Paul. The early writers were writing not so much to discern truth in any objective sense as they were writing to defend Judaism against the attacks of both Paul himself and the nineteenth century German scholars. It is also the case that almost all of the Jewish writers until Sandmel, Schoeps, and Rubenstein have virtually ignored the Christian scholarship on Paul thereby producing a view of Paul heavily reliant upon Acts of the Apostles and worthy of Christian orthodoxy.

I would like to express my appreciation to Professor Samuel Sandmel for his invaluable assistance in the preparation of this thesis and for his help in choosing a topic that was controllable.

I would also like to thank Ms. Nancy Oakes for her time in proof-reading the final draft.

Table of Contents

Preface -----	iv
Chapter I - Introduction -----	1
History of the Research -----	1
Problems in Constructing the Life of Paul -----	5
Problems in Constructing the Theology of Paul -----	7
Chapter II - The Sources -----	38
Acts of the Apostles -----	38
The Epistles -----	58
Apocryphal Acts -----	68
Other Sources -----	68
Chapter III - The Life of Paul -----	71
Chapter IV - Elements of Paul's Thought -----	85
The Nature of Man -----	86
Sin -----	87
Salvation -----	90
The Christ -----	94
How Not to Obtain Salvation: The Law of Moses -----	101
The Mechanics of Salvation -----	108
The Election of Israel -----	114
Ethics -----	116
Chapter V - Analysis and Conclusions -----	119
Notes to Chapter I -----	134
Notes to Chapter II -----	143
Notes to Chapter III -----	152
Notes to Chapter IV -----	156
Notes to Chapter V -----	172
Bibliography -----	174

Preface

An essay of this type, in which the referee is also part of the subject, requires an explanation to the reader of the sources of certain biases and the efforts made to avoid them.

I began my study of Paul two years ago under the guidance of Dr. Samuel Sandmel. Although during that time, Dr. Sandmel in no way attempted either to force his particular views upon me or to coerce me into accepting his assumptions, as is natural in the course of a student-teacher relationship, my methods and perceptions became, perhaps, a reflection of his.

When I began to do the research for this essay, I was determined to remain as independent of Dr. Sandmel as possible. I resolved to look at the major problems afresh and from an "absolutely objective" perspective. To minimize the possibility of mimicing my teacher, I decided to write most of my critical notes prior to reading his books and articles and would attempt to ignore the fact that I had read twice previously his major work on the subject, The Genius of Paul.

When I finally began to read Dr. Sandmel's works, however, I was quite dismayed. For although on a few minor points I either had disagreed with him or felt that perhaps he had overstated his case, in spite of all of my efforts, I found

that virtually all of my major conclusions and analyses either had been anticipated or explicitly stated by him - if not in The Genius of Paul, then in another work, The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity: Certainties and Uncertainties, which I had not read previously.

It was very frustrating - but in my own defense, please allow me to continue. Dr. Sandmel has been called a "historical agnostic"; and I hope that he will not find it derogatory if I say that I think that this is untrue. Rather, I believe that his "agnosticism" is, in reality, a caution produced by clear-sightedness and plain common sense. And if my views reflect this "agnosticism", I prefer to believe that this reflects my own undergraduate training in physics and astronomy as much as it does his approach. In the sciences, a proposition may be related to one of several states: one can check it by experiment - if it works, it becomes a fact, if it does not, it is discarded altogether. Another possibility is that the proposition can be proven mathematically - in this case, it can become either a fact or a principle and again, if the proof does not work, it is discarded. And finally, if one has a hypothesis which is demonstrated by the available evidence yet cannot be subjected either to experiment or to mathematical proof, it becomes a theory - no more, no less - no matter how overwhelming the evidence may be. A theory is discarded only when the evidence is overwhelmingly against it. This then is my background.

In historical analysis, however, two of these options are not available. Historical hypotheses are not subject either to direct experiment, that is, observation, or to mathematical proof. Rather, they may only be correlated with available documents and perhaps archaeological data and therefore are subject only to demonstration, not proof. Another problem to which historical hypotheses are subject is the reliability of the data.

Thus "agnosticism" refers to an awareness that each datum gives us only a limited amount of information and that the information itself may not be reliable. The only certainty that a document conveys is that the author believes that it is correct. It does not clearly tell us the beliefs of its readers - the fact that it is preserved merely indicates that it had readers. Thus, conclusions must frequently be drawn from relatively scanty information - and if the information is too scanty, then it may be better for the conclusion not to be drawn at all.

Yet the fact remains that my approach to the material has generally paralleled Dr. Sandmel's. And the reader may find that this thesis, being largely bibliographical in nature, is no more than an exercise in eclecticism, and if so, I plead only the excuse that it is the nature of the work itself.

Jewish Approaches to Paul

Chapter I

Introduction

History of the Research

Less than a hundred years have passed since the first statement was made by a Jew in scholarly appraisal of Paul of Tarsus.¹ In 1886, S.H. Schiller-Szinessy published an article in The Expositor, a British theological journal, entitled "St. Paul from a Jewish Point of View" in an attempt to show how "Jewish" Paul really was. The article was poorly done - many of Schiller-Szinessy's pre-suppositions about Judaism were totally erroneous² and there was virtually no recourse to Christian scholarship on Paul, such that many of his statements were based on assumptions that even in his time were no longer considered valid. But the article is significant in that it was first. An immediate response to this article was forthcoming. Solomon Schechter published a scathing rebuttal in the November 19, 1886 issue of the Jewish Chronicle.³ But Schechter never wrote on Paul again.⁴

Nothing then appeared until 1893 when the second volume of Heinrich Graetz's History of the Jews was published

in English.⁵ Graetz was the first to consider both Jesus and Paul integral elements of Jewish history. His scholarship on Paul made no attempt to cover the ground already surveyed by Christian scholars, but rather, attempted to portray events as described in the Book of Acts. The problems engendered by this approach will be discussed in later chapters.

The next item to appear was an article entitled "First Impressions of Paul" by Claude G. Montefiore and published in the Jewish Quarterly Review of 1894. This article is confused and unclear, and Montefiore tried to say too much in too little space. It is for these reasons that this article has never been cited in the scholarship. But Claude G. Montefiore was to be the first Jew ever to attempt an in-depth study of Paul's thought or background. Another article, in the 1901 edition of the Jewish Quarterly Review, has similarly attracted little scholarly attention. But in 1914, Montefiore published a two essay volume, Judaism and St. Paul: Two Essays, in which he attempted to discern Paul's background, rescue rabbinic Judaism from the denigration it had received at the hands of Christian scholars, and determine what, if anything, liberal Judaism might learn from Paul. Montefiore has been attacked for being overly apologetic to the Christians,⁶ but at all times, his goal was to promote better understanding between the two traditions.

The next Jewish writings of major consequence to appear

were those of Leo Baeck.⁷ Baeck, in this early period,⁸ did not attempt to approach Paul directly. Rather, his essays were either explanations of the contrasts between Judaism and Christianity or outright polemics against Christianity and were an outgrowth of his earlier work, Das Wesen des Judentums which was published in 1905 as a response to Harnack's Das Wesen des Christentums. His work, at this point, is notable for its tone and motives. In this latter aspect, as we shall see, he is comparable to Montefiore.

Thus until 1925, Montefiore was the only Jew who had attempted any serious study of Paul - and he was spurned by Jews as an apologist and his scholarship was disparaged by Christians as being out of the main stream of scholarly endeavor.⁹ But during the 1920's, several important events occurred. In 1921, George Foot Moore published "Christian Writers on Judaism" in the Harvard Theological Review. In this article, he attacked the nineteenth century German scholarship on Judaism as being unfairly biased. Then in 1924, R. Travers Herford published a book entitled The Pharisees which was a signal that a new approach must be taken to this much maligned group.¹⁰ And later, in 1927, Moore published his Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, and thereby helped to engineer an adjustment toward a fairer Christian view of Judaism.¹¹ But most important for our purposes is the fact that in 1925, Joseph Klausner

published his ישו הנצרי, the first book ever written on Jesus by a Jew in Hebrew.¹² In 1939, Klausner published his second major work on Christianity, מישו עד פאולוס. The effect of these books was twofold. First, they opened Christian studies to a larger Jewish, Hebrew speaking audience. And second, they made Christian studies a more acceptable field for a Jew to enter.¹³ Indeed, Klausner was the first Jew writing in Hebrew, English, or French to approach the New Testament critically; since for all of his ground-breaking achievements, Montefiore had left the critical work to others.

It was not until long after the Second World War that another major work on Paul was produced by a Jew. In the late 1950's, two works appeared almost simultaneously: Samuel Sandmel's The Genius of Paul in 1958 and Hans Joachim Schoeps's Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish History¹⁴ in 1959. Klausner still had approached Paul as the bête noire of Judaism. But with Sandmel and Schoeps, Jews had finally begun to approach Paul with the same critical eye as the Christian scholars.

Since that time, Schoeps has published virtually nothing new on the subject and Sandmel has published The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity: Certainties and Uncertainties (1969) and some pertinent articles (most notably "Paul Reconsidered" in Two Living Traditions (1972)), but the only new name in the field has been Richard

Rubenstein whose My Brother Paul, published in 1972, has been, in light of the major portion of past scholarship, an aberrant addition to the literature.¹⁵ Thus the Jewish contribution to Pauline studies has been relatively sparse. Indeed, in all of Jewish scholarly history, only Klausner, Sandmel, and Schoeps have made full scale analyses of the thought of Paul. It is, however, a perspective of this literature which this paper will attempt to present.

Problems in Constructing the Life of Paul

The major problems which confront us in attempting to reconstruct Paul's life are simply stated: we have few sources and those which we do have are in conflict with each other. Though simply stated, these two problems sound almost impossible to resolve - and the fact is that they are. We know virtually nothing which is certain.

Most of our data for the details of Paul's life comes from the New Testament book called Acts of the Apostles. The title is misleading since seventy-five per cent of the book is about Paul. The Book of Acts is traditionally considered to be the second part of the Gospel According to Luke; a tradition almost universally accepted and one which is universally accepted among Jewish scholars. However, since Rudolf Bultmann's work on form criticism in the 1920's, scholars have realized that the synoptic gospels, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, although apparently relating the history of

the ministry of Jesus of Nazareth, tell us as much or more about the thought of the author as they tell of the actual events in the life of Jesus. This "purpose" of the author, which can be traced through his gospel, is called tendenz. One would suspect, therefore, that if tendenz appears in the Gospel According to Luke, it would also appear in Acts of the Apostles. Furthermore, Luke is the most literary of the synoptic writers and as such, his historical style corresponds most closely to that of other Greek writers of history such as Thucydides and Josephus. This is most prominent in the recording of speeches at which neither he nor, at times, anyone else who could have served as a recorder was present. But here we must note that the ancient writers of history did not attempt to portray events with nineteenth and twentieth century scientific accuracy. It is only when we, two thousand years later, try to glean such accuracy from the documents that problems arise.

We also have some data on Paul's life from the Epistles of Paul. However, sometimes this data, limited though it is, is at variance with that espoused in the Book of Acts. Which should we accept? Are the Epistles themselves genuine? And if they are genuine, is the history related therein reliable? These are the problems with which we shall deal in greater detail in chapters two and three.

Problems in Constructing the Theology of Paul

As the problems in constructing the life of Paul are difficult, so too are the problems in constructing Paul's theological outlook. But here the difficulties, although of greater complexity, are not as insurmountable: the amount of conflicting data is less and we have a number of "epistles" from Paul's own hand. Our major problem in this area thus becomes, "Against what sort of background do we place Paul and what are his religious suppositions?" For as Sandmel points out, the proper question is not "What is the background of such-and-such a passage? but, rather: in the light of such-and-such a background, what does this passage mean in its context?"¹⁶ The problem is analogous to that of a piece of gray paper which when placed against a black background looks light but when placed against a white background looks dark.

i - Background

As Alexander's armies were conquering western Asia in the fourth pre-Christian century, their culture was following close behind and entrenching itself more securely than any army ever could. In some areas such as Palestine, the contrast between the Hellenistic culture of the Greeks and the indigenous culture of the local population was marked. In Judea in particular, the clash between the two cultures became so great that it took the form of armed rebellion, and

in 163 B.C., Judea became, in effect, an independent country. There are those among our scholars, in particular Ellis Rivkin, who see the ensuing events, especially the growth of the movement later known as Pharisaism,¹⁷ as a reaction against the formerly imposed Hellenistic culture. By the time of Paul, therefore, this reaction had already had two hundred years of development such that, while the cultural milieu of the Egyptian city of Alexandria and the Syrian city of Antioch were relatively similar, that of Jerusalem, only a few hundred miles from either and mid-way between them, was very different.

But our problem does not stop at the isolation of the two divergent cultures - for at this time most Jews lived outside of Palestine. On this point, all scholars are agreed - the only disagreement is over numbers.¹⁸ Thus, outside of Palestine, the syncretic influences of cultural cohabitation continued during the two hundred year period after the independence of Judea. Now we must ask ourselves if we have any sources which might demonstrate the effects of these syncretic influences. The answer is yes. We have the relatively numerous works of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha including those written in Palestine which show non-Palestinian influences such as the books of Jubilees and Enoch as well as those written outside of Palestine and which are yet unmistakably Jewish such as the Wisdom of Solomon, IV Maccabees, and certain books of the Sibylline Oracles.

We also have the writings of Flavius Josephus, a Palestinian and avowed Pharisee living, at the time of his writing, in the Diaspora, the philosophical treatises of Philo Judaeus of Alexandria, and the writings of a few Jewish literary figures such as Aristobulus who also lived in the Diaspora.

Problems arise, however, when we attempt to find a consistent interpretation of these sources. Even with Philo of Alexandria, the acme of Jewish writing in the Diaspora, the scholarship is split so as to include the poles of both possible extremes: from Émile Bréhier¹⁹ who all but ignores the fact that Philo was a Jew to Harry A. Wolfson who treats Philo as though he were a collateral Pharisee.²⁰ Thus any attempt to find a consensus on the issue of background is going to leave us with an open question. Still, we are obligated to determine a background against which we may place Paul.

There are two major backgrounds which one may attempt to construct in order to properly situate Paul and his apostleship: Palestinian Judaism (usually Pharisaism but both Klausner and Schoeps include apocalypticism) and Hellenistic Judaism (which is what most critics mean when they say Hellenism, thereby assuming that Paul's Judaism is innate). Other backgrounds which have been variously applied are Hellenism (meaning pagan Hellenism), Schoeps's "eschatological approach",²¹ early Christianity,²² and that which Montefiore,²³ Sandmel,²⁴ and Rubenstein²⁵ all aver is the most important: Paul himself.

Yet although it is true that Paul the man is, in light of our present knowledge, thoroughly unique, this avenue may not be approached until we have some idea of where to start.

The first place that most Jewish writers begin to look is Pharisaic Judaism - for Paul himself states that he is a Pharisee.²⁶ But there are problems with this approach - because as Montefiore and Sandmel properly point out, whether one deals with "rabbinic", apocalyptic, or Hellenistic Judaism, the amount that we know for certain about these Judaisms as they may have existed in Paul's lifetime²⁷ is very little indeed. About Pharisaic (Montefiore uses the term "Rabbinic") Judaism, we only have sources from at least one hundred years later²⁸ and as Montefiore further states, the material which we do have from the period of 100 B.C. - 100 A.D. "is the work of writers whose relation to Rabbinic Judaism is often doubtful and disputed".²⁹

Yet in spite of this, there are a number of critics who attempt to place Paul against a rabbinic Jewish background. Schoeps acknowledges that it may be difficult to point out particular influences, but that one may see in Paul the exegetical and argumentative manner of the schools. He tells us that "the fact that Paul was a 'rabbinist', that his religion is to be approached as a 'radicalized Pharisaism' or 'Pharisaism on a new basis' (Lohmeyer)³⁰ may be accepted without further discussion".³¹ The question for Schoeps becomes, therefore, not whether this statement is valid,

but "How far is this statement valid and when must we revert to Judaic Hellenism?" At this point, it would be proper to interject that this view of Paul as a "rabbinist" corresponds with that of Rivkin who says that "whatever is not original in Paul is Pharisaic..." But Rivkin then invalidates Schoeps's question by adding "... not Hellenistic".³² Schoeps, however, continues. He points to Paul's Rabbinic exegesis citing the following traits: first, all of Paul's arguments even those dealing with the Christ, must have a Biblical basis. He cites Grönbech:

"The attempt to understand the logic and argumentation of Paul must give a Greek a headache. For a Jew, he is a theologian who is a master of the correct technical method of scriptural exegesis but in consequence of some perversity applies it so falsely that he arrives at nonsensical results".³³

Secondly, he says that in Paul's scriptural quotes, those from the **נבואים** supersede those of the **חורא**. Furthermore, Paul knew the seven hermeneutic principles of Hillel for deriving halakha, tended toward the aggadic style of midrash nonetheless, and dealt with the concepts of **זכור** **אכור**, pessimistic judgement about the **יצר הרע**, and other rabbinic doctrines. Schoeps concludes by saying that "every explanation proceeding from rabbinism deserves a limine preference over all other explanations"³⁴ as long as it can be demonstrated adequately.

This view is nearly congruent with that of Baeck in his later essay³⁵ and with that of Klausner.³⁶ However, to

Schoeps's view Baeck adds that Paul treated Hellenism in the same manner as did some Palestinian teachers. His prime example of this is the treatment of "wisdom" in the Greek sense as the חכמה of the Bible. In other words, the Greeks had חכמה but they did not have תורה.³⁷ He also sees Paul's Judaism (Palestinian Judaism implied) reflected in his response to the event at Damascus which resulted in Paul's apostleship:

"A Greek who had experienced such a vision would have reflected, talked, and mused, or spoken and written about it; he would not have heard the Jewish command: 'Go' --- 'Thou shalt go'. The Greek had no God who laid claim on him and sent him out to be His messenger. Only the Jew would always be aware that the revelation entailed the mission..."³⁸

Klausner too states in the strongest terms that Paul was a Palestinian Jew,³⁹ but he adds another dimension. Klausner recognized many striking resemblances between Paul and Philo. But Klausner says that Philo too is inexorably bound to Palestinian Judaism. Klausner is willing to acknowledge that both Paul and Philo do display Greek influences,⁴⁰ but even that aspect of Philo which most observers consider thoroughly Hellenistic, his concept of the λόγος of God (with which we will deal more fully below), he considers to be an angel or archangel and thus fully consistent with strains of Judaism found in Palestine.⁴¹

To the assessment of Paul as a Palestinian Jew, Klausner adds that Paul lived according to Jewish Law "like a proper

Jew", knew the Old Testament in the original Hebrew and meditated upon it, and, as it says in the Book of Acts, sat at the feet of Rabban Gamaliel.⁴² Klausner concluded that Paul was a Palestinian Jew "gone astray", one who innately despised Greek learning but who, against his will, was affected and influenced by the Hellenistic culture with which he had come in contact,⁴³ and that ultimately, "there is nothing in the teaching of Paul - not even the mystical elements in it - that did not come from authentic Judaism".⁴⁴

Another Jewish writer who sees Paul as a Palestinian Pharisee is Hugh Schonfield. But since Schonfield adds so much insupportable material, his conclusions will have to be discussed individually as they become relevant.⁴⁵

Ellis Rivkin also interprets Paul as a Palestinian Pharisee, but also allows that there might have been an independent Hellenistic Judaism. But Rivkin then asks if there might not also be a Hellenistic Pharisaism which was more intimately connected with Palestine. Rivkin says that Judaism in the Diaspora may be characterized by its commitment to monotheism, the Pentateuch, and the Aaronide cultus, its commitment to Hellenistic monarchies and polis institutions as compatible with Pentateuchal monotheism, and a blending of Hellenistic cultural and ideational motifs with Pentateuchal monotheism. However, if we look at the literature of these communities, by which Rivkin means the Hellenistic works of the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha such as, I presume,

the Wisdom of Solomon, the Sibylline Oracles, the Letter of Aristeas, and IV Maccabees, we find that they are not committed to the concept of the twofold Law (that is, the Oral and Written Law) which must be considered the touch-stone for Pharisaism. Yet Paul claimed to be a Pharisee and Paul lived in the Diaspora. Thus we do have a first-hand acknowledgement of an existing Diaspora Pharisaism. But if the touch-stone of Pharisaism is the twofold Law, and we have already demonstrated that the Pentateuchal Judaism of the Diaspora is not committed to the twofold Law, then Hellenistic Pentateuchalism, that is, Hellenistic Judaism such as demonstrated by the Apocrypha-Pseudepigrapha and Philo, is not equal to Pharisaism and a Pharisee in the Diaspora, such as Paul, is not the same as a Hellenistic Jew in the Diaspora such as Philo, the author of the Letter of Aristeas, or the author of IV Maccabees.⁴⁶ Schoeps agrees that there might have been a Pharisaism in the Diaspora which was separate from the Hellenistic Judaism of Philo.⁴⁷

Most of the discussion about a Palestinian Jewish background for Paul has centered on the Pharisaic-Rabbinic mode of Palestinian Judaism. And this is probably as it should be, for it is quite clear that Christianity, and Pauline Christianity in particular, bear little resemblance to the Temple Judaism of the Sadducees, and although Kaufman Kohler, in his article in the Jewish Encyclopaedia, said that Paul

used Essene writings as a basis for his thought,⁴⁸ this mode has been little explored by Jewish writers. Yet another possibility, which Schoeps includes in his "Palestinian-Judaic Approach", is that of Apocalypticism. Schoeps does not discuss this in great detail in his own thought, and except for Klausner, who mentions it only as an allusion, it too is dismissed as a principal background for Paul by Jewish writers.

The other possible background for Paul which must receive major consideration is that of a Hellenistic Judaism. That a discrete Hellenistic Judaism even existed is itself a matter for debate. Montefiore, in looking at Paul's attitude toward Judaism - and this statement perhaps should be further qualified to say that Montefiore saw Paul's attitude toward Judaism as much through the eyes of the nineteenth century German Protestant scholars who in turn saw it through the eyes of Martin Luther as he did through Paul's eyes - decided that no true "Rabbinic" Jew could possibly perceive Judaism, especially the Law of Moses, as Paul did. In stating his case, Montefiore admitted that we know very little about the Judaism of 30-50 A.D. - but in its spirit, the "Rabbinic" Judaism of that period (by which we must assume he means Pharisaism) could not have been substantially different from that of 300-500 A.D. at which time, says Montefiore, those who professed to be Rabbinic Jews, the writers of the Talmud, demonstrated a profound love of Judaism, a "joy of the

commandments",⁴⁹ and a lack of burdensomeness of the Law. And he does not understand, therefore, how someone who also professed to be an adherent of this same group could at once understand the religion and not also love it. Montefiore says that therefore, "either the Rabbinic Judaism of 50 was not the Rabbinic Judaism of 500 (or 300), or Paul at the time of his conversion was no pure Rabbinic Jew".⁵⁰ But he also says:

"In one point only was the Rabbinic Judaism of the first century probably much inferior to the Rabbinic Judaism of the fourth or fifth. In the first century, the opposition between the learned and the ignorant must have been much more intense and much more violent than it afterwards became. A class of people existed who, for one reason or another, did not observe the Law, and were regarded by the teachers as outcasts and reprobates [the עמי הארץ]. But it is an interesting fact that these people, who form a background for the life of Jesus, do not do so for Paul".⁵¹

That is, Paul was not one of these ignorant people, rather, he claimed to be a Pharisee. But, Montefiore feels that he has already demonstrated that Paul could not possibly have been a Rabbinic Jew and, if not, then that Judaism which he castigated, and by extension, that Judaism to which he adhered, was other than Rabbinic Judaism. And this stands to reason - for Paul "had been subject, and had become susceptible, to those outside influences which were not Jewish at all".⁵² And it was these outside influences which produced a religion in Paul which differed from Rabbinic Judaism in that "it was poorer than, and inferior [to it]. It may have been more

systematic, and perhaps a little more philosophic and less child-like, but possibly for these very reasons it was less intimate, warm, joyous, and comforting. Its God was more distant and less loving. He was less immediately concerned with Israel and with the world; He left more 'spheres of influence' to the control of angels and devils".⁵³

Montefiore called this "poorer" and "inferior" Judaism Hellenistic Judaism. He did not, however, attempt to tell us much about what it was - only what it was not. And what it was not was Rabbinic Judaism.

Montefiore might have had a little more flesh to put on this skeleton he created had he been aware of the articles "Judaism in the pre-Christian World" (1897) and "The 'Pauline' Emancipation from the Law: a Product of the pre-Christian Diaspora" (1902) by M. Friedländer. These articles seem to have escaped the notice of most modern critics, although in the second, Friedländer alludes to a rebuttal of the first by Emil Schürer. In the first, he postulated a Diaspora Judaism divided into two camps: "one law-abiding and national, the other addicted to philosophical analysis of the original text of Scripture and advocating unlimited universalism".⁵⁴ He goes on to say in his second article, that Greek Jews had, by and large, made of the Mosaic Law a revealed divine philosophy and that the Septuagint, having been translated two hundred fifty years before, must have bred allegorists. This leads to an expansion of his former statement such that

it should now read:

"That before the dawn of Christianity there already existed in the dispersion a Jewish party, or, rather, to be more precise, a Jewish sect which, on the ground of allegorical interpretation repudiated ceremonial law, rejected the rite of circumcision, Sabbaths, and festivals, and other religious institutions; took their stand outside national Judaism, and incurred the severe censure not only of the masses of simple believers, but also of liberal and cultured men of Philo's stamp".⁵⁵ (underlining Friedländer's)

He then goes beyond the realm of our work by identifying these sects as the Ophites, Cainites, Sethites, and Melchizedekites - Jewish mysteries - whose common denominator was their antinomianism.⁵⁶ One should note, however, that these non-national antinomian sects were not the "Hellenistic Judaism" of Philo and Paul which we are considering; rather, these are the sects against which Philo writes in "De Migratione Abrahami" and "De Posteritate Caini". Therefore for our purposes, the importance of the articles is not in their specific details; rather, it is to show the wide spectrum of Judaism which existed or might have existed in the Hellenistic Diaspora.

It was not until the 1930's, with the uncovering of the frescoes at the synagogue of Dura-Europus, that concrete evidence was available for the existence of a Judaism divergent in form from that of Palestine. The most significant aspects of these frescoes were that one, they portrayed images, an aspect not characteristic of Palestinian synagogues

and seemingly antithetical to Judaism as the Pharisees interpreted it, and two, that these images seemed, at least to the eyes of Erwin R. Goodenough,⁵⁷ to represent an allegorical interpretation of Judaism which Goodenough called the Jewish Mystery. It is on the basis of this Jewish Mystery that Goodenough understands a Hellenistic Judaism, the highest literary figure of which was Philo of Alexandria. Goodenough, in his portrayal of a Jewish Mystery as analogous to the Greek mysteries, may have been somewhat excessive, but the groundwork for a new appraisal of pre-Christian Diaspora Judaism had been laid.

Sandmel, working against the background of an existing Hellenistic form of Judaism, says that there are three basic forms which the Hellenization of Judaism might take: the adoption of Greek language, the adoption of Greek philosophy - or at least Greek modes of thought, and the adoption of Greek ways of doing things.⁵⁸ He also says that these forms might occur in three varying degrees: that seen in Rabbinic Judaism, which shows overtones only; that seen in Josephus, a Palestinian Jew who knew the Greek world but only from without, who shows some degree of Hellenization but on an unprofound level, and whose efforts at writing about Greek philosophy show familiarity and acquaintance but not study; and that of Philo, who, according to Sandmel, shows a maximum degree of Hellenization in his theosophical writings but who is still unmistakably Jewish.⁵⁹ It is interesting

to note that Sandmel does not include a fourth degree, that theorized by Friedländer and Goodenough, in which Judaism exists in a form which is recognizable only as Hellenistic, a form which is so similar to the Greek mysteries as to be identifiable with them, and which is thus Jewish only in its own historical perspectives of its origins. It is also interesting to note that Paul has been categorized in each of the first three degrees by various critics (the first degree by Schonfield, the second by Klausner, Rivkin, and Schoeps, and the third by Sandmel and Montefiore) and that Philo is considered in the second degree by Wolfson, the third degree by Sandmel, and the fourth degree by Goodenough.

Schoeps says that in order to analyze Paul as a Hellenistic Jew, we must first bear in mind two facts: that Paul knew and spoke Aramaic and Hebrew and that there were Hellenistic Jewish antecedents to Paul. The first of these antecedents is what Schoeps calls the "Piety of the Septuagint".⁶⁰ Schoeps sees in the Septuagint a missionary purpose to Judaism which does not appear in the Hebrew Scriptures. He gives as an example of this difference the Hebrew and Greek versions of Isaiah 54:15: "מֵי-גֵר , מאוֹתֵי, מִי-גֵר" which can only be translated,

'If a people conspire together, they are nothing apart from me; whosoever conspires against me, however, will fail'"⁶¹

and "ἐνὶ ποσὶ ἁπλοῦται προσεδεύοντες σοι δὲ ἐμοῦ"

καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ καταφεύξονται⁶² in which **וַי** is translated as *προσέλκυντες* - "proselyte" instead of "one who conspires" or "one who stirs up strife". This missionary undercurrent must therefore be in the mind-set of every Jew who uses the Septuagint as his Bible. It would seem, as almost all Jewish scholars except Klausner agree, that this would include Paul. In Schoeps's words, "This universalistic 'pathos' of world mission ... was the very soul of Septuagint Jewish circles".⁶³

What Schoeps sees as being more important, however, is the fact that the Septuagint ethicized Judaism, that is, it caused it to be understood as a moral law. This is best characterized by the fact that the Septuagint translates the Hebrew word **תורה**, which although it may mean "law" is probably best translated in English as "revelation", as *νόμος*, a strictly legal term meaning "law".⁶⁴ The significance of this is also discussed by Sandmel and Montefiore and will become more important for our purposes later in this essay. This ethicization was also pointed out by Klausner as being characteristic of other Greek-Jewish writings such as the Sibylline Oracles⁶⁵ and must certainly be seen in IV Maccabees where Judaism, meaning essentially the religion of the Law, is the true revelation of Reason, with Reason being used in the technical Stoic sense.

Baeck pointed out that it was the Septuagint, or rather Scriptures in general, that differentiated Hellenism from

Judaism: that the Greeks had a uniformity of form but a multiplicity of schools of thought whereas the Jews has an anorohism of forms but a unity of religion as derived from a uniform source - the Bible.⁶⁶

But except for Sandmel ⁶⁷ and the aforementioned article by Friedlander, all Jewish scholars have ignored the most significant aspect of the Septuagint - that is, that the translation of the Pentateuch dates from approximately 250 B.C. This means that by the time of Philo and by the time of Paul, it is altogether likely that a Greek exegesis to the Septuagint had developed which was independent of the Hebrew and Aramaic exegesis of Palestine. This is not to say that the exegesis of Paul was the same as the exegesis of Philo - it was not; neither is it to say that there is nothing original in either Paul or Philo. Rather, it is simply to point out that there is no reason to expect, as so many scholars do, that for the details of their exegeses, Paul and/or Philo were reliant upon Palestinian antecedents.

The next point with which Schoeps says we must deal in reference to Hellenistic Judaism is the "Piety of Philo".⁶⁸ Schoeps indicates that Philo's deification process is relevant when we study Paul's concept of the Christ and his soteriology and, as such, Philo will be drawn upon as needed in later chapters of this paper. What is important for us now is to note that Philo is himself an enigma. Louis Ginzberg asked whether Philo was a Greek philosopher

with Jewish background and loyalties or was he a Jewish thinker couching his Judaism in philosophic terms?⁶⁹ This is analogous to the problem which we face in Paul. That Philo is a Jew is unmistakable - the fact that nearly all of his preserved writings are Biblical exegeses is sufficient to indicate that. But it is also apparent to anyone who reads Philo that he is heavily infused with the thought of the Stoics, the Pythagoreans, and Plato. Hence the religious expectations of Philo which Schoeps calls Philo's piety and which we shall call, with Sandmel, Philo's religiosity, are different from those that we find in the Palestinian rabbis but strikingly similar to those of Paul. This aspect will be treated more fully in the next section of this chapter, but now it is important to note that among Jewish scholars, Sandmel uses the religiosity of Philo as an analogue to that of Paul while the turn-of-the-century writers, Kaufman Kohler and Gerald Friedlander, draw even stronger parallels.⁷⁰

Another possible Hellenistic influence on Paul might have been Greek philosophy. Here we have a problem with the definition of philosophy. If one means by philosophy the formal philosophies of Aristotle, Plato, neoplatinists like Philo, or even the Stoics, then one must agree with Schoeps that the influence of Greek philosophy is negligible.⁷¹ Sandmel, however, believes that Paul does show strains of popular philosophy.⁷² Similarly, it is apparent that Stoic

philosophy influenced the writers of the Sibylline Oracles, the Wisdom of Solomon, and IV Maccabees, and if Paul used these works, as Klausner believes,⁷³ then there may be secondary influence from Greek philosophy.

There are, as has already been mentioned, other possible sources of input for Paul's thought - all of which may be part of, but none of which are the total of, his background. These are pagan Hellenism, early Christianity, and what Schoeps calls the "eschatological approach".⁷⁴

The first of these, pagan Hellenism, may perhaps be seen in Paul's use of the vocabulary of the popular Greek mystery religions. Schoeps lists the most prominent of these as *γνώσις*, *σωτηρία*, *σοφία*, *τέλειος*, and *μυστήριον*.⁷⁵ And indeed, this last term, mystery, is used several times by Paul as though he were merely teaching another mystery.⁷⁶ But Schoeps himself points out that these terms meant something totally different to Paul than they meant to the participants in the pagan mysteries. Schoeps, in fact, denies any demonstrable contact between Paul and Hellenistic paganism. Sandmel too alludes to Hellenistic paganism as a possible background. He refers to Goodenough, who claimed that Philo attempted to turn Judaism into a mystery - "indeed, the only true mystery".⁷⁷ He similarly acknowledges that mystery vocabulary appears in both Philo and Paul⁷⁸ but that as Jews, neither Paul nor Philo saw the mysteries as legitimate solutions to the human predicament.⁷⁹ Indeed, he claims that the assertion that Paulinism and Philonism are mysteries is

often an effort to denigrate them whereas the assertion that they are not mysteries is often an effort to rescue them from the assertion that they are.⁸⁰ Montefiore too acknowledges contact between Paul and the pagan mysteries.⁸¹ But of the Jewish critics, only Kaufman Kohler⁸² and Simon Dubnow⁸³ claim any direct borrowing from the mystery religions: assertions made with reference to the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist.

Early Christianity as an influence on Paul is mentioned by Baeck, Klausner, Montefiore, Sandmel, and Schonfield. However, Sandmel says that the state of the Christian Church prior to Paul is, by and large, unknowable.⁸⁴ Baeck nevertheless points out that there are at least three tenets which Paul received from the early Church: the miracles of Jesus,⁸⁵ the crucifixion,⁸⁶ and the resurrection from the dead on the third day.⁸⁷ Klausner adds to these the depolitization, ethicization, and exaltation of the Messiah, as well as the terms Son of Man and Son of God.⁸⁸ And although we may find other beliefs and practices such as the Eucharist and baptism which Paul found already in use by early Christians, we will defer discussion on them until they become pertinent.

Among Jews, the "eschatological approach" is made only by Schoeps who makes three major points: "That the doctrine of last things forms the 'greatest block of Jewish material in the thought-world of Paul'",⁸⁹ that the eschatological

expectation, that is, the personal Messiah, the coming Day of Judgement, and the doctrine of the two aeons, was unknown in the Hellenistic world, and, with Schweitzer, that much of Paul's eschatology becomes unintelligible because he was writing a "consistent eschatology" based on the belief that the Parousia was imminent.⁹⁰ No Jewish author denies the eschatological element in Paul's thought, but similarly, no Jewish author, other than Schoeps, sees it as an overwhelming basis of Paul's thought.⁹¹

Up to this point, we have merely pointed out the various backgrounds against which Paul may be perceived. But as one might expect, each of these views have their relative merits and detractions. That the situation is by no means uncomplicated is indicated by the statements of Sandmel, who says that it is frequently impossible to identify a given notion as Greek or Jewish,⁹² and Rubenstein, that we will probably never know just how Hellenistic or how Rabbinic Paul really was.⁹³ And the best solution, on a broad level, is probably that of Schoeps - that all of the various approaches are "relatively right" - the question is, "How relative?"⁹⁴ The three minor viewpoints discussed above are of correspondingly minor importance for our purposes. No Jew has seriously considered Paul from the perspective of pagan Hellenism, and Schoeps is correct in asserting that pagan Hellenism is significant only insofar as it influenced Jewish Hellenism and that the "acute Hellenization of

Christianity" (by which I presume Schoeps means the extreme Gnostic views which later became rampant in Christian circles) is a post-Pauline phenomenon.⁹⁵

The early Christian background has already been dealt with as fully as is necessary - for outside of a few basic facts about the death of Jesus, and even fewer about the life of Jesus, and the scant information which can be gleaned from the Epistle to the Galatians, we cannot adequately describe the circumstances of early Christianity.

And although Schoeps claims that most Jewish scholars have missed the eschatological relevance in Paul, "preferring like J. Klausner to expound an extreme and long-out-of-date liberal attitude",⁹⁶ we shall make use of this approach only when necessary. For although Paul's thought is thoroughly infused with eschatological doctrine, Paul is far too profound and far too unique to allow us to channel him so narrowly.

This leaves us with the two remaining alternatives: Paul was a Rabbinic Jew or Paul was a Hellenistic Jew. If we make recourse to the weight of opinion, at least to that of Jewish writers (that is, including non-scholarly writers) on Paul, we would find the scale tipped overwhelmingly in favor of Rabbinism. If, however, we look only to the major scholars so far enumerated, we find the balances almost even: with Baeck (in his earlier essays), Kohler, Montefiore, Sandmel, and Gerald Friedlander on the Hellenistic side and Baeck

(in his late essay, "The Faith of Paul"), Klausner, Rivkin, and Schoeps on the Rabbinic side. Thus the weight of scholarly opinion gives us no answer. Let us look, therefore, to the relative merits of each of the arguments.

That Paul shows evidence of Pharisaic-Rabbinic doctrine is, at least to me, unquestionable. I would ask the reader, however, to allow me to defer until chapter three a more detailed defense of that statement. But this fact notwithstanding, there are several serious shortcomings with the Rabbinic argument. The most serious of these is that of sources. The earliest written Rabbinic material comes from the middle of the second century. How reliable is this material for the period prior to 70 A.D.? That the rabbis read their own sitz-in-leben back into the period of the Bible is one of the fundamental principles of understanding Rabbinic texts. If the rabbis could perceive Abraham, a desert semi-nomad, as living essentially as they did, would it not be reasonable to expect that they would see Hillel and Gamaliel, their ideological forebears, in the same light? Yet we have no written Rabbinic material from that period. It is entirely possible that the "rabbinic" world of 10 - 60 A.D. was quite different from that of the post-70 era. The United States of 1950 was vastly different from that of 1930 and yet the events of 70 were no less cataclysmic from a Jewish perspective than were the Great Depression and the Second World War from an American

perspective. Schoeps said that one may see in Paul the exegetical and argumentative manner of the schools. Granted that Paul's exegesis may show Rabbinic overtones, is it possible to claim that we may use the schools as a basis? Which schools? Ishmael's and Akiba's? Of course not. Beth Hillel and Beth Shammai? This is undoubtedly what Schoeps meant - but what do we know of Beth Hillel and Beth Shammai that we do not see through the eyes of later writers?

Schoeps also tells us that all of Paul's arguments must have a Biblical basis. This is simply not true. Although we will deal with sources more fully in the next chapter, we should note that it is only in the Epistle to the Romans, the First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians, and the Epistle to the Galatians that Biblical quotes are common. In the remaining epistles generally considered to be genuine, Philippians, I Thessalonians, and Philemon, there are no Biblical quotes at all.

Schoeps tells us that "every explanation proceeding from rabbinism deserves a limine preference over all other explanations" (see above, p. 11) but he does not tell us why. This assumption seems to be prevalent in all Jewish scholars who use a Palestinian Pharisaic background to explain Paul. But it is unsatisfactory to take the word "Pharisee" from Philippians 3:5 and then make assumptions based on that word and apply them to Paul without prior recourse

to the thought of Paul himself. For although Paul may indeed have been a Pharisee, this fact, in unto itself, does not rule out any possible Hellenistic pre-suppositions which Paul may have had.

Sandmel points out three major assumptions which govern the interpretation of Paul as a Rabbinic Jew. The first is the acceptance of the testimony of the Book of Acts. That this is a problem has not yet been fully discussed, but many scholars, particularly Christian scholars, do not consider the testimony of Acts trustworthy. And yet certain information, such as Schoeps's and Klausner's belief that Paul knew Aramaic and Hebrew is based solely on that testimony. Furthermore, although Paul is portrayed as a traditional, typical Pharisee in Acts, whose only difference from the rest of the Pharisees is that he believes that Jesus was the Messiah, Paul's own Epistles display a Paul who is only marginally what we would call a Pharisee. Secondly, one must assume that there was no distinction between Hellenistic Judaism and Palestinian Judaism. Some writers, like Rivkin, avoid this objection by allowing a distinction between the Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaisms and maintaining that there was a Pharisaism in the Diaspora apart from "Hellenistic Judaism" which was virtually identical to the Pharisaism in Palestine. And lastly, many of those who refrain from attributing Hellenistic influences to Paul feel that to do so would reduce Paul's authenticity - for it was Palestinian

Judaism which was the parent religion of revelation - "Hellenism" implies the religions of the heathen.⁹⁷

There are, however, other objections to a Rabbinic view of Paul. First is the aforementioned lack of sources for the Pharisaism of the pre-70 period. Second, granted that Paul was a Pharisee, we must also acknowledge that, even in the testimony of Acts, Paul was not a native Palestinian (and although Acts claims that he was educated in Jerusalem, Galatians 1:17-18, according to many scholars, indicates that he was not) and that as a native of the Diaspora, may well have been associated with a Pharisaism that was not directly related to that of Palestine. We simply do not know what connection there was between the two. Thirdly, we do know that regardless of sect, Judaism itself was, at that time, extremely fluid - contrary to the reports of the nineteenth century German scholars. Indeed, there was not even yet a fixed canon.⁹⁸ Thus, it is all the more difficult to pinpoint a specific doctrine as Pharisaic or "Essnaic"⁹⁹ or even Jewish or Greek. And lastly, every scholar, Jewish or Christian, who attempts to use a Rabbinic background for Paul, being necessarily dependent upon later sources, ignores the profound effect of the events of 70 on both Judaism and Christianity and the events of 135 on Judaism. The trauma of the loss of nationhood was incredibly severe and it is only by interpolating the severity of that trauma that one may adequately understand the Rabbinic material.

But what of the Hellenistic approach? Are there not short-comings with that approach also? Yes. First, we must deal with the fact that Paul claimed that he was "extremely zealous ... for the traditions of his fathers"¹⁰⁰ and that he was, "according to the Law, a Pharisee".¹⁰¹ This problem will be treated more fully in the third chapter of this paper. But a second problem also arises with the Hellenistic approach - we have no direct literary testimony that an independent Hellenistic Judaism existed. If it did indeed exist, it, along with most of its literary production (which we must presume it had), has long since been purged from Judaism. But this is to be expected. After the collapse of the revolt of 66-70, of all the Palestinian Judaisms, only Pharisaism survived, and its entire perspective turned increasingly inward. After the collapse of the second revolt in 135, this introversion became intensified. Except for brief periods of a few decades, this remained the total perspective until the time of Sa'adia - and after him, only the Spanish period stands out until the nineteenth century. But meanwhile, the Roman Empire had undergone the slow process of decay and final collapse, and with it, Hellenistic civilization. By the time Judaism turned outward again, any Hellenistic Judaism which may have existed, had long since disappeared. And its literary works, Philo, the relevant Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and the works of such authors as Aristobulus and Josephus had also passed into

Jewish oblivion and were preserved only by the Church.

But apart from the findings at Dura-Europus, and the writings of Philo (whose Hellenism is still debated in scholarly circles), IV Maccabees, the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Sibylline Oracles, it must also stand to reason that such influence existed as to create a separate "Hellenistic" Judaism. We know, for example, that Judaism was sufficiently widespread to influence substantial numbers in the Hellenistic world. Many of the Diaspora synagogues contained members who were *εὐσεβὲς καὶ θεοῦ φοβούμενοι*, "fearers of God", who, while not full-fledged converts, attended the synagogues and followed at least the Noahide portions of the Law. Was the "fence around the Torah" yet so high that the influence could not have passed the other way? I doubt it. For outside of Palestine, and to a lesser degree even inside of Palestine, syncretism, pluralism, and heterogeneity were the rule and the relatively homogeneous portrait of Judaism frequently presented is the product of scholars, created because of inadequate knowledge and data and the inherent desire to simplify the known material as much as possible.

But if this is so, then in those whom we would call Hellenistic Jews, namely Paul and Philo, we would expect to find religious assumptions and expectations different from those found among the rabbis in Palestine. It is precisely this set of assumptions and expectations which Montefiore called the connection of Paul "with his entire

Weltanschauung",¹⁰² which Schoeps calls "piety", and which Sandmel calls "religiosity". And it is precisely this set of assumptions and expectations which must be our next item of examination.

ii - Religiosity

Paul, Philo, and the rabbis all had one essential aspect in common - they were all Jews. This means that there are a certain number of religious assumptions which are common to all of them and which indicate no relationship among them beyond that common aspect. The first of these assumptions is that there is a God and that God is one.¹⁰³ He is also eternal and Creator and He interacts with man, manifesting Himself both by love and through punishment.¹⁰⁴ And although for Paul and Philo, God may have been somewhat more transcendent than He was for the rabbis; Paul, Philo, and the rabbis all ask how man can achieve the proper relationship with God.¹⁰⁵ And, since the proof of an improper relationship with God is death, this question extends itself to, "How can man rise above the punishment of death and overcome his mortality?"¹⁰⁶

Another major point that all have in common is their reliance upon the Scriptures as the source of divinely revealed truth.¹⁰⁷ It is indeed this reliance upon Scriptures which causes some scholars to label both Paul and Philo as Rabbinic Jews. But this is not necessarily so, for it is a

dependency which one must expect of any Jew.

But there were basic differences between the rabbinic world and the Greek world. The rabbis believed that the world and man were essentially good, that no matter what was happening, it was happening through the will of God and that God was constantly looking out for man and for His people, Israel. The Greeks, on the other hand, saw otherwise. One look around them told them that the state of the world was rotten. Disease, filth, and poverty were ways of life. A substantial portion of the population lived in the bondage of slavery. Even among the wealthy, or perhaps especially among the wealthy, gluttony and sexual licentiousness were rife. The goal of the Greek, therefore, was escape. But how, other than by death, does one escape from the world? This was the major question confronting Paul and Philo -- it was not the major question confronting the rabbis.¹⁰⁸ It was obvious to both Paul and Philo that the world was full of sin. But if men were aware of this, and if it were universally recognized that sin was something undesirable, why could men not rectify the situation? Could it be that man was by his very nature sinful? To the eyes of the Greek, it must have been so. Thus, to escape from the world, to be saved from the world, to achieve salvation, was to reach a state of sinlessness, and the religious quest was the attainment of that state. But this is very far from the religious posture of the rabbis.

The rabbis were aware that man sinned - but was that not to be expected? God created man to be man, to be imperfect, not to be as the angels or as God Himself. If man sins, it is because it must be so, but open to man also is the option of repentance, and the truly repentant is forgiven by God. Of Jewish (that is, Rabbinic) concepts, that of repentance is most prominently missing from the thought of Paul.

There is yet another major difference between Paul and Philo on one hand and the rabbis on the other. To the rabbis, prophecy, and its essential corollary, revelation, ceased with the prophets Zechariah, Haggai, and Malachi; whereas probably for Philo and certainly for Paul, revelation was still a viable medium for knowing the Divine Will.

What our task must now become is to take the various terms and conceptions which are prevalent in Paul's thought and, using Philo as a control, compare Paul's usage of those terms and conceptions to those of the rabbis and to those of the non-Rabbinic sources. Is Paul's concept of the nature of man that of the ultimate in God's Creation, a unity, one who is essentially free to choose to do good or evil, or is it something different? Is Paul's concept of sin and righteousness the same as that of the rabbis? In other words, when Paul says *ἁμαρτία*, does he mean the same thing as the rabbis when they say *חטא* or *פשע*? Is salvation the same process for Paul as for the rabbis? Is "Christ" in

Paul's thought the same thing as "משיח", its literal Hebrew translation, for the rabbis? Does the term have any correspondence to Philo's $\lambda\gamma\epsilon\varsigma$? How does Paul treat such basic Jewish concepts as the Law of Moses and the election of Israel? What is the significance of baptism and the Eucharist for Paul? Is there a relationship between baptism and מבילה ? When Paul speaks of $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon$, does he mean אמונה ? Are Paul's ethical assumptions different from those of the rabbis? It is these questions which constitute the study of the theology of Paul and thus it is these questions which we will attempt to answer and to see how they have been answered by other Jews.

Chapter II

The Sources

Acts of the Apostles

Acts of the Apostles, the second part of the Gospel According to Luke, purports to be the tale of the deeds of the Apostles of Jesus which took place after his death. Accordingly, the book begins just after the death of Jesus with the Apostles gathered in Jerusalem. But this motif lasts for only one-fourth of the book - after which the story is almost exclusively that of Saul/Paul of Tarsus and his traveling companions.

The first appearance of this character is at the stoning of the apostle Stephen, whose adversaries "cast him out of the city and stoned him; and the witnesses laid down their garments at the feet of a young man named Saul",¹ who is portrayed as having consented to Stephen's death.²

Saul was apparently quite an ardent persecutor of the Church, for he seemed to delight in discomfitting the group.³ When, in fact, Jerusalem seemed too small an area in which to persecute "Christians" (the term here being an anachronism), Saul went to the high priest to request permission to go to Damascus with writs of extradition addressed to the local synagogues in order to bring those "belonging to the Way" back for justice.⁴ It was on his way to Damascus that Saul had a vision. In his vision, Saul saw a blinding light and

heard a voice which said, "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?"⁵ Upon inquiring as to who it was that was speaking to him in this manner, he was told by the being in the vision that it was the Risen Christ. Saul, left blind by the experience, was instructed to continue on to Damascus and seek the house of one Ananias. Following these instructions, Saul found Ananias waiting for him, having himself been informed by a vision of Jesus to await Saul's arrival (we must also point out that Ananias was apparently aware of who Saul was and what he was bearing - and as we later find out, so too were the people of Damascus). Ananias cured Saul's blindness, Saul was baptized, and then Saul went out to preach the gospel in the synagogues of Damascus. The Jews of Damascus, liking neither the sudden reversal in Saul's ways nor the message which he was preaching, plotted to kill him. He escaped over the wall in a basket and with a companion named Barnabas, fled to Jerusalem. There he was introduced to the Church by Barnabas and was accepted. When he began to preach in Jerusalem, however, the "Hellenists" plotted to kill him so he fled to Caesarea and thence to Tarsus.⁶

There is then an interlude in the story of Saul and we return to Peter in Palestine. There, Peter had had a vision which showed him that all foods are clean - the result of which was that he believed that he was free to convert a Roman centurion, that is, a Gentile, to "Christianity" -

and the significance of which was that it was Peter, not Saul/Paul, who first converted a Gentile.

It seems also that the Apostles, who were dispersed at the time of the stoning of Stephen, had been out in the Diaspora preaching and making converts (but of course, "none except Jews"⁷). Upon hearing of these conversions, Barnabas, now in Antioch, went to Tarsus to search for Saul.⁸

In chapter thirteen of Acts, we find Saul, now called Paul,⁹ in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch where, after reading from the Law and the Prophets, a general invitation was issued to anyone who might have wished to make an "exhortation". Paul accepted the invitation and preached the message of the messiahship of Jesus. If one looks at the mode of Paul's teaching in the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of Acts (Paul's first missionary journey), one might conclude the following: Paul did indeed preach to Jews and at this time did not yet intend to abrogate any part of the Law of Moses. That which was different in the mode of Paul's preaching was his willingness to allow Gentiles, that is, the uncircumcised, into the congregation. It was on this issue primarily that the Jews balked. No longer successful among the Jews, Paul was forced to go exclusively to the Gentiles. If one then assumes, as does Klausner, that Paul was an opportunist whose primary goal was to make converts, the next two steps must follow: that the Law was an impossible burden for the Gentiles to bear and therefore Paul abandoned

the Law and was forced to derive a rationale for doing so. Such can be derived from the testimony of Acts. The opposing view, that of Sandmel, that it was exactly because of Paul's view of the Law, which he had established before he began to preach to anyone, that he was rejected by the Jews, is not defensible on the basis of that testimony.

But the Jews were not the only ones who were upset by Paul's views; for some men came down from Jerusalem preaching the need for circumcision. Paul and Barnabas, violently opposed to such a pronouncement, resolved to go to Jerusalem to debate the matter.¹⁰ "When they came to Jerusalem, they were welcomed by the church, and the apostles, and the elders... But some believers, who belonged to the party of the Pharisees, rose up and said, 'It is necessary to circumcise them and charge them to keep the Law of Moses'".¹¹ But then Peter related that it had been he who had first announced that the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel.¹² A compromise was then concluded by James, brother of Jesus, to the effect that the Gentiles must merely refrain from sexual licentiousness, idolatry, and that which has been strangled.¹³ Paul, Barnabas, Judas called Barsabbas, and Silas were then sent to Antioch to announce the compromise.¹⁴ After a short time in Antioch, Paul decided to make a second missionary journey, had an argument with Barnabas over whether or not John Mark should accompany them, and left Antioch without Barnabas, taking only Silas with him.

When he reached Lystra, Paul met a disciple named Timothy and here did what even for the Paul of Acts was a curious thing: he circumcised him, ostensibly because Timothy's mother was a Jew whereas his father was a Greek.

Later in the chapter (16:10), we come to the first of the so-called "we-passages" where the narrator switches from the third person to the first person plural. Traditionally, these passages have been considered four in number: Acts 16:10-17, 20:5-15, 21:1-13, and 27:1-28:16. Kirsopp Lake, however, combined the second and third passages making only three, although as Enslin points out, if this were to be done, then that passage must be 20:5-21:26.¹⁵ It is also entirely possible, as Klausner believes,¹⁶ that 20:5-28:16 is one long "we-passage", the use of the first person merely being inappropriate for the intervening verses. Indeed, it is because of these passages taken in combination with II Timothy 4:11, "Luke alone in with me...", that tradition ascribes to Luke the Book of Acts and the gospel which is its first part.

It is in this chapter also that Paul first claims to be a Roman citizen¹⁷ and that Paul first crosses into Europe.

In chapter seventeen at Thessalonica and in chapter eighteen at Corinth, we again find Paul preaching his message in the same mode as we found him preaching at Pisidian Antioch and at Lystra. And as at the two previous cities, the major item of contention seems to have been the admission

of Gentiles to the community.¹⁸ When he reached Cenchrae, Paul "cut his hair for he had made a vow".¹⁹ He continued on to Ephesus where he was again to be found arguing with Jews. The second journey ended at Caesarea, where "he went up and greeted the Church, and then went down to Antioch".²⁰ After what in Acts is a very short time, Paul began his third missionary journey. While in Ephesus, Paul met a man from Alexandria named Apollos who was "well-versed in Scriptures"²¹ and who had been baptizing in the name of John but not in the name of the Holy Spirit. Paul corrected Apollos's error. This time in Ephesus, as the last time, Paul again preached to Jews, in spite of his earlier announcements, one of them in Ephesus itself,²² that he would go only to the Gentiles. Paul continued on to Philippi where he stayed for Passover. He then decided that the time had come for him to go up to Jerusalem bearing a collection which he had been raising for the support of the Church there: "he was hastening to be at Jerusalem, if possible, on the day of Pentecost".²³ He apparently returned to Ephesus on the way where he charged the elders to preach "both to Jews and to Greeks of repentance to God and of faith in our Lord, Jesus Christ".²⁴

When they arrived in Jerusalem, Paul and his companions were received "gladly" by the brethren. But as the account continues, we find that there was indeed dissention between the brethren and Paul. James, speaking to Paul, said that

the Jews who had believed and who were zealous for the Law "have been told about you that you teach all the Jews who are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children or observe the customs".²⁵ James then ordered Paul to purify himself which Paul did and, having done so, went to the Temple. The significant points here are that James was obviously in charge and was one whose authority Paul was willing to accept and that even though the issue was the same irritant which had been plaguing the Church about Paul previously, Paul himself now seemed to be perfectly willing to conform with the Law of Moses.

In the Temple, Paul was accused of defiling the holy place by bringing a Greek into the courtyard. The crowd was about to lynch Paul when the tribune of the cohort intervened and arrested Paul, thus saving him from the crowd. Paul then asked the tribune's permission to address the crowd and, permission being granted, did so in Hebrew.²⁶ His message here was essentially as it had been throughout the entire Book of Acts but there are some new points - Paul claimed that although he was born in Tarsus, he was raised and educated in Jerusalem "at the feet of Gamaliel"²⁷ and he exhorts the crowd to "rise and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on his name".²⁸ The crowd apparently listened to Paul quite attentively until Paul told of his encounter with the Risen Christ who had commanded him,

"Depart, for I will send you far away to the Gentiles,"²⁹ at which point the tribune had to have him brought into the barracks for his own safety. Paul was then turned over to the chief priests and "all the council"³⁰ for inquiry. Here, he cleverly perceived that the council was made up of both Sadducees and Pharisees and announced that he was on trial only over the matter of resurrection of the dead. A quarrel ensued, of course, and the council adjourned without delivering a verdict. Paul had to be removed by the tribune for his own protection.

Paul, through a nephew living in Jerusalem, then learned of a plot to kill him and so had his nephew inform the tribune. Paul was then transferred under guard to the procurator, Felix, in Caesarea. Ananias, the high priest, came to Caesarea accompanied by some elders and Tertullus, their spokesman, and Paul was again examined, this time before Felix. Apparently, Paul was convicted of no charge but was left in prison as a favor to the Jews. How long he was there is difficult to tell. Acts says that "when two years had elapsed, Felix was succeeded by Porcius Festus..."³¹ but there is no way of knowing whether that "two years" means from the time of Felix's ascension or from the time of Paul's arrest. However, after Festus's arrival, Paul was again examined and was threatened with trial before the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem. When this prospect became imminent, Paul appealed to Caesar. Shortly after his appeal

King Agrippa II, accompanied by his sister Bernice, visited Festus. Paul was brought out to be examined by Agrippa who pronounced him innocent, but since he had already appealed to Caesar, to Caesar he would have to go.

Paul was then sent to Rome. After having been shipwrecked off the coast of Malta, Paul finally reached his destination where he was placed under house arrest. Under the terms of his arrest, he was allowed to receive visitors. So once again he preached to Jews and, having been rejected, he once again vowed to go to the Gentiles. The book closes with Paul having lived "there two whole years at his own expense, and welcoming all who came to him, preaching the kingdom of God and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ quite openly and unhindered."³² Whether or not Paul was killed in Rome during Nero's anti-Christian persecutions as tradition claims or whether Paul was able to continue on to Spain as he wished,³³ neither the Book of Acts nor any other work of the canonical New Testament tells.

Such is the story of Paul as we have it in Acts of the Apostles. The question must now be asked, "How reliable is this story in terms of its presentation of accurate history?" Unfortunately, only three of the Jewish scholars, Klausner, Sandmel, and Schoeps, deal with this question in any detail.

The problems that arise in Acts fall into two basic categories: details, that is, textual problems arising through direct contradictions with the information which we have from

the Epistles of Paul, and tenor, for the spirit of Acts and the picture of Paul presented therein is radically different from that presented by Paul himself in his own writings.

The most prominent of the textual problems is that surrounding the events of the so-called "Apostolic Council" described in Acts 15 and Galatians 2. In Acts 15, Paul and Barnabas are appointed by the church at Antioch to go up to Jerusalem to discuss the matter of the Judaizers (i.e., circumcisers) whereas in Galatians 2:2, Paul writes that he went up by "revelation." In Acts 10, as we recall, it is Peter who first went to the Gentiles and who later, in Acts 15, declared that perhaps the Law was not binding upon the Gentiles - at which the Jerusalem Church not only does not protest, but actually accedes to in principle. In Galatians, Peter is unquestionably Paul's adversary. Furthermore, in Galatians, Paul claims that his authority is from Christ, not from men, whereas in Acts, as we have seen, he accepted the authority of James to affect a compromise. In Acts 15, there is the three-point Apostolic Decree which Paul himself delivers to the Antiochians. In Galatians, there is no mention of such a decree.³⁴

There are several possible solutions to this problem. The first is that Acts 15 and Galatians 2 do not refer to the same event. If this is the case, then the discrepancies are irrelevant. That this might be the case may be seen in the fact that the Apostolic Decree was delivered to the Antiochians

whereas Galatians, of course, was written to the Galatians. This is essentially the solution used by Hugh Schonfield.³⁵

Another argument says that since there are more items of agreement than of disagreement, one may ignore the disagreement due to the "subjectivity of Paul" relative to the "objectivity of Acts."³⁶ In its extreme form, this means no less than Paul is a liar. Indeed, Klausner, for one, believes that Paul was a complete opportunist whose primary goal was making converts. Klausner also points out that Luke is not a modern historian committed to portraying events with our sense of historical accuracy. If this is the case, then it is possible that Luke made a few errors.³⁷

It is also possible that Acts is the correct version and that Galatians is a forgery, but no Jews use this solution. However, the view of Kaufman Kohler must here be mentioned. Kohler believed that Galatians is a forgery but that Acts also is incorrect - in other words, we have no correct version of what happened.³⁸

To understand the approach of Schoeps, we must go back to the beginnings of Christian scholarship: to F.C. Baur and the Tübingen School. Baur understood the Galatians version to be the correct one. But why then the variation in Acts? Baur believed that there were two poles at odds with each other within the early Christian Church. These were Jewish Christianity, represented essentially by Peter, and Gentile Christianity, represented essentially by Paul. By the time Acts was written,

it had become necessary to reconcile these two views. Hence, we have in Acts a Peter operating in Paul's "antinomian" realm and a Paul operating as an observant Jew. This is basically the view of Schoeps and superficially the view of Sandmel. Schoeps believes that although the early Christian Church was neither a monolith against Paul nor was the rift as great as Baur thought it to be, there were serious areas of disagreement - particularly over the means of converting Gentiles (the crux of the problem was the question of circumcision - even the most ardent of the Judaizers would not have rejected a Gentile who had had himself circumcised in accordance with the Law). It is clear, therefore, that Acts is interested in "minimizing divisions, in softening strife, and in diluting arguments on either side"³⁹ and as a result of this "harmonizing tendency," Acts has changed the "stony sitting" of Galatians into the "friendly discussion" that is there depicted.⁴⁰

Sandmel too believes that the problem lies with Acts, not with Galatians, and Sandmel's views on the underlying motives are quite unique (see "Notes to Chapter I", note #84). Sandmel agrees that tendenz exists, of course, but he sees that tendenz not as trying to synthesize the differences between Peter and Paul, but rather as neutralizing a pure Paulinism which would not have been suitable for an organized Church. Sandmel agrees also with Bruno Bauer in that if there was a split, the rift had already been healed.⁴¹

The other textual problems are virtually ignored by all of the Jewish scholars except Sandmel. In the Epistles, for example, Paul repeatedly says that the Law has been superseded - indeed, the whole thrust of Galatians is that it is wrong to observe the Law. But in Acts, he circumcises Timothy (in Galatians, he refuses to circumcise Titus), he cuts his hair because of a vow which he had made, and he goes to the Temple to fulfill a vow. Romans 9-11 infers that few Jews became Christians. In Acts, however, we are given the impression that myriads of Jews converted. In Galatians 1:1, Paul calls himself "an apostle, - not from men nor through men, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father..." But in Acts, Paul was taken to Ananias in Damascus who baptized him and laid his hands upon him. He then proceeded to Jerusalem (in direct contradiction to Galatians 1:17 where Paul says that he did not go up to Jerusalem, but rather, spent three years in Arabia) where, through the good offices of Barnabas, he was accepted by the apostles. And in the Epistles, Paul preaches that his was a unique gospel - indeed, the only true gospel (a statement which would have been unnecessary were there not people preaching other versions) whereas in Acts, the only differences between the Jews and the "Christians," including Paul, were over the resurrection and messiahship of Jesus.⁴²

It is possible to explain away most, if not all, of these basis differences - which both Schoeps and Klausner do. Schoeps,

for example, says that Paul's antinomianism as well as the absence of repentance in Paul's thought are omitted by Luke because he did not understand the concepts.⁴³ But an image should by now be forming of a Paul in Acts which is radically different from the Paul of the Epistles. It is this difference which I have called the tenor problem. On this issue, the field of Jewish scholars is narrowed to include only Klausner and Sandmel. Klausner does not perceive the problem of tenor directly, but he does point out that there are differences, contradictions, and inconsistencies between Paul's Epistles and the Book of Acts and that they are caused by the difference in authorship and the difference of the purpose of the author. Acts, according to Klausner, has four purposes: to show how the Church miraculously survived, to tone down the battle of Peter versus Paul (as hypothesized by the Tübingen School) and change it to James versus Peter and Paul, to show that the Jews persecuted the Christians, and to flatter Rome.⁴⁴ Klausner also says that Acts, "in its complete form" (underlining Klausner's), was not composed prior to 95-100 A.D.⁴⁵

But then Klausner goes on to argue for the validity of Acts, notwithstanding any of the apparent problems. He says that the "we-passages" indicate that these portions are the words of an eye-witness who imitated the editorial style of the editor of Ezra-Nehemiah-Chronicles. Furthermore, the length and detail of these "we-passages" indicate that they are indeed eye-witness accounts as opposed to hear-say evidence.

Klausner also believes that the author of these "we-passages," using other sources, wrote the entire Book of Acts and that that author is also the author of the third gospel. "Luke" used other sources to write the first fifteen chapters and chapters seventeen through nineteen and, due to the amount of detail, these were primarily written sources - although oral sources were probably available.⁴⁶

Klausner then begins to write about the character of Luke. Luke was a Greek, a pagan converted by Paul who was also his traveling companion and physician (these latter two positions Klausner understood from the aforementioned verse, II Timothy 4:11. Klausner realized that the weight of scholarly opinion, including, in fact, his own, is against Pauline authorship of II Timothy; so he hypothesizes that II Timothy was written by a disciple of Paul's). Luke wrote the "we-passages" from his own eye-witness accounts, elaborated the speeches from actual events "according to the custom of the writers of that time,"⁴⁷ and, in seeming contradiction to what he had previously said about written sources, used the following source references: Paul himself, Philip the Evangelist (according to Klausner, Luke must have met Philip during his two year stay at Caesarea while Paul was Felix's prisoner), John Mark in Rome (this is based on I Peter, a source whose reliability is far more questionable than that of Acts), and James in Jerusalem.⁴⁸ Luke also used the Epistles, the lack of correlation between them and Acts deriving from the fact that Luke was not a

meticulous scholar, and Josephus.⁴⁹ Klausner concludes by saying that the spirit of Acts is merely that of a work written long after the events of which it speaks.⁵⁰ And Klausner's conclusion as to the reliability of Acts is that it may be used for historical purposes but with care.⁵¹

Sandmel, on the other hand, views the problem from a completely different perspective. Instead of analyzing each detail, Sandmel stands back and looks at the over-all picture presented by Acts and the over-all picture presented by the Epistles and compares them. He finds that in addition to the specific tendenzen of Luke mentioned by Schoeps, Klausner, and the Tübingen School, there is a general tendenz in Acts to counteract the Paul of the Epistles.⁵² Sandmel admits that the general motifs of Luke do indeed carry over into Acts, the most important of these being to portray an unbroken continuity of Judaism in Christianity. But when confronting Paul, or rather, Pauline doctrine, with which Acts by its very nature must deal, Luke changes the essentially Greek Jew of the Epistles, one who has Greek pre-suppositions, into an essentially Palestinian Jew who is subservient to the Jerusalem Church. Luke, furthermore, attempts to detract from the singularity of Paul's message and places him against a background of other similar apostles preaching similar messages as opposed to the most prominent spokesman of Christianity in the Diaspora.⁵³ Sandmel's conclusion, therefore, is "that Acts not only errs egregiously in details

in matters which are also found in the Epistles, but tendentiousness respecting Paul is so strong in Acts that it adds misleading and unreliable details about him."⁵⁴ In other words, since it is an unreliable source of history, Acts may not be used as a determinant for either Paul's life or his theology.

One further factor to consider in Acts is that, unlike the Epistles, it is Jerusalem-centered. Whenever Paul is on his missionary journeys, the reader is always aware that wherever Paul may be, he is not in Jerusalem. Thus at the end of the third journey, we are given the impression, not that Paul is going up to Jerusalem, but that he is returning there. In Acts, Jerusalem is the essential hub of all Christian activity.

How then, has the majority of Jewish writers on Paul treated Acts? Indeed, in spite of Sandmel's arguments, only he and Montefiore⁵⁵ have fully disavowed the work as a reliable source of history. Flusser (author of the article "Paul of Tarsus" in the Encyclopaedia Judaica),⁵⁶ Graetz,⁵⁷ Jacob (author of the article "Paul" in the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia),⁵⁸ Werner,⁵⁹ Schiller-Szinessy,⁶⁰ Rubenstein,⁶¹ and Schonfield⁶² all accept Acts unquestioningly and without addressing the problem. Klausner, as we have seen, also accepts the historicity of Acts but he, at least, has confronted the fact that a problem exists. Other writers, Baeck,⁶³ Belkin,⁶⁴ and Petuchowski,⁶⁵ admit that Acts is of dubious

historical value - and then proceed to use its contents for historical purposes. And finally we have the opinions of Kaufman Kohler and H.J. Schoeps. Kohler has the uncanny ability, in both Acts and the Epistles, to determine which verses, and therefore which facts, are spurious and which are genuine.⁶⁶ This ability can only have origins in Kohler's own pre-suppositions of what Paul's life must have been like and what Paul must have thought - for it then becomes merely mechanical to eliminate those verses which contradict the pre-suppositions. Schoeps tells us that the speeches of Paul in Acts are tendentious and later accretions although possibly based upon historical deliveries. Thus "as authentic testimony to the teaching of Paul ... they do not enter the question. Nevertheless, for the reconstruction of Paul's life story, they are indispensable"⁶⁷ (underlining mine). He also points out that certain doctrines, such as Paul's abrogation of the Law, are absent from Acts. Similarly, Paul's doctrine of justification is misconstrued by Luke as forgiveness of sins.⁶⁸ Schoeps also finds the non-eschatological Paul, which is what Acts portrays, incomprehensible.⁶⁹ And yet, by and large, Schoeps accepts the narrative of Acts as historical.⁷⁰ One has the impression when reading Schoeps's chapter on the sources, that he knows better than to use Acts, but cannot prove his case without it. This impression is further enhanced by the fact that Schoeps barely deals with the problem at all - rather, he makes only the above-mentioned statement regarding the speeches of Paul.

This would not be so striking had Schoeps not written about every other possible source, including the apocryphal Acts, in detail. It is his very thoroughness which makes him look like a cat with canary feathers in his whiskers.⁷¹

Does this non-reliability of Acts mean that all of the information contained therein is false? Not at all. I believe that there is a great deal of information in Acts which, if not accurately reported, is based on actual events. I also believe that Paul was far more aware of Palestinian trends than the Epistles would, at a glance, allow - a statement which, as I have previously indicated, I will support more fully in the third chapter. I also believe that there are certain events in Acts in which there is no tendenz, such as the fact that Paul made four journeys, and of which we have no contradictory evidence, and which may be accepted without penalty at least as reference points. No, what the non-reliability of Acts means is that since we have no sure method of separating the valid information from the invalid, we may not use it for historical data.

Why then do many scholars, Jewish and non-Jewish, make use of Acts for their interpretations of Paul? There are, I believe, three major reasons. The first is that they read Acts first. This grants to the work a "sub-conscious" textual authority. Any following reading of the Epistles is then compared to Acts. However, due to this textual authority, Acts is never fully discarded. Thus, this approach is backwards.

It is the Epistles which must be studied first - especially those almost universally considered to be genuine: Romans, I & II Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, and I Thessalonians. And it is upon Acts, not the Epistles, that the burden of proof must be placed.

One must also account for the growth of legend in the folklore process. This is especially apparent in the incidents in which Rabban Gamaliel appears. At least four times in the Epistles, Romans 11:1, II Corinthians 11:22, Galatians 1:13-14, and Philippians 3:5-6, Paul enumerates his Jewish credentials, and at no time does he mention that he was a pupil of Rabban Gamaliel's. Admittedly, this is an argument from silence, but when coupled with the fact that the Paul of the Epistles operates under pre-suppositions inconsistent with those which one would expect of a student of Rabban Gamaliel's and that no Pharisee-Rabbi of prominence is ever mentioned in the Epistles and none but Gamaliel in Acts, one must realize that an allowance for the growth of legend over a period of approximately fifty years must be made.⁷²

The third reason is that although many scholars admit that there is tendenz in Acts, if they are writing on Paul, there is a proclivity to compare Acts only to the Epistles. However, this takes no cognizance of the fact that Acts is part two of Luke, and thus Acts has a much greater literary affinity to the synoptic gospels than it does to any of the Epistles. It is, therefore, in light of the synoptics and the problems

therein arising that Acts must be studied. The fact that Luke is called an "irenic" gospel must also be interpolated into Acts - that is, there should be tendenzen smoothing over differences within the Church, between the Church and Rome, and between Christianity and Judaism. If this were done, one would also find the general tendentiousness of Acts as a unit that Sandmel has found.⁷³

The Epistles

It is not my intention in this section to repeat information which may be found in any basic introduction to the New Testament. Rather, I merely wish to point out which epistles are accepted by which scholars since this has a bearing on their interpretation of Paul. A few words of introduction may, however, be appropriate.

There are, in the New Testament, thirteen epistles to which Paul's name is affixed plus the Epistle to the Hebrews which Church tradition ascribes to Paul. These may be categorized essentially as follows: nine are to specific churches, all of which, with the exception of that in Rome and that in Colossae, were founded by Paul; one each to the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians and two each to the Corinthians and the Thessalonians. These are actually letters which deal with specific problems which arose in the individual churches. With the exception of Romans, which is a detailed outline of Paul's gospel, these letters are in

no way representative of a systematic theology. Furthermore, since they are written in response to pre-existing problems, the modern reader can only speculate as to what those problems may have been. Two of the epistles, Romans and Ephesians, are thought by some scholars to have been circulated as encyclical letters and in the case of Romans, with personal notes added later by Paul to make it applicable to the particular church.⁷⁴ In addition, four of the Epistles are addressed to individuals: one to Philemon, one to Titus, and two to Timothy - the latter three being known as the "Pastoral Epistles."

Until the probings of modern scholarship, all of the Epistles were assumed to be genuine. However, after the research of F.C. Baur and the Tübingen School, this outlook changed. Baur noticed differences in vocabulary, style, and content which caused him to revise his previous conception. His conclusion was that four of the Epistles show such similarities in all three attributes and in their frequent use of Biblical verses, a phenomenon not characteristic of the other Epistles, that they must be considered genuine. These four were Romans, I and II Corinthians, and Galatians; the others, Baur said, were still "in need of examination."⁷⁵

A later group of scholars, Bruno Bauer, Rudolf Steck, and a group known as the "Dutch School" or the "Dutch Radicals" including Allard Pierson, W.C. Van Manen, and

A.D. Loman, believed that all of the Epistles were forgeries - created early in the second century by anti-Jewish-Christian Gnostics, and that the historical Paul, if indeed he existed at all, was the Paul found in the Book of Acts.

The present consensus of scholarship, Jewish and non-Jewish, is that Romans, I and II Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, I Thessalonians, and Philemon are genuine, the Pastoral Epistles are pseudepigraphic, and about II Thessalonians, Colossians, and Ephesians there is division and debate. However, this is a consensus and our Jewish critics do not all conform.

i - Romans, I and II Corinthians

These epistles, three of the four declared genuine by Baur, are accepted by all of the Jewish writers on Paul with a few minor exceptions. Kaufman Kohler, as mentioned above (see page 55), is wont to declare single verses spurious. For example, he so declares Romans 13:1-7 since it praises the Gentiles as ministers of God. Kohler finds this belief unacceptable in the "genuine" Paul.⁷⁶ The Corinthian correspondence poses a special problem because many scholars consider it to be an edited compilation of as many as four separate letters: in chronological order - II Corinthians 6:14-7:1, I Corinthians, II Corinthians 10-13:10, II Corinthians 1-6:13, 7:2-9, 13:11-13.⁷⁷ II Corinthians 6:14-7:1 is considered spurious by Baek⁷⁸ as is I Corinthians 15:23-28 -

this latter because Baeck feels that "Paul's structure of faith is contrary to eschatology"⁷⁹ and that it makes no sense in context, but rather creates a jump in thought which would not occur if 15:29 were to follow 15:22.⁸⁰

Kohler considers the sections on celibacy in I Corinthians 7 and the passages concerning the inferiority of women, such as I Corinthians 14:34, to be spurious⁸¹ while he feels that I Corinthians 13, while perhaps not spurious, is certainly out of place between I Corinthians 12 and I Corinthians 14.⁸²

ii - Galatians

Normally, this epistle would be considered with the above three - for doctrinologically, it is inexorably attached to Romans. I list it separately only because Kaufman Kohler declares it to be spurious on the basis of its being too anti-Jewish to be a genuine Pauline writing.⁸³ Kohler cites for support the writings of B. Baur (sic - he means Bauer), Steck, and Maehleis,⁸⁴ but whereas these men deny the authenticity of all of the Epistles, Kohler singles out Galatians, and their arguments will not support this action. Sandmel alone deems it necessary to counter this argument. He says that if Galatians is not by Paul, then the whole enterprise of understanding the New Testament must be given up.⁸⁵ Sandmel's reason for saying this is that Galatians is an emotional, rather than a rational, letter. Paul is clearly very angry - so much so, in fact, that he becomes

veritably tongue-tied (he is dictating) and at times, unable to maintain his train of thought because of the tangents which come into his mind. Sandmel properly accords the view that Galatians is spurious to "the fringes of scholarship"⁸⁶ while by other scholars, this view, perhaps even more properly, is ignored.

iii - Philippians, I Thessalonians

These two epistles were not included among those of which Baur was sure, largely from arguments of silence; that is, both epistles are lacking many of the doctrines that appear in the other epistles - but this is because they are short answers to single questions. In addition, the Scriptures are never quoted in these epistles - in marked contrast to the four major epistles. However, since the time of Baur, scholarly consensus has shifted to the general acceptance of these letters as genuine. Consequently, with three exceptions, all of the Jewish scholars also accept them. Baeck does not include them in his list of those which are definitely genuine,⁸⁷ Gerald Friedlander, who does not tell us his own position, says that the consensus among all but the "conservative scholars" indicates that they are not genuine (Friedlander wrote in 1912),⁸⁸ and Ernest Jacob accepts only the four major epistles as genuine.⁸⁹ Kaufman Kohler accepts these epistles in general but believes that Philippians 3:5 is an interpolation, for it makes Paul too Jewish.⁹⁰

iv - Philemon, Colossians, and Ephesians

These letters are being considered together because as Enslin points out, Colossians and Ephesians are nearly identical in outline, structure, and phraseology and share Tychicus as their messenger. Onesimus, the returning runaway slave of Philemon, is mentioned as the co-messenger of Colossians.⁹¹

According to Enslin, Philemon has been little challenged except by the Tübingen School and the Dutch Radicals.⁹² Indeed, there is little reason to challenge it - for it contains no doctrine at all, rather, it is a note to Philemon asking him, as a personal favor, to accept the return of Onesimus, his slave, without retribution. Nevertheless, none of the early Jewish scholars, by which I mean everyone prior to Klausner and including Baeck, accept Philemon - no reasons are given. Klausner tacitly accepts Philemon⁹³ whereas Flusser, Sandmel, and Schoeps⁹⁴ all enumerate it among the genuine epistles as do Schonfield and Schiller-Szinessy who accept all of the Epistles.

Colossians, on the other hand, has met a great deal of resistance to scholarly acceptance; the primary reasons being that the Christology is too high and it contains denunciations against false doctrine at a time when it is assumed that doctrine was only loosely established. Those who accept Colossians say that it should be of no surprise that there were errorists and that the Christology is no higher than in any

of the other epistles.⁹⁵ But of Jewish scholars, only Schiller-Szinessy, Schonfield, Klausner, and apparently Kohler⁹⁶ explicitly accept Colossians.

Ephesians, although it is doctrinologically related to Colossians, presents even greater problems and is accepted by even fewer writers than is Colossians. Unlike Colossians, Ephesians reads not like a letter but a tract. In addition, the author does not seem to know the people for whom it was intended. Klausner disagrees with this objection on the grounds that Paul would certainly have known the Ephesians for he had been to Ephesus several times.⁹⁷ This, however, is backward reasoning. The question is not whether or not Paul knew the Ephesians, indeed, it is quite the opposite. It is because it is assumed that Paul knew the Ephesians that the genuineness of the letter is in question. Klausner's reasoning on this point is quite circular: he assumes that Paul wrote the epistle, of course Paul was in Ephesus, and therefore it is absurd to assume that the author of the epistle did not know the people to whom he was writing.

Other objections are the excess and mystical importance given to the Church, thought to be neither a fully organized body at that time nor to have been considered a monolithic whole, the fact that the epistle contains indications of later speculations, and the style of the epistle is heavier than is Paul's wont in the other epistles.⁹⁸

Klausner answers these objections by saying that Ephesians

does contain genuine Pauline ideas (but that might well be expected of a post-Pauline document). He also says that the letter may have received an incorrect address, that it may have been an encyclical and when the Ephesians received it, they affixed their own name, or perhaps an older Paul, a prisoner in Rome, was able to appreciate the "apostles and the prophets" (Ephesians 2:20) of the Church better than the younger Paul.⁹⁹ Klausner does not, at this point, state whether or not he accepts Ephesians or whether he is merely offering alternatives to non-Pauline authorship. Indications later in his book are, however, that he does indeed accept it as genuine. No other Jewish scholars, except again Schiller-Szinessy and Schonfield, accept the Epistle to the Ephesians as Pauline. Sandmel and Schoeps both mention it as a debated matter.

v - II Thessalonians

The genuineness of this epistle, like that of Colossians and Ephesians, is a matter for debate in scholarly circles. Klausner mentions two of the major objections as being the lack of warmth in this epistle as opposed to that found in I Thessalonians and in this epistle, the Day of the Lord and the coming of the Messiah are connected with the coming of the anti-Christ whereas in I Thessalonians, the Day of the Lord is to come "like a thief in the night" (I Thessalonians 5:2).¹⁰⁰ An objection which Klausner neglects to mention

is the extreme textual similarity between the two Thessalonian epistles which leads many critics to believe that the author of II Thessalonians copied I Thessalonians. Paul, having just written I Thessalonians, would have had no need to repeat himself to the same church.

Klausner argues that Paul was not a professor of theology or philosophy and thus we should not expect total consistency from him. Furthermore, any man is entitled to change his mind and it is not unlikely that Paul might have done so.¹⁰¹ These are, however, merely counter-arguments, not conclusive demonstrations. Nevertheless, Klausner does accept II Thessalonians as genuine. As with Colossians, the only other Jews who accept this work as genuine are Schiller-Szinessy, Schonfield, and perhaps Kohler (see "Notes to Chapter II", note #96). Sandmel and Schoeps, as with Colossians and Ephesians, both mention the acceptance of this epistle as a debated matter.

vi - The Pastoral Epistles

The Pastoral Epistles, I and II Timothy and Titus, have long been considered non-Pauline by virtually all scholars. These epistles presume an organized Church, dealing as they do with church organization and church officers, perhaps, as Sandmel claims, in order to counter Paul's doctrine of individual freedom which, in a large organization over a long period of time, would have led to anarchy.¹⁰² Lacking is the imminent expectation of the Second Coming so prominent

in the other epistles. There is opposition to "teachers" of heretical doctrines which bear resemblance to second century Gnostic beliefs. The wording, phraseology, and style are radically different from those of the epistles recognized as genuine. Other, less certain, deficiencies are the fact that these epistles are not mentioned in Marcion's canon, neither are they mentioned by the Church Fathers until the beginning of the third century, they assume a theology whereas the other epistles expound one, and, even if one were to accept Acts, these epistles cannot be correlated with the events in that work at all.¹⁰³

Sandmel points out that these epistles could have been original Pauline works into which interpolations have been made;¹⁰⁴ Klausner, that they were unintentionally altered by later copyists.¹⁰⁵ Another possibility mentioned by Klausner, although one which I believe to be less likely, is that these epistles were written by a disciple of Paul.¹⁰⁶ The reason this is less likely is that if the epistles are as late as the second century, we would necessarily have to be dealing with a second, third, or even fourth generation disciple, and furthermore, it requires an assumption which is unnecessary.

We may note that with the exception of Schiller-Szinessy and Schonfield, no Jewish writer accepts the Pastoral Epistles as genuine.

Apocryphal Acts

There are a large number of non-canonical books of "Acts" of individual apostles - including Paul. One of the smaller works on Paul is called the Acts of Paul and Thecla. To my knowledge, there are no scholars who seriously consider these works to be historically valid, but there is in the Acts of Paul and Thecla a description of Paul which is used as valid by Schonfield and Baeck.¹⁰⁷ Schoeps says that he agrees with Baeck that this eikon of Paul may be an attribution of the description of Socrates to Paul.¹⁰⁸

In addition, Schonfield uses other New Testament apocrypha. In particular, in one book, he has Peter and Paul in Rome together¹⁰⁹ - an occurrence based on the Acts of Paul and Peter. He later disavows the historical validity of this work.¹¹⁰ No other Jewish writer even mentions this material.

Other Sources

The most commonly used "other source" is the Rabbinic material found in the Mishnah, Talmud, midrashim, and Tosephta, but unfortunately, more frequently as found in Strack-Billerbeck's Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. Some of these references are specific, for example, Schoeps, agreeing with both Schonfield and Herford, believes that the character of Gehazi in Sanhedrin 107b and Sota 47a may refer to Paul.¹¹¹ But most references to Rabbinic material are not to specific mentions of Paul (or supposedly specific

mentions of Paul) but to ideas.¹¹² Schoeps indicates that the use of this material is tenuous at best, but Schoeps relies on this material more than any of the other major Jewish scholars although Schonfield,¹¹³ Schiller-Szinessy,¹¹⁴ and Belkin¹¹⁵ do the same (among non-Jewish scholars, W.D. Davies¹¹⁶ is equally guilty). But the problem is that all of the material was written at least a century after Paul's lifetime and some as much as five or six centuries later. The ability to find a tenet which Paul held in the writings of a rabbi who lived five or six hundred years afterward, proves nothing. Rabbinic Judaism, contrary to the opinions of the nineteenth century Germans, was extremely open doctrinologically and the fact that a particular item of thought should appear at least once is to be expected. But this does not indicate that the particular item was typical of Rabbinic Judaism as a whole or even that the belief was held by anyone other than the rabbi who stated it. Thus, recourse to the Rabbinic material is, as Schoeps said, tenuous at best and thoroughly invalid at worst. The only useful method for connecting Paul with Pharisaic-Rabbinic Judaism is to look for halakhic overtones directly in Paul.

Other commentators, Klausner¹¹⁷ and Kohler¹¹⁸ most notable among the Jews, use works of the Greek Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, especially the Wisdom of Solomon and the Sibylline Oracles, in their interpretations of Paul. That the ideas of the Wisdom of Solomon appear in Paul, especially

in the Epistle to the Romans, is rather apparent. But whether these are merely parallel ideas or whether there was direct usage by Paul is impossible to know, for Paul never quotes any of this material.

Philo of Alexandria has also been used by various writers as a source. Sandmel relies very heavily on Philo as an analogue to Paul since, as he believes, Philo is also a non-Rabbinic Jew of the Diaspora. The theory of Gerald Friedlander and Kaufman Kohler,¹¹⁹ that Paul read Philo, is probably incorrect. It assumes that Philo's works were widely circulated - so widely that they were available on the other side of the Mediterranean - and that Paul somehow managed to acquire an ample number of them and read them. There are, however, no reasons for assuming this. According to Sandmel, that Paul's writings show pre-suppositions parallel to Philo is because they both lived in the Greek world, but they show no evidence at all of direct borrowing.¹²⁰

Schoeps's use, with the Tübingen School, of the Pseudo-Clementine literature is dangerous. This literature is quite late and we do not know enough about it to assume that the views and actions of Simon Magus in the Pseudo-Clementines are reliable historical reflections of the views and actions of Paul.¹²¹

Finally, Schonfield's belief that Paul became an ascetic while a student in Jerusalem and thus made use of the mystical מעשה בראשית is but fanciful musing. No evidence whatsoever exists for this assertion.¹²²

Chapter III

The Life of Paul

It is not my intention in this chapter to reiterate the events of Paul's life as found in the Book of Acts, neither is it to create a life of Paul based on Acts such as Klausner has done¹ nor to create a life of Paul ostensibly based on Acts but largely based on conjecture and fancy such as that of Schonfield.² Rather, I would like to bring to the fore the few certainties of Paul's life that we know from the Epistles as well as some of the problems which the Epistles leave unsolved.

The date and place of Paul's birth is not known for certain. It is probable, however, that he was born about a decade later than Jesus and probably in Tarsus.³ Paul tells us that he was trained in "the traditions of [his] fathers" in which he was "advanced ... beyond many of [his] own age among [his] people."⁴ Whether or not Paul went to Jerusalem to study, as the Book of Acts claims, is not known, for it depends on how one interprets Galatians 1:17-18, 22 which says, "nor did I [after conversion] go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me but I went away into Arabia; and again I returned to Damascus. Then, after three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, and remained with him fifteen days ... And I was still not known by sight to the churches of Christ in Judea." Those such as Sandmel who deny the validity

of the Book of Acts say that this implies that Paul had not been in Jerusalem prior to this visit to Cephas. Those such as Klausner who accept Acts say that nothing of the sort is herein implied; Paul might have been in Jerusalem prior to his visit to Damascus just as Acts claims. And as for his not being known on sight to the churches in Judea, this should not be at all strange - especially if by the statement Paul means those churches outside of Jerusalem. However, a further weakness in the Acts account is that it has Paul returning directly to Jerusalem after his conversion and omits the trip to Arabia and the three years in Damascus.

Yet we do know that prior to his conversion, and perhaps even afterward, Paul considered himself a Pharisee⁵ and that prior to his conversion, he was an ardent persecutor of the church. The nature of this persecution is not known, but it must have been of sufficient magnitude for the churches in Judea to have been aware of it.

What then follows is the only experience of Paul upon which we can place an approximate date. Somewhere in the Diaspora, probably outside of Damascus, Paul had an experience which caused him to become a member of the church he had been persecuting. Exactly what this experience was in ontological, objective terms we do not know, neither is it important; what is important is the fact that Paul believed that he had experienced the Risen Christ and that he had received from the Christ the command to become his apostle to the Gentiles.

Rubenstein's analysis of this vision as Paul's conquest of his own mortality⁶ is fascinating but not especially pertinent. What is relevant in Rubenstein's analysis, however, is that he believes that at this point in his career, Paul was faced with a conflict between the "traditions of his fathers" and his own experience, and resolved it in favor of his own experience.⁷

However, to continue with our narrative: Paul then continued into Damascus. Exactly what happened to Paul while in Damascus, we do not know from Paul's own hand, but Paul must have done something severe enough and noticeable enough to cause the governor of King Aretas to try to arrest him, for the next sure point in Paul's life shows him escaping out a window and over the wall in a basket.⁸ Judging from the time of the reign of King Aretas, this must have happened sometime around the year 35 A.D. or no more than half a dozen years after Jesus's death. We should also note that at this point, by means unknown, there is already a functioning church in Damascus and probably in Antioch as well.

Paul then went into Arabia (the desert, we may assume - why, we do not know), returned to Damascus, and remained there for three years. It is after this three year period that he went up to Jerusalem to confer with the other apostles, but met only Cephas and James.

We may further assume that Paul either claimed or was confirmed in the role of apostle, but we must now determine

what was meant by the role of apostle and whether or not there were antecedents. George Foot Moore said that "Jews did not send out missionaries,"⁹ but this statement is contradicted by virtually every Jewish writer on the subject. Klausner¹⁰ and Kohler¹¹ both take as axiomatic Jewish missionary efforts in the Diaspora, and Klausner points to "Christian" efforts as well after the stoning of Stephen. Sandmel points out that the rabbis saw Abraham as the paradigmatic missionary and then asks rhetorically how this could be unless they themselves were aware of Jewish missionaries.¹² Baeck speaks of wandering Greek theatrical troupes and wandering Greek orators by which he explains the infusion of Greek ideas into Palestine.¹³ All of these provide a fertile background against which Paul might do his missionary work. Furthermore, Paul himself speaks of other "apostles": Apollos, Cephas when he came to Antioch, and the Judaizing elements against which Paul constantly had to do battle.¹⁴ But there was also another background, pointed out by both Baeck (see above, page 12) and Sandmel,¹⁵ which Paul, as a Jew, must have felt - and that is Biblical prophecy. Paul was convinced that he had seen the Risen Christ, that he had had a revelation from God, and that, therefore, as a Jew, there was but one available choice of action - preach. And so too did his message resemble that of the Biblical prophets. Amos, Micah, Hosea, and Isaiah all saw a certain vacuousness in the prevalent religious mode - that of the priestly cultus. The

people believed that they had fulfilled their religious obligations through the priests and the sacrifices. The prophets told them that they were wrong, that a certain ethic, a certain morality, was also incumbent upon the people of God. Paul too saw a vacuousness in the prevalent religious mode of his day. He was seeking salvation - a state of sinlessness - and the prevalent religious mode - the Law of Moses - did not achieve that end; quite the opposite - for "the Law imparts ... consciousness of sin."¹⁶ Thus Paul was constrained to go out and preach that which God had revealed to him - the proper way to salvation.¹⁷

In spite of this, Paul was not secure in his apostleship. Every epistle he wrote, except Philemon and Romans, is an argument against a misunderstanding of his gospel or more frequently, against others who were preaching a different gospel and challenging Paul's apostleship. All of the Jewish scholars that deal with the matter agree that Paul's opponents are Judaizing Christians.¹⁸ In Galatia, he was challenged doctrinologically - the circumcisers said that Christians must obey the Law of Moses - Paul said no. In Corinth, Paul was attacked personally and his right to apostleship was questioned.

The most difficult problem to handle, however, if indeed it is not impossible, is the state of Paul's Jewishness. At least four times in the Epistles, Paul defends his Jewish credentials.¹⁹ He was a Hebrew, an Israelite, circumcised

on the eighth day, a member of the tribe of Benjamin (how Paul knew this, we do not know), and finally, according to the Law, a Pharisee ... as to righteousness under the Law, blameless.

It is the Pharisaic aspect of Paul which produces the most problems for the critics, and is therefore handled least adequately. Properly, most of the writers on Paul see his Pharisaism in his frequent recourse to the Bible. Sandmel, Rubenstein, Baeck, Montefiore, and, if one considers that the Scriptures must constitute at least half of the twofold Law, Rivkin²⁰ all mention this as the one sure indication that we have of Paul's "Pharisaism." But does it indicate that at all, or does it merely indicate that Paul was Jewish? Indeed, Sandmel claims no more. Baeck has said that the one thing that all Jews had in common was their use of the Bible. If we are to find some item of Paul's thought that is indicative of Pharisaism, we must look further than this. Rubenstein cites Paul's belief in the resurrection of the dead as the determining Pharisaic factor.²¹ Luke himself does the same. Klausner looks to Paul's "midrashic method" for indications of Pharisaism,²² but Klausner goes too far; for he then ascribes the same method to Philo, and except for Wolfson, there are few indeed who would call Philo a Rabbinic Jew. What Klausner fails to notice is the difference in the use of Scripture in Paul and Philo. Philo uses Scripture for allegorical purposes. He starts from the verse and draws allegory upon it. If he then uses proof-texts, it is to

build the scheme of his allegory. Paul's usage, on the other hand, is much closer to that of the rabbis, using texts to reconstruct a narrative and to build a sermonic point based upon the text which may or may not be allegory. Kohler finds traditional Jewish (that is, Pharisaic) practices in Paul's initiation of proselytes: emphasizing the "Law of God," specifying mandatory commandments, a catalogue of sins, and a confession.²³ Kohler does not cite his sources though, and I am not altogether certain that these practices can be found in the Epistles.

However, none of these critics adequately addresses the question of Paul's Pharisaism. Rivkin, on the other hand, does. He wisely does not claim absolute certainty about his answer, for, he says, the sources do not tell us what we need to know about the Pharisees. Therefore, any historical model we construct depends on how we conceptualize and use the sources and may thus be totally right or totally wrong.²⁴ Rivkin offers an explanation of Pharisaism which if applied to Paul, might explain why he persecuted the church so vehemently: he tells us that "the Pharisees ... far from looking for the messiah and the ushering in of a terrestrial kingdom of God, were hostile to anyone making such a claim or proclaiming such a kingdom" and that such messianic hope "was limited to individual prophet-like figures, apocalypticists, eschatologists ... who gained now more, now fewer adherents, though never more than a tiny minority."²⁵ If this were

indeed the case, it would be easy to understand why Paul, if he were a Pharisee, might relentlessly persecute any such adherents.

But what does "if Paul were a Pharisee" mean? Rivkin believes that the sine qua non of Pharisaism was belief in the twofold Law which grants individual salvation in the form of resurrection. That Paul believed in the twofold Law Rivkin derives from Galatians 1:14, "traditions of my fathers"; the word for "tradition" being *παράδοσις*.²⁶ This is the same word used by Josephus in Antiquities XIII:297 and the evangelists in Mark 7:5, 8 and Matthew 15:2 where the twofold Law is meant. "As to the Law, a Pharisee" means, therefore, that Paul, prior to his conversion, believed that only through the twofold Law could one attain salvation. We know that Josephus was a Pharisee; yet Josephus wrote in Greek, lived in the Greek world, and was aware of Hellenism and Hellenistic civilization. Therefore, because Paul shows an awareness of Hellenism, writes in fluent Greek, and lived in the Greek world,²⁷ is not sufficient cause to portray him as any less a Pharisee than Josephus or any other Palestinian.²⁸

There are, however, several weaknesses in this argument. First, Paul may or may not have meant the twofold Law by the word *παράδοσις*. Rivkin does not address himself to the question of a separate, or rather, different Hellenistic Pharisaism or whether or not there might have been an independent Hellenistic Oral Tradition. He has attempted

to demonstrate Paul's thought by his use of the word "Pharisee" rather than by trying to find out what Paul might have meant by "Pharisee" by studying Paul's thought. Rivkin uses Romans 7 to show that Paul's "problem" was that of a Pharisee living in an alien society and thus denies any Hellenistic thought in Paul's writings. But there are, as we shall see in the next chapter of this work, a plethora of Hellenistic pre-suppositions in Paul's thought. Rivkin misses the differences in the definitions of "salvation" and "resurrection" between Paul's thought and Rabbinic thought. Secondly, the argument "Because Josephus - therefore Paul" is unsound. Paul and Josephus were not only different men writing for different purposes, but they also had different backgrounds. Paul was a Diaspora Jew, Josephus lived all but the last twenty years of his life in Palestine. We would therefore expect Josephus to have Palestinian Rabbinic pre-suppositions and in fact, would be quite surprised if he did not. Rivkin points out that Josephus says that only Pharisaic Judaism need be taken seriously²⁹ and concludes from this that any "Hellenistic Judaism" which may have existed was insignificant. But Josephus is writing as an apologist to a Greek audience for the Jews who have just staged a massive rebellion against Rome. Paul is writing nothing of the sort. Rather, he is answering questions or responding to problems that have arisen in Christian churches. We cannot even use Philo, whose background was much closer to Paul's than that of Josephus, in

the manner of one-to-one correspondence. We can, as Rivkin himself said, only look at our sources and interpret them. But before we can compare one to another, we must evaluate each on its own merit.

On the issue of Paul's Pharisaism, Sandmel says that we can arrive at two incontrovertible facts: Paul was a Jew and he was educated in Judaism such that he surpassed his school-mates in prowess - a fact attested to by the effortless manner with which he quotes Scripture.³⁰ As to Paul's assertion that he is a Pharisee, we have four major problems: Pharisees had divergent views and the sources are few,³¹ "... late Pharisaism/proto-Rabbinism represented an impulse which was the exact antithesis of that of Paul,"³² we can neither ascribe Rabbinic exegesis to Paul (since Paul's thought is so obviously non-Rabbinic) nor can we ascribe to Paul Rabbinic exegesis for non-Rabbinic ends since this is a description of the content from the label rather than the label from the content,³³ and there is the possibility of a Hellenistic Pharisaism different from that of Palestinian Pharisaism.³⁴ Thus the only signs of Pharisaism are his use of the Scriptures³⁵ and his apparent indifference to the Temple - for Paul's Judaism seems to be of the synagogue variety rather than that of the Temple.³⁶

However, this view does not fully address the problem. Paul's ardent opposition to the Law is in itself an affirmation that Paul, at least prior to his conversion, accepted certain

basic Pharisaic assumptions.³⁷ A Buddhist would not feel compelled to attack the Law in such a manner - neither would a Sadducee.

If Rivkin's initial assumption is correct, that the sine qua non of Pharisaism is the belief in the efficacy of the twofold Law, then we must look in Paul for an awareness of a halakhic process - thereby incorporating the possibility of an independent Hellenistic tradition.

In Romans 7:1-3, Paul says,

"Do you not know, brethren -- for I am speaking to those who know the Law -- that the Law is binding on a person only during his life? Thus a married woman is bound by law to her husband as long as he lives; but if her husband dies she is discharged from the law concerning her husband. Accordingly, she will be called an adulteress if she lives with another man as long as her husband is alive. But if her husband dies she is free from that law, and if she marries another man she is not an adulteress."

In Galatians 5:14 and again in Romans 13:9, Paul says, "For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself!'"³⁸ In defending himself against charges of wrong-doing at Corinth, Paul tells the Corinthians that "... Any charge must be sustained by two or three witnesses."³⁹ In speaking to the Romans about the election of Israel, Paul says, "As regards the gospel, they are enemies of God, for your sake; but as regards election they are beloved for the sake of their forefathers. For the gifts and the call of God are irrevocable."⁴⁰ This last statement being clearly

an example of the concept of זכוח אבות.⁴¹ This is in no way to imply obeisance to the Law or the preachment thereof on Paul's part. Paul preaches relentlessly for the complete and thorough abrogation of the Law. But these verses show an unmistakable awareness of a halakha or proto-halakha by Paul and such an awareness can only be a result of Paul's Pharisaic upbringing. But the question must then be asked, "Why, if Paul had a Pharisaic upbringing, do we not find more examples of halakhic awareness and why does his thought appear to be so consistently non-Rabbinic and Hellenistic and his language so thoroughly Greek and unmixed with Hebrew or Aramaic phraseology?" With one answer to this question we have already dealt: there is a high likelihood that there existed in the Greek world a Pharisaism separate from that of Palestine but equally committed to the concept of a twofold Law. A more significant answer has been mentioned by Schoeps, and that is that Paul shows Greek or Jewish trends of thought depending on the nature of his audience.⁴² In I Corinthians, Paul himself tells us that the "Jews demand signs and the Greeks seek wisdom."⁴³ But more importantly, Paul, in the same epistle, says,

"To the Jews I became as a Jew in order to win Jews; to those under the Law I became as one under the Law -- though not myself being under the Law -- that I might win those under the Law. To those outside the Law I became as one outside the Law -- not being without law toward God but being under the Law of Christ -- that I might win those outside the Law. To the weak I became weak, that I might

win the weak. I have become all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. I do it all for the sake of the gospel, that I may share in its blessings."⁴⁴

This shows itself in I Corinthians where Paul uses "wisdom" as a technical term,⁴⁵ in Ephesians where Paul addresses himself to the mystical elements of the church there,⁴⁶ and in his frequent use of the word "mystery" in the Roman and Corinthian correspondence.⁴⁷ Thus Sandmel's assertion that "Paul was always entirely earnest"⁴⁸ holds true only insofar that Paul believed that above all else, Christ was the Savior and that salvation could be obtained only through him. Because, whether he is earnest or not, the fact is that Paul is inconsistent.⁴⁹ It is my belief (although admittedly a conjecture which cannot be substantiated) that Paul was far more aware of the mind-set of his listeners than has been accredited to him, and were we to have, for example, a document from him addressed to an exclusively Pharisaic audience, we would find him equally conversant in both Greek and Pharisaic modes of thought.⁵⁰

Thus, the question now arises, "When we look at the religiosity of Paul, are we indeed looking at the religiosity of Paul or are we looking at that of his audience?" The probable, although by no means certain, answer is both. There are certain all-pervasive elements in Paul's thought which appear consistently throughout his epistles; the most prominent of these being the aforementioned belief in the

salvation through Christ. But if it is the case that much of the Pauline literature tells us only about his audience, then to engage in an attempt to discern the nature of Paul the man as it must have been, is all but futile. All that is left to us now is to look at Paul's thought as we have it.

Chapter IV

Elements of Paul's Thought

It is a curious fact that although Paul is considered the leading apostle of Christianity to the Gentiles, the earthly character of Jesus appears but once or twice in all of Paul's epistles.¹ That this is so is attested to by all of the major Jewish writers on Paul,² and the reason, given by both Sandmel³ and Klausner,⁴ is that, as a newcomer to the "Christian" community, to recognize the supreme importance of the earthly Jesus would have been to simultaneously diminish his own significance as an apostle, for he had probably never seen the earthly Jesus. Thus for Paul, it was the metaphysical exalted Christ that was of prime importance. Hence, Paul's gospel, as far as we know, was unique in his time and that it was legitimate comes from the fact that Paul firmly believed that it came to him "through a revelation of Jesus Christ."⁵ The only Pauline teachings which may be ascribed to a pre-Pauline church are the knowledge that Jesus was crucified, the belief that he was raised from the dead, the belief that he had appeared to several of the apostles -- last of all to Paul,⁶ that Jesus was opposed to divorce,⁷ and the practices of baptism and the Eucharist (although these were probably not of the sacramental nature to which Paul applied them).⁸ Our task in this chapter will be to examine those beliefs, practices, and pre-suppositions which

give Paul's teachings their uniqueness.

The Nature of Man

"For God has done what the Law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, he condemned sin in the flesh, in order that the just requirement of the Law might be fulfilled in us who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit. For those who live according to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh, but those who live according to the Spirit set their minds on the things of the Spirit. To set the mind on the flesh is death, but to set the mind on the Spirit is life and peace. For the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God; it does not submit to God's law, indeed it cannot; and those who are in the flesh cannot please God.

But you are not in the flesh, you are in the Spirit, in fact the Spirit of God dwells in you. Anyone who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him."⁹

Going all the way back to the time of Plato, the thought of the Greek world considered existence to be of two distinct substances: flesh and spirit.¹⁰ Flesh is by its nature inherently evil; spirit, inherently good. God, therefore, and Christ as well are entirely of the spirit. Man, on the other hand, is of both spirit and flesh. Being of the flesh, man too is inherently evil. But the spirit is always within him¹¹ and thus man has the potential for salvation by putting off the flesh or denying its influence and putting on or accepting the influence of the Spirit.

Jacob, Klausner, Kohler, Montefiore, and Sandmel have all recognized this distinction in Paul, but only Sandmel has

recognized it as a restatement of Platonic dualism. Sandmel and Kohler have both pointed out that this concept is identical to that found in Philo and Jacob, Montefiore, and Sandmel have all pointed out that this view is fundamentally different from the Rabbinic view of man as inherently good and free to do good or evil and that man, although in possession of a soul is basically a unity - that both body and soul were given to man and both are equally culpable or praiseworthy.¹²

Montefiore, although he is aware of this vast difference between the Pauline and Rabbinic conceptions of man, is either not aware or else does not state that the Pauline conception is essentially the Greek conception.¹³

Klausner, on the other hand, properly discerns Paul's concept but identifies it as Jewish - in fact, Biblical. The examples that he gives, however, are that of Hebrew poetic parallelism (for example: "In whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the spirit of all human flesh" (Isaiah 57:16) - the underlining is Klausner's).¹⁴ Klausner says, therefore, that Paul got the idea from the Bible but through his Hellenistic upbringing, made such an extreme dualism of it that it approached a non-Jewish concept.¹⁵

Sin

"... all men, both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin..."

"... since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, they are justified by His

grace as a gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus."¹⁶

"Therefore as sin came into the world through one man Adam and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned -- sin indeed was in the world before the Law was given..."¹⁷

Since, as we have seen, Paul considered the flesh inherently evil, he must also have considered that man has no alternative but to sin. For Paul, man indeed has no choice - for sin is not as it is in Biblical, Rabbinic, or even modern Judaism. That is, for Paul, sin is not a simple act of commission or omission, a transgression: a **xon** or a **ywb**. To sin is to "fall short of the glory of God." But all men fall short of the glory of God, thus all men are sinners, that is, it is an intrinsic part of their nature - no act is involved.

That this is so is understood by few Jewish writers on Paul. Indeed, we must suspect that this would be so for we are now entering areas of Paul's thought where Paul uses the same vocabulary as the rabbis but means something totally different. That this is Paul's concept of sin is seen by Baeck,¹⁸ Hirsch, Jacob, Klausner, and Sandmel.¹⁹

Graetz seemed to have been aware that there was a difference between Paul's concept of sin and the Rabbinic concept, but the only indication of this is that Graetz acknowledges that for Paul, sin was hereditary.²⁰ Rubenstein adequately defines the Jewish concept of sin, tells us that for Paul,

Adam was the paradigmatic sinner, and then stops - giving no explanation of what Paul meant by sin.²¹ Schonfield²² and Montefiore (in his earliest essay)²³ use the Rabbinic concept of sin as voluntary act to describe Paul. All other Jewish writers, including Montefiore in his later essays and Baeck in most of his essays ignore the issue altogether, thereby giving the impression that they are not aware of any difference whatsoever.

Montefiore,²⁴ Sandmel,²⁵ Schoeps,²⁶ and Shalom Spiegel²⁷ all mention the possibility that Paul also conceived of sin as a daemonic force. If this is the case, the occurrence of such doctrine is rare in Paul's recognized genuine epistles.

One concept strikingly missing from the thought of Paul is that of repentance. Jacob, Klausner, Montefiore, Rubenstein, Sandmel, and Schoeps all mention this.²⁸ But only Rubenstein and Sandmel seem to be aware that the whole concept is irrelevant for Paul - but both for different reasons. Rubenstein, who has taken a psychological approach to Paul, says that with every act of submission, there is also a desire to rebel, and therefore no repentance is completely sincere; for "no matter how reprehensible the deed, some part of the sinner wanted to commit it."²⁹ Sandmel, on the other hand, sees repentance as a complete impossibility within Paul's "system." One can repent for one's own actions, but if sin is defined such that it is part of one's being, repentance can no longer be an option - for

one cannot repent for one's own being and repentance, therefore, serves no purpose.³⁰

This established, Paul is now on the verge of his quest, "How does man achieve a state of sinlessness?"

Salvation

For Paul, therefore, the goal of man, escape, that is, salvation, involved a change in man's state. And the question that for Paul needed to be answered was, "How does man achieve the absolute certainty of salvation?"³¹

"Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death?"

"For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we shall certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his."

"For he who has died is freed from sin. But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him. For we know that Christ, being raised from the dead, will never die again; death no longer has dominion over him."³²

And thus death no longer has any dominion over the man in Christ. This then is Paul's definition of salvation: by accepting Christ (through baptism, which will be discussed later), one dies to the flesh and thus to sin, and is reborn to the spirit in Christ - for as one is "united with him in a death like his" so too is one united with him in eternal life. How is this possible if the sinfulness of man is an unatonable entity? It is unatonable for man. But Christ on

the cross was the perfectly pure sacrifice, the perfect atonement which God accepted for no reason other than grace and which atones not for the sins of man but for the sinfulness of man.

Thus through grace is man justified. "To justify" is here not as Baeck understood it, an act of justice performed on man,³³ rather, it means "to make righteous."³⁴ As most Jewish scholars properly point out, "justification" is not forgiveness on the part of God, it is complete acquittal. And indeed, this is what one would logically expect - for the man who has been reborn in Christ is, in fact, a new man.³⁵

Another "benefit," to use Sandmel's word, of salvation is "reconciliation." The word is not used frequently by Paul³⁶ and except for Kohler,³⁷ Montefiore, and Sandmel, Jewish scholars ignore it altogether. Montefiore, however, spoke of it only in his first essay at which time he did not fully appreciate the concept.³⁸ For it does not mean "to make-up" as he implies, rather, it means that God and man become as one substance whereas previously they had been estranged as a result of man's captivity in the flesh. A man reborn in the spirit becomes one body with Deity Himself through Christ. It is this reconciliation that Paul speaks of when he says to the Galatians, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ."³⁹

And lastly, a spiritual man is a "son of God."⁴⁰ This is

by virtue of the fact that he is united with the Christ - the Son of God - and is thus one with him. Exactly what Paul means by this will be explained in the next section, "The Christ."⁴¹

Up to this point, Paul's concept of salvation is very similar to that of the Greek mystery religions - to the adherents of which union with their patron god, be he Attis, Adonis, or Mithra, also meant salvation.⁴² But Paul's concept of salvation was more complex because it took place in at least two steps - I say at least two for as time went on, Paul became ever more complex and ever more contradictory, hence the multi-phased eschatology of I Corinthians 15:23-28. The first of these steps had already taken place, the crucifixion of Jesus Christ followed by his resurrection: "For he says, 'At the acceptable time I have listened to you and helped you on the day of salvation.' Behold, now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of salvation."⁴³ But Paul also believed that on the "Day of the Lord," the Christ would return, at which time those not having been saved would perish and those who had already been saved would live eternally in Christ.⁴⁴ However, problems arose because Paul believed that the Parousia was imminent - probably within his own lifetime.⁴⁵ But after a number of years had passed, some of the original believers began to die. His churches, especially in Thessalonica and Corinth, wanted to know if those who had died were lost to salvation. To the

Thessalonians he said,

"But we would not have you ignorant, brethren concerning those who are asleep, that you may not grieve as others do who have no hope. For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so, through Jesus, God will bring with him those who have fallen asleep. For this we declare to you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive shall not precede those who have fallen asleep."⁴⁶

But to the Corinthians, his response was much more elaborate. He told them that when they had become one in Christ, they had, in fact, already died to the flesh and had already been resurrected in the spirit. This meant that the death of their bodies was but a mere detail - a temporary phenomenon - for on the Day of the Lord, the day of resurrection, no one would have his "fleshly" body for "we shall all be changed." For those who are alive, the "fleshly" body shall cease to be and only the spiritual body will exist. For those who have fallen asleep, they will be alive in the spirit as in fact they already are.^{47, 48}

Some scholars, therefore, have stressed a Pauline concept of aeons which is a bit more complicated than that of the rabbis. In Rabbinic Judaism, the primary division was between the **עולם הזה** and the **עולם הבא** with some references having the **ימות המשיח** in between. Paul, on the other hand, has the world before the Law, the time between the giving of the Law and the coming of Christ, the period between the first and second comings of Christ, and the period after the second coming. According to Schoeps, the **ἔσχατος**, the last age,

actually began with the first coming and only the consummation is left. Upon Christ's return, the final judgement will take place and the dead will be resurrected. Thus the period between the first and second comings is actually an overlap between the two major aeons of "this world" and "the world to come."⁴⁹

Rubenstein points out that in I Corinthians 15:23-28, it appears that the final ruler of the world is not Christ but God Himself.⁵⁰

The Christ

As we have already seen, the earthly life of Jesus is basically irrelevant to the thought of Paul. The only events in his life that became important to Paul were his atoning death on the cross and his resurrection. Thus it was the exalted Christ rather than the earthly Jesus who was paramount, but for the practical consideration of the delayed Parousia, this meant that the death took precedence over the resurrection.⁵¹

The Greek word *Χρίστος* is an exact translation of the Hebrew word *מָשִׁיחַ*; both meaning "anointed." This in itself should indicate some relationship between the two, one which is probably pre-Pauline in nature. The question which we must now ask then is, "Is the Jewish *מָשִׁיחַ* the Pauline Christ?" The Jewish Messiah was unquestionably a national figure. His primary function was the restoration of the Jewish

political state. In addition, he was to usher in an age in which sin would cease, the nations would be judged in righteousness and the Gentiles would all look to God as their Deity.⁵² This was not Paul's concept. Lest he incur the wrath of Rome, the concept of the national messiah was not tenable. It is not, however, that Paul "dispensed" with this concept, rather, his conception of what the Christ was to be was different. Sandmel says that "Palestinian Jews saw in the Messiah the divine agent who would help the collective people out of their national predicament, while Paul saw in him the means of salvation of individuals out of the human predicament."⁵³ And Baeck points out that in Paul, the function of the Messiah changes from a horizontal one, that is, one which sees the world moving from its creation to its fulfillment, to a vertical one, that is, one which "reconciles" (Paul's word, not Baeck's) the world below to the world above (meaning, the world of the flesh to the world of the spirit).⁵⁴ Thus we are now dealing with an entirely different entity with an entirely different function from that concept held by "messianists" in Palestine. We now have a being who is, in fact, divine in his very nature, who is an individual Savior, who is himself not a man, but a "spirit" related to Deity Himself.

Yet in spite of this, there are some critics, most notably Klausner, Montefiore, Rubenstein, and Schoeps, who see Jewish overtones in Paul's Christ concept. All four men see the

concept of the vicarious atoning death of Christ as innately Jewish.⁵⁵ Schoeps and Klausner both point out that this is essentially the idea found in Isaiah 53, where the "suffering servant" suffers for the sins of the people.⁵⁶ In addition, Schoeps, Spiegel, and Rubenstein (who used Schoeps's idea) all see the story of the sacrifice of Isaac as a paradigm for the crucifixion of Christ, the details of which will be discussed below. Montefiore and Schoeps both see the crucifixion as a form of **כפרה**, a form of expiation of sins. This, however, is an impossibility within Paul's system. It is rather an "expiation" of sinfulness. The difference may indeed appear to be semantic, but it is not. Christ's death did not atone for a man's coveting of his brother's wife, rather, he atoned for that part of man which would make him covet his brother's wife in the first place. That the suffering servant motif should appear in Paul should be of no surprise - neither should it impinge on our Hellenistic impression of Paul. To call Paul Hellenistic is not to call him non-Jewish, for he was in fact a Jew and used the Bible extensively.⁵⁷

But in Paul, we have a Christ who is something which does not appear within the context of Palestinian Judaism. Christ is a pre-existent being,⁵⁸ the "first born of all creation"⁵⁹ who, "though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God as a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the

likeness of men. And being found in human form he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a cross."⁶⁰ In other words, the Christ pre-existed Jesus and became incarnated in Jesus at his birth.^{61,62}

But what then is the Christ? Paul uses three terms, all of which represent exactly the same thing: Christ, Son of God,⁶³ and *κύριος* or Lord. It is precisely on this issue that we can see a striking parallel to Philo of Alexandria. Philo sees the *λόγος* as that aspect of transcendent Deity which is perceptible to the human mind. So too is Paul's Christ that part of Deity perceptible to the human mind. This in no way makes Paul dependent on Philo as Gerald Friedlander suggests. Rather, both concepts are functionally similar to the gods of the Greek mysteries. In the Greek mysteries, the highest goal man can attain is unity with the deity, however to Philo and Paul, to whom this response was Jewishly unsatisfactory, it was union with the *λόγος* of God or with the Christ. The *λόγος* is not an easy entity to describe. Sandmel uses the analogy of a power plant and a light bulb: the power plant representing God, the light bulb, the *λόγος*.⁶⁴ Clearer perhaps is the analogy of a flashlight held behind a large sheet and obliquely to it. What we see on our side of the sheet is an elliptical projection of light. We cannot tell the nature of that which is producing the light or even the actual shape of the light beam. But we know that it is there by means of the illuminated ellipse.

But the concepts of Paul and Philo correspond only functionally. Philo spoke in Stoic-Pythagorean-Platonic terms, thus his *λόγος* was a metaphysical abstract. Jesus, on the other hand, was a historical fact. Thus, union with Christ has, in the minds of Paul's audience, much more physical reality than union with Philo's *λόγος*, thereby placing Paul much closer to the mystery religions than Philo.⁶⁵

Somewhat different views are held by Rivkin, Schonfield, and to some extent, Klausner. Schonfield believes that the term "Christ" means "Israel"; that is, the Messiah is Israel personified. So when Paul speaks of unity in Christ, he means unity in Israel, and thus he is able to make Israelites of the Gentiles without the Law.⁶⁶ This identification simply does not hold up under scrutiny, however, and Schonfield has the process completely backward. By saying unity in Christ, Paul does not mean unity in Israel except in a superficial sense. In Romans 9-11, Paul defines "Israel" as those in Christ (instead of the other-way-around), not by identification, but because the inheritance of Abraham is transmitted through Christ as opposed to transmission through "fleshly" descent, in the same manner that it was transmitted through Isaac and not through Ishmael, through Jacob and not through Esau.

Rivkin says that "paradoxically," Paul's Christ is congruent with the Pharisaic system of the twofold Law. Each was believed by its adherents to be the creation of God the

Father, each promises to deliver from sin, each offers eternal life and resurrection for the believing individual, each preaches that reality is within, not without, each denies to externality the power to refute the certainties of internalized faith (underlining Rivkin's), and each says that the Messiah will come (or come again) and that salvation is at hand.⁶⁷ Thus, according to Rivkin, Paul has merely replaced the twofold Law with Christ.⁶⁸ The premises may be correct as far as they go, but they do not go far enough to yield the conclusion; for they deal neither with the fact that by salvation, Paul means something very different from that promised by the twofold Law of the rabbis, nor with the fact that the process of salvation and the function of the Christ is very different from that of the twofold Law. The twofold Law has its authorship ascribed to God, but it is neither an offspring nor a son of God; one attempts to live by the precepts of the twofold Law, union with it is never a goal.

Klausner⁶⁹ and Kohler (see "Notes to Chapter IV", note #65) both claim that Paul's Christ infringes upon the unity and divine prerogatives of God. This is clearly not the case; see, for example, I Corinthians 3:23, "... and you are Christ's and Christ is God's," or I Corinthians 15:28, "When all things are subjected to him, then the son himself will also be subjected to him who put all things under, that God may be everything to everyone," wherein Christ's subordinate role is quite apparent. Sandmel summarizes this by saying, "It

may appear to us that in Paul's view, Christ acts for God; but in Paul's thought, God acts in Christ" (underlining Sandmel's).⁷⁰

Another aspect of Paul's Christology which we must consider is that of the Second Adam:

"If, because of one man's trespass, death reigned through that one man, much more will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man Jesus Christ. Then as one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by one man's obedience many will be made righteous."⁷¹

That is, just as one man, Adam, brought death and sin into the world, his counterpart, the New Adam, the New Creation,⁷² Jesus Christ, brought eternal life and an end of sin into the world.⁷³

And finally, an aspect of Pauline Christology mentioned by Rubenstein, Schoeps, and Spiegel, although not by Paul himself (which Schoeps freely admits), is the parallel of the sacrifice of Christ with the story of the binding of Isaac. Schoeps believes that Paul started with a pre-supposed Isaac, which, being a pious Jew, he must have heard in the Rosh Hashanah liturgy,⁷⁴ and built his soteriology around it. The parallels and opposites as Schoeps sees them are as follows: like Isaac, the sacrifice of Jesus was a divinely commanded son-sacrifice, the differences being that only Christ claimed to be the Messiah and one whom God had sent and the sacrifice

of Isaac was not consummated. Schoeps also says that in Rabbinic thought, the sacrifice of Isaac had expiatory power just as the death of Christ had expiatory power (on expiation versus atonement, see above). Schoeps also sees word parallels between Romans 8:32 and the Septuagint version of Genesis 22:16. But according to Schoeps, the most significant difference between the two motifs is the fact that God interrupted Isaac's sacrifice but not Jesus's.⁷⁵

Spiegel, on the other hand, sees the Akedah merely as analogous to the Golgotha event: as the Akedah granted merit to Israel, so the Golgotha event granted merit to the whole world; as Isaac was called the sheep for the burnt offering, so too was Jesus called the Lamb. Spiegel also mentions with Schoeps that Abraham did not complete the sacrifice of his son whereas God did.⁷⁶

How not to Obtain Salvation: The Law of Moses

"Yet who know that a man is not justified by works of the Law but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Christ Jesus in order to be justified by faith in Christ, and not by works of the Law, because by works of the Law shall no one be justified."

"For all those who rely on works of the Law are under a curse; for it is written, 'Cursed be everyone who does not abide by all things written in the book of the Law and do them (Deut. 27:26).'⁷⁷ Now it is evident that no man is justified before God by the Law; for 'He who through faith is righteous shall live' (Hab. 2:4); but the Law does not rest on faith, for 'He who does

them shall live by them' (Lev. 18:5). Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, having become a curse for us - for it is written, 'Cursed be everyone who hangs on a tree' (Deut. 21:23) that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles, that we might receive the promise of the spirit through faith."

"Why then the Law? It was added because of transgressions, till the offspring should come to whom the promise had been made; and it was ordained by angels through an intermediary. Now an intermediary implies more than one; but God is one."⁷⁸

Thus the Law is abrogated. To Paul, it was unfulfillable and therefore not a valid vehicle for salvation.⁷⁹ For it was not within the domain of Providence to provide man with a means of salvation which was itself unattainable. Therefore, the means of salvation must be something other than the Law. Furthermore, the Law was but an inferior form of revelation; for it was revealed not by God, but by angels and then through an intermediary, Moses.⁸⁰ Similarly, in Paul's mind the Law was further weakened by the fact that he had had a direct encounter with God - one later than that of Moses and therefore more valid.⁸¹

But the proof that the Law was not the sine qua non of righteousness could be found in the example of Abraham himself:

"For what does the Scripture say? 'Abraham believed God and it was reckoned to him as righteousness' (Gen. 15:6). Now to one who works, his wages are not reckoned as a gift but as his due. And to one who does not work but trusts Him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is reckoned as righteousness."⁸²

And as we have already seen, "righteousness" or "justification" is the same thing as salvation itself; for it is the removal of the human state of sinfulness. But this state of salvation was reckoned to Abraham on the basis of faith alone and prior to the giving of the Law. So too with circumcision:

"He received circumcision as a sign or seal of the righteousness which he had by faith while he was still uncircumcised. The purpose was to make him the father of all who believe without being circumcised and who thus have righteousness reckoned to them, and likewise the father of the circumcised who are not merely circumcised but also follow the example of the faith which our father Abraham had before he was circumcised."⁸⁵

Thus as with the Law itself, circumcision cannot be an essential matter for salvation, since Abraham was considered righteous before he was circumcised.^{84,85}

Now we must ask how it is that a Pharisee and a practicing Jew as Paul claimed to have been came to abrogate the entire Law.⁸⁶ Schoeps believes that Paul, through his use of the Septuagint, lost the Hebrew concept of **ברית** through its translation by **διαθήκη** which does not contain the idea of reciprocity between God and man, and thus he also lost the corresponding concepts of **יראה** and **חשובה**. Also, Paul's concept of the Second Adam, whose sacrificial death had the ability to expiate human sin, meant that "the failure of the Law of Moses could be compensated and wiped out by **ἡμετέρας χριστοῦ**."⁸⁷ But, as was explained in the last section,

the view of Jesus's death as an expiatory sacrifice is not sufficient to explain the fulness of Paul's thought.

Montefiore said that Jesus had pointed out three shortcomings of those who followed the Law: putting the literal in place of morality, self-righteousness or pride, and ill-directed intellectualism. But Paul, on the other hand, attacked Law as Law. Although Montefiore here has ignored past scholarship by treating the synoptic tradition as we now have it as a pre-Pauline phenomenon (Schoeps and Rubenstein are frequently guilty of the same thing), he is on the right track by saying that it was the very fact that the Law is law which caused Paul to attack it.⁸⁸ Part of the reason why this is so is as we have already mentioned, the Septuagint's translation of חורה by νόμος.⁸⁹

This, according to Sandmel, would cause someone with innate Greek pre-suppositions to confuse the issue of νόμος meaning חורה and νόμος meaning polis law or imperial law: not so much in terms of their origin, but in terms of their nature as law. In the Greek world, there existed the dual concept of natural law versus written law. The written law was made by the local ruler or by the government in Rome. It could be good or it could be bad. Natural law, on the other hand, was that ideal law (here using "ideal" in the technical Platonic sense) by which all men ought to live and which the laws of all rulers ought to approximate. Philo was quite aware of this problem. His solution was that the

book of Genesis was the book of the law of nature and that Moses, in legislating the remainder of the Law, attempted to approximate the lives of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob who in fact had lived in accordance with natural law. Thus the Law of Moses was the best approximation of natural law available in written form.⁹⁰

Whether or not Paul was actually aware of this concept is impossible to tell for sure. But there are two possible references to natural law in the Epistles:

"Ever since the creation of the world His invisible nature, namely, His eternal power and deity has been clearly perceived in the things that have been made. So they [that is, the ungodly of verse 1:18] are without excuse."

and

"When Gentiles who do not have the Law do by nature what the Law requires, they are a Law to themselves, even though they do not have the Law."⁹¹

Rubenstein, who assumes that the synoptic tradition, especially the Sermon on the Mount, is older than Paul, believes that the break with the Law came not from Paul but from Jesus himself. For when, in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus asserted his authority over the Law, and when in Matthew 12:8 Jesus declared that "the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath," for Paul, the precedent had already been established.⁹² The problem with this view is its assumption of the primacy of the synoptic gospels.

Most Jewish scholars, however, believe that Paul used the

Law itself and its casuistic dialectic to prove that it was no longer valid. The only major exception to this is Sandmel. Klausner,⁹³ Kohler,⁹⁴ and Schoeps point to Romans 7:1-6:

"Do you not know, brethren, for I am speaking to those who know the Law -- that the Law is binding on a person only during his life? Thus a married woman is bound by law to her husband as long as he lives; but if her husband dies she is discharged from the law concerning her husband..."

"Likewise, my brethren, you have died to the Law through the body of Christ, so that you may belong to another, to him who has been raised from the dead in order that we may bear fruit for God. While we were living in the flesh, our sinful passions, aroused by the Law, were at work in our members to bear fruit for death. But now we are discharged from the Law, dead to that which held us captive, so that we serve not under the old written code but in the new life in the Spirit."

to show that having "died," man is now dead to the Law.

Schoeps, in addition, notes that this concept appears in much of the Rabbinic literature.⁹⁵

However, the Rabbinic dictum pointed to by most Jewish scholars is found in Sanhedrin 97a (also in Jer. Megillah 70d, Abodah Zarah 9a, and Pesikta Rabbati 4a) and states that "the world will exist for six thousand years: two thousand of chaos, two thousand of the Torah, [and] two thousand days (years? - Hebrew - מֵנוּחַ) of the Messiah." This view, attributed by some to Baeck and by some to Schoeps, actually originates with Graetz.⁹⁶ No one notices, however, that

neither this statement nor anything vaguely related to it is ever mentioned by Paul himself. Indeed, although we cannot date the statement, all of the sources are much later than Paul. And both this idea and that listed above completely ignore the fact that Paul considered the Law inefficacious for salvation prior to the initial appearance of the Christ.⁹⁷ Furthermore, as Sandmel has said, "if the abrogation of the Law is only a detail, only a by-product of the arrival of the Messianic Age, then it is not simultaneously the central factor in the question: How can I achieve my individual salvation?"⁹⁸

But all of these possible motives notwithstanding, the best reason for Paul's abrogation of the Law is that given by Paul himself. Assuming, with Baeck and Sandmel, that Paul's goal was the certainty of salvation, then we must realize that within the Pharisaic context, only the Law had been the acceptable mode through which salvation could be achieved. Paul, in Romans 7, tells us that he had found that he could not obey all of the precepts of the Law. Moreover, many of the precepts of the Law had made him want to do things which he had not even considered before he had heard about them in the Law itself (all Jewish scholars except Schoeps consider Romans 7 autobiographical - Schoeps considers it to be about EveryJew).⁹⁹ Thus there is no certainty of salvation in the Law at all; so too repentance - for there is no way of knowing whether or not the repentance has been accepted. Thus the Law cannot

be the solution.

Another question with which Jewish scholars struggle is why, from the standpoint of his sincerity, did Paul abrogate the Law. And among Jewish writers, only Sandmel and Rivkin allow unequivocally that Paul acted out of principle. Living in the Greek world, the Law was unobservable. Hence, Paul's decision to nullify - not because it was burdensome - but because due to its unobservability, it was ineffectual.¹⁰⁰ And it is logical, therefore, that the reason Paul had so much trouble converting Jews was because of his stand on the Law.

All other writers see the answer in reverse. Paul, finding himself unable to convert Jews, tried to convert the Gentiles but found the Law an obstacle; hence he nullified the Law and was constrained to find a rationale.¹⁰¹ But this is tantamount to calling Paul a hypocritical liar. And if that is the assumption with which one begins, then the entire scholarly enterprise, or any other attempt to discern truth in the matter, is a waste of time.

The Mechanics of Salvation

i - The Sacraments

It is entirely likely that the two practices, baptism and the Eucharist or fellowship meal, were found in the early Church prior to Paul's conversion. That these practices were to be found in Judaism is attested to by Schoeps,¹⁰²

Klausner,¹⁰³ Kohler (baptism only - the origin of the Eucharist is not discussed),¹⁰⁴ Zeitlin (baptism only - Zeitlin is writing about Klausner, not specifically about Paul),¹⁰⁵ Baeck (baptism only),¹⁰⁶ and Petuchowski (Eucharist only).^{107,108} But in Judaism, these practices were either mere ceremonies or, in the case of baptism, a ritual cleansing. But to Paul, they were sacramental in nature, that is, they effected an actual change in the nature of the participant. Thus we must look to the Greek mysteries where these rites are also found. That this is so may be found in Schoeps,¹⁰⁹ Klausner,¹¹⁰ Kohler,¹¹¹ Dubnow,¹¹² and Baeck.¹¹³ Sandmel believes that the Eucharist, as such, was original with Paul which he "received from the Lord" in a revelation.¹¹⁴

Part of what the sacrament of baptism meant to Paul may be found in Baeck who contrasts the "Jewish" meaning with that of the Greek mysteries. In Judaism, baptism was an intransitive act carried out by an individual upon himself; in the Greek mysteries, it was a transitive act done to an individual by another person. In Judaism, the function of baptism was to cleanse the individual (either of dirt or of his sins); in the Greek mysteries, the individual was transformed. In Judaism, the act was ritualistic in nature, in the Greek mysteries, sacramental. And finally, in Judaism, the individual was a subject who cleansed himself of pollution whereas in the Greek mysteries, he was an object united with deity (underlining mine).¹¹⁵ In every instance, Paul's

interpretation is congruent with that of the Greek mysteries. But Baeck omitted one essential point which is applicable to Paul; the baptism "is" a death and rebirth. With baptism, an initiate dies to the flesh in the crucifixion of Christ and upon emerging from the water, he is resurrected in the spirit, in the resurrection of Christ, and in the body of Christ. Thus, he has in fact been transformed.

So too with the Eucharist: as Rubenstein points out, there is a fundamental difference in the Eucharist as practiced by the early disciples (sources - the gospels and Acts) and as practiced by Paul (source - I Corinthians 10:16, 11:23-25). To the early disciples, the meal was a simple bread-breaking, a remembrance, an anticipation. For Paul, the participant becomes one with the body of Christ;¹¹⁶ as Paul himself explained:

"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ?"¹¹⁷

Although not all Jewish writers on Paul deal with the sacraments in detail, there are among those who write on them, no serious disagreements as to their meaning - only as to their origin.¹¹⁸

ii - Faith

"For in [the gospel] the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith; as it is written, 'He who through faith is righteous shall live' (Hab. 2:4)."

"The promise made to Abraham and his descendants, that they should inherit the world, did not come through the Law, but through the righteousness of faith."
(This statement, as we have already seen, is based on Genesis 15:6).

"... for in Christ Jesus you are all sons of God through faith."

"... not having a righteousness of my own, based on Law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness from God which depends on faith;"¹¹⁹

Thus faith is the basic mechanism through which salvation is both achieved and maintained. But since we have seen that other terms common to both Pauline and Rabbinic usage have different meanings in each, we must ask whether or not the Pauline *πίστις* is the same as the Rabbinic *אמונה*.

Zeitlin's statement that Christianity has substituted salvation by faith alone for the life of the commandments is overly simplistic,¹²⁰ as is Klausner's statement that for Paul, the "essential thing is -- faith in Christ" (underlining Klausner's).¹²¹ For Paul, the Christ and faith "in him" were no mere substitutions, any more than the Law was a substitution for the Temple sacrifices, although superficially, both may appear to be functional substitutes. Rather, the Christ was the culmination of God's plan, the ultimate revelation which had yet been revealed to man by Deity. Christ superseded, not replaced, the old revelation because it had been ineffectual in achieving the ultimate goal of salvation - indeed, one which it was never designed to achieve. So too

was faith "in Christ" not a mere intellectual belief.¹²² And the term "faith in Christ" should more properly be replaced with "faith in the saving death and resurrection of Christ."

As the explanations of Zeitlin and Klausner are inadequate, so are those of Baeck and Kohler condescending. Two statements from "Romantic Religion" summarize Baeck's view of Pauline faith:

"What everything represents is not a creation of God and not an eternal moral order, but a process of salvation ... There is no other word but the definite word 'myth,' romantic myth, to characterize this form of faith."

"Paul sees everything ... in the 'phantastic form,'" and therefore, his concept of the border line between "appearance and reality" disappears or is fuzzy at best. "Thus he lives in the beyond which transcends all things ... where only faith can reach and only miracles can take place. Therefore faith is everything to him ... la foi pour la foi."¹²³

Kohler calls Paul's faith blind and artificial, a condemnation of all human wisdom, reason, and common sense, an opening of the door to mysticism and superstition.¹²⁴ It is unfortunate that on this point, the weakest in Paul's "system," these writers have chosen to attack Paul rather than discern what he meant. Yet in one sense, Kohler and Baeck are correct: to our "enlightened" nineteenth and twentieth century minds, Paul's system of faith provides no more certainty of salvation than does the Law of Moses. Not for nought did Kirkegaard so name his "leap of faith," and as he said, sooner or later,

in any religious system dealing with a transcendent deity, that leap must be made.

Schoeps and Montefiore both point to Paul's dichotomy between "works" and "faith." Both show that it is not a true dichotomy at all: Montefiore saying that Paul himself at times recognizes the efficacy of works in the final Judgement,¹²⁵ and Schoeps saying that Paul at times treats faith as though it were itself a "work."¹²⁶ And both Montefiore and Schoeps see Paul's *πίστις* as something other than Biblical *אמונה*. Schoeps indicates that "faith is not trust in the Biblical God but is faith in the sacral event of the Christ-soteriology, which he assesses as a saving disposition of God."¹²⁷ And although in all of his earlier essays on Paul, Montefiore confuses the words "faith" and "belief,"¹²⁸ in an essay written much later, he says that "Rabbinic emunah, which we translate 'faith' like the usage of the same word in the Bible, means not so much 'belief' as 'trust.' It is in some respects narrower than Pauline pistis; in some respects wider."¹²⁹

It is at this point that we are finally approaching something of an understanding of what Paul meant by *πίστις*. For it is indeed a combination of "belief," "trust," and total reliance and subjugation. To have faith in the atoning power of the death of Christ is to give oneself up totally to that power and to understand that for one in Christ, there is nothing but Christ.

The Election of Israel

One thing upon which most Jewish scholars are agreed, Paul never considered himself anything but a true Jew.¹³⁰ But it is quite apparent from Paul's epistles, and especially the section from Romans 9-11, that Paul did not consider those who called themselves Jews to be the true inheritors of the promise of Abraham; but that this distinction exists is not the fault of Paul, rather, it is the blindness of those of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh which prevents them from realizing that the Christ is the Savior of mankind.¹³¹ The election of Israel has not been abrogated,¹³² rather, the nature of what is meant by Israel has changed.

Klausner says of Paul that "he always saw Christianity according to his own conception of it, namely, that it was the true Judaism; and he considered that he was bringing the Gentiles into Judaism, and not taking the Jews out of Judaism at all" (underlining Klausner's).¹³³ But Paul did not wish to abandon the concept of the election of Israel and therefore, rather than do so, he altered the concept.¹³⁴ Paul started with the realization that the promise made to Abraham was not handed down through all of his sons. Ishmael was specifically disinherited, and Isaac, the second son, was named the heir. So too with Isaac's sons: Esau, the eldest, was disinherited and the line of succession passed to Jacob. Also, the prophets mention that in the last days, there would be but a remnant of Israel left. Thus it was apparent to Paul that a

selection process was continually in progress with God holding the prerogative to choose whomever He wished to be the inheritors of the initial promise. In revealing Himself through Christ, He had revealed a New Israel, an Israel of the Spirit as opposed to the Israel of the flesh. "Membership" in the Israel of the Spirit was thus now opened to the Gentiles and also to those Jews who were in the Spirit, that is, who had accepted Christ. But what of the remainder of the Jews? Was all hope lost for them? No. Like Pharaoh, their hearts had been hardened by God in order that the Gentiles might be summoned and that Israel (of the flesh) might become jealous of them. When all of the Gentiles were brought into Christ, then the hearts of the Jews would be softened, they would be brought into Christ too, and the Parousia would occur. Thus, at the present time, vis-à-vis the proclamation of the Messiah, the Jews are despised of God, but vis-à-vis their original election, they have זכות אברהם .135

On this matter, it is also important to note that in spite of all of Paul's bitter attacks against the Law, he never attacks Judaism per se and only once attacks Jews as a corporate entity.¹³⁶

Many writers, therefore, see in Paul's concept of Israel and in his de-nationalization of the concept of the Messiah, a new universalism opposed to the particularist nationalism of Palestinian Judaism. Schoeps sees this as the predominant thrust of Hellenistic Jewish evangelism,¹³⁷ and Kohler

defines it as an attempt to "break down the partition wall between Jew and Gentile."^{138,139} Sandmel, on the other hand, disagrees. He says that Paul is not universalistic at all. Rather, he has merely substituted a Christian particularism for the Palestinian-Jewish one. But Sandmel has also set forth two further problems which others have neither recognized nor solved. First, there is the possibility that Jewish ethnocentricity did not exist at all - rather, it is a counter-position to "Christian universalism" perceived by the nineteenth century analysts. And secondly, it is quite probable that we do not adequately understand first century ethnocentricity.¹⁴⁰

Ethics

When discussing Paul's, or for that matter, anyone else's, "ethics," one must bear in mind the distinction between ethical pre-suppositions and ethical systems. Frequently, in the case of Paul, scholars speak of one or the other, rarely both, calling both "ethics," and arrive at widely divergent conclusions because they are not referring to the same entity.¹⁴¹

Sandmel and Klausner both find that Paul's ethical pre-suppositions are thoroughly Jewish. He is opposed to idolatry, sexual licentiousness, covetousness, and other taboos that one finds in the Scriptures. Klausner also finds some Stoic overtones as well as influence from the "Oriental

mystery religions" in Paul's lists of household virtues and duties. But these are minor compared to the over-all Jewish tenor of Paul's ethical thought.¹⁴²

However, we do not find in Paul the systematized kind of ethics that one finds in the Stoic literature: there is no mention at all of the virtues or the passions. But neither is there a "system" such as we find in Judaism, one regulated by the Law and one in which the ethical precepts are believed to come from God. Both Baeck and Schoeps have said that Paul put both ritual and ethical Law on the same level (Schoeps saying that the transformation of the Torah into a mere ethical code originates in the Septuagint itself and therefore "must have been a special characteristic of Hellenistic Judaism") and thus to dispense with one was to dispense with the other.¹⁴³

Indeed, Paul's abrogation of the Law has caused Ernest Jacob and Baeck to say that Paul had no ethics, that it has been replaced by faith and that faith is the antithesis to ethics.¹⁴⁴ But although Paul abandoned the Law as a means to salvation, even a quick perusal of Romans 12-15:13 and I Corinthians 5-8 will show that Paul has not abandoned his ethical sense.

Since Paul has no ethical system, his ethics has been called "interim ethics," that is, designed to exist only for the brief period between the first and second comings of Christ.¹⁴⁵ But this lack of a system created serious

problems for Paul. Paul's whole thought is based on one central problem, "How can one be certain of achieving salvation?" with its two corollaries, "salvation is achieving a state of sinlessness" and "the Law does not achieve salvation." When he preached, he apparently was able to pass on only the solution to the problem, not the inner-felt tension that preceded the solution. Thus his audiences, especially in Corinth and Ephesus (if Ephesians is indeed by Paul), upon hearing that the Law was not valid, and not appreciating the difference between The Law and law, felt free to act as they pleased. Paul, on the other hand, believed that those who sincerely accepted Christ, would not or could not possibly violate the ethical precepts of the Law. He felt merely that the Law was not necessary to maintain them, rather, what was needed was "love." As Montefiore, using "sin" with its Jewish meaning of "transgress," so well phrased it, "The man who really knew the right could not choose to do wrong, said Socrates; the man who really believed in Christ could not desire sin, said Paul."¹⁴⁶

Chapter V

Analysis and Conclusions

The purpose of scholarship, at least as I understand it, is to attempt to discern and present an objective and unbiased picture of "The Truth." It is an unfortunate fact, however, that in religious scholarship in particular, the results often come far short of the goal. In Christian scholarship especially, Judaism has often been pictured as the weaker sister, a "lower" form of religious experience, a rigid, legalistic system, devoid of warmth and out of touch with the needs of the people. And, as if this were not enough, lurking in the background of much of the early scholarship is the accusation of deicide.

Thus a Jew, such as Claude Montefiore, entering the realm of Christian scholarship required a great deal of courage and resiliency. All too often, Claude G. Montefiore has been attacked by Jews as an apologist. But this shows an insensitivity to the fact that he was a man treading on virgin, hostile ground. Montefiore wrote three essays directly on the subject of Paul and a plethora of essays on Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism in general. His writings show him to have been an exceedingly modest man who claimed that he himself was not a scholar. Whether he was or was not will depend on the reader's definition of scholarship, but we must not expect in Montefiore the exactitude or pedantry

which is characteristic of the German scholarship of the period.

In his essays, Montefiore attempted to defend Judaism against the attacks of the nineteenth century German scholars and against the attacks of Paul himself. In many essays, he was also asking the question, "What can we, as Liberal Jews, learn from ...?" and inserting in the ellipsis whatever the topic of the essay happened to be.

To accomplish his goal of defending Judaism, he attempted to prove that the Judaism which Paul attacked was neither the Rabbinic Judaism of two or three centuries after Paul's time nor its descendant, the Judaism of today.¹ As we have seen, his solution was to show that either Paul thoroughly misunderstood the Judaism of his day or, as was more likely, the Judaism of Paul was something radically different from Rabbinic Judaism. The deficiency of Montefiore's writings is that having determined that Paul was not a Rabbinic Jew (which is all that we learn from him, it was not his wont to then describe Paul's Judaism in detail), he then attacks Paul's Judaism with the same virulence and in the same derogatory tones as the detractors of Rabbinic Judaism used in their own attacks. Sandmel has said that Montefiore ignored Christian scholarship on both the reliability of Acts and on the question of the rapid Hellenization of Christianity.² Both of these statements are true, but neither was within Montefiore's province. The latter was irrelevant to Monte-

fiore's goal - he simply did not care. The former would have been counterproductive. Montefiore was aware of Christian scholarship on Acts and did mention it. But although he himself did not actually use the Book of Acts as a reliable source, he did not attack the picture of Paul portrayed therein on the basis of unreliability of the source. I believe that as a Jew, he would have felt that discarding Acts would have weakened his case before a Christian audience: the book was not his to discard. Therefore, though he drew his conclusions from the Epistles, he would not open a direct attack on Acts.

The significance of Montefiore, however, was not in his conclusions. His deference to other scholars, particularly Loisy, indicates that the conclusions were not unique. Rather, Montefiore broke the ground for other Jews to follow. For without him, Jews might have had to wait another half century before entering the field of Christian scholarship.³

In 1905, Kaufman Kohler wrote his article, "Saul of Tarsus," for the Jewish Encyclopedia, significant for the breadth of his audience. It is to Kohler's credit that he was able to deal with as much of Paul's thought as he did within the small space of an encyclopedia article; a cursory check of the references in this essay will impress upon the reader the scope of Kohler's work. But Kohler also faced the same problems as did Montefiore: the attacks on Judaism made by both the nineteenth century scholars and Paul himself.

Kohler's response became a polemic and his scholarship thereby deteriorated. Kohler had formed an image in his mind as to what Paul must have been like, then he proceeded to identify as spurious all of the material that did not fit that image. He became so extreme on some issues, such as the genuineness of Galatians, that he approached what Sandmel referred to as the "fringes of scholarship." His condescension and arrogance cloud the reader's path to understanding. Paul is the apostle not to the Gentiles, but to the heathen, salvation is secured by "some arbitrary act of divine grace,"⁴ the biographical details of Paul's life "form the subject for much dispute among Christians, but are of no special interest for Jewish readers ..."⁵ At times, Kohler entered the realm of the ludicrous; he combines Galatians 3:28 (where Paul says that in Christ there is neither male nor female) with Galatians 5:12 (where Paul expresses his hope that those of the circumcision party who trouble the Galatians would castrate themselves) to concoct the conclusion that Paul advocated eunuchism.⁶

The article is useful in that it is another example of how Jews reacted to the pressure put upon them by Christian scholarship. But for the thought of Paul of Tarsus, it is better left unread.

Krister Stendahl, in his introduction to the Schocken anthology, "The Pharisees" and Other Essays, said that "Leo Baeck was looking for the essence of things."⁷ That is one

way of phrasing it. But the fact is that Baeck too felt the same pressures from Christian scholarship that Montefiore and Kohler felt, and he spent the first part of his scholarly life (at least in the realm of Christian scholarship) answering Harnack's Das Wesen des Christenthums. "Judaism in the Church," "Two World Views Compared," and "Romantic Religion" are all polemical to some degree, "Romantic Religion" being the most extreme. Baeck's hypothesis in this latter essay is that Christianity is a romantic religion as opposed to Judaism which is a classical religion. He then spends the remainder of the essay demonstrating the superiority of classical religion over romantic religion. But during this period of his life, his view of Paul is quite interesting and, I believe, more accurate than what it was to become. In essence, it may be reduced to a mathematical equation of the type $f(x,y) = z$ where f is the function performing on x and y to produce z . Substituting the givens for the variables, we have:

$$\text{Paul}(\text{Hellenism}, \text{Judaism}) = \text{Christianity}$$

In other words, Paul acted on both Hellenism and Judaism such that, by bridging the gap between the two, he produced a synthesis, Christianity, which was neither but related to both.

Later in life, however, specifically in the 1952 essay, "The Faith of Paul," Baeck changed his views completely - a fact also mentioned by Stendahl.⁸ In this essay, Hellenism has all but disappeared from the character of Paul, excepting,

of course, those concepts such as the sacraments where it is unmistakable. In fact, this trend becomes stronger within the essay itself, such that by the time Baeck reaches the conclusion, the only difference between Paul and any other Palestinian Jew is the question of whether or not the Messiah and the kingdom of God had actually arrived.⁹ Our equation still holds but the effects of the x (Hellenism) upon the z (Christianity) become minuscule.

It should also be noted that in "The Faith of Paul," Baeck basically ignores Christian scholarship on most of the issues at hand. He admits, for example, that most scholars consider Acts to be unreliable (a change from Montefiore's time), but the conception of Paul which he has in this essay can be derived only from Acts.

Klausner too is heavily dependent upon the Book of Acts. But Klausner is the only Jew besides Sandmel who deals with the problem. Klausner's solutions are interesting because they are so contradictory. By the time Klausner wrote, the influence of the nineteenth century scholars was beginning to diminish, as can be seen in the writings of George Foot Moore. Correspondingly, the reaction of Jewish scholarship to that influence was also beginning to diminish, as can be seen in Klausner. But Klausner is still somewhat defensive - for every chapter but one in the seventh book of his From Jesus to Paul ends with the question, "How could a Jew believe something like that?" or a reasonable facsimile thereof.

Klausner, however, seems to be a victim of the authority of the text. By this I mean that by virtue of a text's being written word, it has already acquired some semblance of authority for him. Zeitlin, in a review of Klausner's Jesus of Nazareth in "Studies in Christianity" in the Jewish Quarterly Review, had the same complaint. There he says that Klausner gives the opinions of other scholars and seems to agree with all of them.¹⁰ In Pauline studies, this text-authority has taken the form of accepting both the Paul of Acts and the Paul of the Epistles. Klausner gives a portrayal of Paul based on the Book of Acts. He also presents a relatively accurate Paul based on the Epistles (in fact, he and Sandmel, who are quite far apart on the issue of Acts, are frequently in agreement on the details of Paul's thought). What he does not see, however, is that he has portrayed two entirely different men: the Paul of Acts being a distinctly Palestinian Jew and the Paul of the Epistles being a distinctly Hellenistic Jew. Perhaps Klausner does not see the problem because he is determined to make a Palestinian Jew of Paul. Almost all of the ideas found in the Epistles are, according to Klausner, ultimately of Jewish origin. He makes the same statement about Philo. Klausner does not seem to appreciate the fact that ideas do not exist in isolation and that one must expect to find some intellectual and cultural overlap between two cultures living in proximity. Klausner also seems to believe that an idea is Jewish simply

because he says it is.

But Klausner's book too has its significance; for as Montefiore paved the way in English, so did Klausner pave the way in Hebrew. And having made an appearance in Hebrew, Christian studies now became available to a wider portion of the Jewish population.

Another Jewish writer on Paul who relies very heavily on Acts is Hugh Schonfield. Schonfield, however, goes far beyond the limits of any other Jewish scholar on Paul, in fact, beyond the limits of what most critics would call scholarship. He accepts all of the material as genuine: Acts, all of the Epistles (including the Pastorals), the apocryphal Acts, and all possible references in the Rabbinic literature which might have some reference to the thought of Paul. However, even with all of this information, there are gaps in the life of Paul, for he never left us an autobiography. But this is of little concern to Schonfield; he fills in the gaps with information of his own. If a translation contradicts his position, he makes up his own, and some of his translations are completely erroneous. I liken Schonfield's approach to a gelatin mold with fruit in it. Inside the mold there are peaches, pears, cherries, and grapes, none of them related in any way except that they are fruit, and the only thing which binds them together is the gelatin.¹¹ So too with Schonfield's Jew of Tarsus; there are scattered pieces of information, some of which are wrong, some of which are

unrelated, and all of which are bound together only by the extraordinary mass of gelatin created by Schonfield. In a review of Schonfield's Jew of Tarsus, Kenneth W. Clark has pointed out that although Schonfield recognizes the influences of esoteric Judaism, esoteric Pharisaism, and apocalypticism on Paul, he does not recognize the influence of Hellenistic Judaism. So too did Clark point out that Schonfield's hypothesis, that Paul thought that he was the Messiah, is absurd (see "Notes to Chapter III", note #17).¹²

Hans Joachim Schoeps takes an approach to Paul which is much closer to that of the earlier Christian scholarship than that of his Jewish predecessors. Schoeps, using the full gamut of Jewish sources as well as the full body of earlier scholarly literature, attempts to find not so much the nature of Paul's thought, but its origins. Schoeps proposes to pursue Montefiore's direction, but by a "better method." He will investigate the known Hellenistic sources: Philo and the Septuagint, and the apocalyptic literature and then attribute that which he does not find in either to Hellenistic Pharisaism. He will then compare the Hellenistic Pharisaism to Rabbinism to see how much of Paul's thought is evident in Rabbinic Judaism and thus how much of a Rabbinic Jew Paul himself was. But in this last step, Schoeps makes several crucial errors. The first of these, pointed out in a review of the book by Jakob J. Petuchowski, is that "much of Schoeps's evidence rests on the assumption that rabbinic material, found in

written form at a later time, was already extant orally in the days of Paul. To a certain degree such an assumption is justified, but one must proceed on it with a caution which is not always exercised in this book."¹³ This lack of caution is a result of the misuse of Strack-Billerbeck, in which the Rabbinic material is listed topically. Thus Schoeps seems to have no concept of general trends in Rabbinic Judaism. This causes him to take any saying from any rabbi at any time in history and if it corresponds with any idea found in Paul to say, "You see, Paul's thought can be found in Rabbinic Judaism."¹⁴ What this does not account for is that which I have already mentioned in this essay - that Rabbinic Judaism was actually very broad and very open; and that to find a particular idea at some time and some place in its history is not to be thought of as unusual.

Another error in Schoeps's thought is the seemingly pre-conceived notion that Paul was a Rabbinic Jew and that his (that is, Schoeps's) task, rather than to discover whether or not Paul was in fact such a Jew, is to prove that in fact he was. Thus Schoeps finds that none of the ideas in Paul are non-Jewish with the exception of the concept of a Son of God, or as Petuchowski phrases it, a God-man intermediary.¹⁵ Thus where Paul deviated from Judaism was not in his ideas, but in his reconstruction of them.

The final problem in Schoeps is his carelessness with the sources. He never discusses the problems facing the

student when using the Book of Acts (see Chapter II above). He is likewise careless in his use of the Pseudo-Clementine literature and "oral tradition."

However, if we should extract the post-Pauline material from Schoeps's work, we would be left with an excellent collection of the sources, and by then applying Schoeps's intended method, we might indeed have a better understanding of the origins of Paul's thought.

But that which was missing from the Jewish scholarship on Paul was a perspective of Paul's thought such as Paul himself might have understood it. This is Sandmel's contribution to the literature. Sandmel believes that one must understand Paul as Paul probably understood himself prior to determining the origins or dissecting the minutiae of Paul's thought. To do this, Sandmel has made extensive use of his earlier studies on Philo, not as Friedlander did, saying that Paul himself used Philo, nor even that Paul was aware that Philo existed, but rather, to see what pre-suppositions could be found in the thinking of another Jew living in the Hellenistic world. What Sandmel found was that the religious pre-suppositions of Philo were strikingly similar to those of Paul - although their solutions to the "religious questions" of the time were very different. With that understanding, Sandmel was then able to stand back far enough to get an over-all perspective of Paul's thought and then focus on the details to determine what they meant in

view of the whole. In this approach he is unique - at least among Jews in the field of Pauline studies (Rivkin uses a similar approach to all of Jewish history - the difference being that since his scope is larger, Rivkin cannot then return to as many details). This too may be represented by a mathematical analogy. Prior to Sandmel, scholars approached Paul using the concept of a summation, Σ ; as the area under a mathematical curve was determined by adding up the areas of a number of rectangles inscribed in the curve, so too was the scholarship a summation of the various points of Paul's thought. But, as with the curve, certain portions are left out, with the scholarship, certain points are missed. However, with Newton and Leibniz, this form of subdivision was no longer necessary because a single operation, integration, \int , could now be performed and one could more accurately determine the entire area. So too is Sandmel's method an integration of the whole. But once he has integrated that whole, he is then able to break it apart to look at the details.

I believe, however, that there are overstatements in Sandmel. He may have so committed himself to the concept of a Hellenistic Paul that he misses certain points which we might otherwise call Pharisaic or Rabbinic: Paul's method of exegesis, for example. So too must he explain away Paul's use of Passover symbolism in I Corinthians 5:7.¹⁶ Also missing is an adequate explanation of Paul's Pharisaism.

But these points tend to be minor compared to the integrated whole.

If Sandmel attempts to see Paul as Paul might have seen himself against his own background, Rubenstein attempts to see Paul as Paul's subconscious (or his psychoanalyst) would have seen him. The problem is that Paul has been dead for nearly two thousand years and lived in a vastly different cultural milieu. Psychoanalysis is difficult when the patient is present for fifty minutes a week for five or ten years. One would think that given the circumstances, the task of psychoanalyzing Paul would be impossible.

But Rubenstein makes no claim of objectivity. To the contrary, he says that "one arrives at a point at which one recognizes that each scholar presents his own Paul" (underlining Rubenstein's).¹⁷ And Rubenstein says that he is going to present Paul as Paul appears to him. This sounds very innocent and straight-forward on the surface, but the result is that Rubenstein reconstructs Paul on the basis of his own psychological understanding of himself and as attempting to overcome the same problems. Thus he is creating an existential or phenomenological Paul. This might perhaps be valid if we were dealing with an entity such as "Q." Whether "Q" existed or not is irrelevant - the fact is that we have no "Q." Therefore, it can be defined as anything we choose, like "those logia common to Matthew and Luke but not found in Mark." But Paul, on the other hand, did exist - he was real,

flesh and blood - an ontological, not a phenomenological entity. The phenomenological Paul, therefore, may or may not reflect the historical Paul.

Rubenstein's case might have been better made had he gone one step less. A psychiatrist affiliated with the Hebrew Union College, Dr. Walter Stone, told me once that he believed that fairy tales and myths persisted because they in some way relate to basic human psychological concerns. If, as Rubenstein says, Paul was operating on the most basic level of the human subconscious, then this above statement might explain the persistence of Pauline Christianity.

There are, to be sure, other Jewish writers on Paul. Their works are not massive, usually an article or a reference in a work dealing with the Jewish history of the period. At times, congregational Reform rabbis have written papers analyzing Paul in the light of their own religious experiences. Neither time nor space permit a detailed comment on each work. Some have appeared in the body of the thesis; some, such as the works of Hyman G. Enelow and Beryl D. Cohon have not. But one thing is indeed common to all of those authors not mentioned above in this chapter - all except Ellis Rivkin rely upon the historical accuracy of the Book of Acts. It is also common to almost all of them that their purpose is not a discernment of the truth, but a defense of Judaism from the attacks of Paul. Indicative of this perhaps is the fact that by far, the largest body of literature written by Jews

on Paul is that written on Paul's attitude toward the Law. It is also an unfortunate characteristic of these writings that so many of them ignore all of the Christian literature that has been written on the subject.

We must now ask the direction in which Jewish scholarship on Paul should go. We have essentially three solutions open to us: the apologetic-polemic of Baeck, the pedantry of Schoeps, or that of wider understanding but less pedantry of Sandmel and Montefiore. The first alternative, I believe and hope, has finally been abandoned. The choice between the last two depends on how one views the scholarly enterprise. But it should be our belief that the only utility in that enterprise is the broadening of our human insights.

Notes to Chapter I

- ¹This and all other statements in this work apply only to those languages enumerated in the thesis proposal: English, French, and Hebrew. Graetz's History of the Jews, for example, was first published in German in 1875.
- ²For example: "They [Paul's parents] no doubt, had him taught Bible at five years of age, the Mishnah at ten, and the Talmud at fifteen.*" * "This is no anachronism, as both Mishnah and Talmud though not in concrete form, were several hundred years anterior to the rise of Christianity (underlining mine). Hillel brought from Babylon Mishniyyoth (sic): the Sopherim even earlier than he composed Mishniyyoth, of which traces are still left." S.M. Schiller-Szinessy, "St. Paul from a Jewish Point of View," The Expositor IV (1886): 326.
- ³Solomon Schechter, "[Review of] Schiller-Szinessy, 'St. Paul from a Jewish Point of View,'" Jewish Chronicle (November 19, 1886): 14. Schechter accuses Schiller-Szinessy of giving, not a Jewish point of view, but a Jew's point of view and of conveying the attitude of "Judaisme, c'est moi." Schechter also points out that Schiller-Szinessy never deals with questions of pertinence and interest like "Is Acts reliable history?" and "Are scholars of one opinion on these matters?"
- ⁴Solomon Schechter, Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (New York: Schocken Books), p. 18. Schechter found that "either the theology of the Rabbis must be wrong, its conception of God debasing, its leading motives materialistic and coarse, and its teaching lacking in enthusiasm and spirituality, or the Apostle to the Gentiles is quite unintelligible."
- ⁵See Note #1 above.
- ⁶Walter Jacob, "Claude G. Montefiore's Reappraisal of Christianity," Judaism (Summer, 1970): 342. Jacob wavers between praise for and condescension toward Montefiore. But he does point out that "Jews continued to view his efforts with suspicion as he was too much an apologete for Christianity."
- ⁷One may note that in the interim, M. Friedländer published an article entitled "The 'Pauline' Emancipation from the Law: a Product of the Pre-Christian Diaspora" in the 1902 edition of the Jewish Quarterly Review (Vol. 14), Kaufman Kohler published his "Saul of Tarsus" in the Jewish Encyclopedia (1905), and Gerald Friedlander published his Hellenism and Christianity in 1912. But at this point it becomes

impractical to deal with every published article in the above manner.

- 8 Baeck's later essay, "The Faith of Paul" (1952), is of a completely different tenor from his earlier works. This is actually somewhat frightening because it makes one realize that if one were to apply modern form criticism to these essays of Baeck's, one could make an excellent case for the existence of two Leo Baecks or of a Leo Baeck and a pseudo-Leo Baeck.
- 9 Jacob, "Montefiore's Reappraisal," p. 342.
- 10 Herford also wrote a book in 1912 entitled Pharisaism: its Aims and its Methods, but I am unfamiliar with that work.
- 11 Samuel Sandmel, The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity, p. 66. Sandmel says that "since Moore's time, there has been a considerable effort [to be fair to Judaism], and considerable attainment, especially in America and Britain but there is still a great distance to go ..."
- 12 Solomon Zeitlin, "A Review of Klausner's מישור ער פאולוס," Jewish Quarterly Review 31 (1940-1941): 309. This must refer to modern Jewish scholarship, for it certainly excludes חולדות ישר.
- 13 Sandmel, First Christian Century, p. 197 note #1. On this matter, Sandmel says of himself, "It is likely that, had there not been Klausner, I myself would probably not have had the horizons through which to enter the field."
- 14 Originally published in German as Paulus: Die Theologie des Apostels im Lichte der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr 1959).
- 15 No derogatory connotation is hereby intended. Rubenstein's approach is psychological-existential, and as such, does not correspond with the "normative" scholarly approach.
- 16 Samuel Sandmel, "Judaism, Jesus, and Paul: Some Problems of Method in Scholarly Research," Vanderbilt Studies in the Humanities 1 (1951): 241
- 17 See Ellis Rivkin, The Shaping of Jewish History, Chapter III. We do not know for certain the origins of Pharisaism. We do know that they were well enough established by the time of John Hyrcanus I for him to have broken with them (Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews XIII, 10, 6).

- ¹⁸See Victor Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews (New York: Atheneum, 1970), pp. 504-505 note #86. Tcherikover cites an article by Rosenthal in the American Jewish Annual, Vols. X-XI (1949), p. 319ff. enumerating the various estimates.
- ¹⁹Émile Bréhier, Les Idées Philosophiques et Religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie (Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard & Fils, 1908).
- ²⁰Harry Austryn Wolfson, Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947).
- ²¹Hans Joachim Schoeps, Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History, p. 43.
- ²²Claude G. Montefiore, "Rabbinic Judaism and the Epistles of St. Paul," Jewish Quarterly Review 13 (1901): 165-167.
- ²³Ibid.
- ²⁴Samuel Sandmel, "Paul Reconsidered," in Two Living Traditions: Essays on Religion and the Bible, p. 210; idem, First Christian Century; idem, The Genius of Paul.
- ²⁵Richard Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 3.
- ²⁶Philippians 3:5. In Galatians 1:14 he says "... zealous was I for the traditions of my fathers."
- ²⁷Claude G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul: Two Essays. Montefiore uses the dates 30-50 to approximate the active apostleship of Paul.
- ²⁸Ibid., pp. 14-17. See also Sandmel, First Christian Century.
- ²⁹Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, p. 15.
- ³⁰This is Ernst Lohmeyer. But from which of Lohmeyer's works these phrases are taken, Schoeps does not say.
- ³¹Schoeps, Paul, pp. 37-38.
- ³²Rivkin, The Shaping of Jewish History, pp. 77-78.
- ³³Grünbech, Paulus, Jesu Christi Apostel (Copenhagen, 1940), p. 18; cf. Schoeps, Paul, p. 38.
- ³⁴Schoeps, Paul, p. 40.

³⁵That is, "The Faith of Paul." As I stated earlier, Baeck's views about Paul in this essay (1952) are almost completely opposite those of his earlier essays - particularly on this point of background.

³⁶Joseph Klausner, From Jesus to Paul,

³⁷Leo Baeck, "The Faith of Paul" in Judaism and Christianity, pp. 153-154.

³⁸Ibid., p. 142.

³⁹Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 482. "There is nothing in Paul that is not grounded in the Old Testament, the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic literature, or the Tannaitic literature of his time" (underlining Klausner's).

⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 179-198. Klausner believes that Philo attempted to blend Greek paganism with Judaism and emphasized the Judaism - for all of Philo's philosophic ideas, be they Stoic, Pythagorean, or Platonic, find their ultimate roots in Judaism.

Ibid., p. 443. Similarly, Klausner admits that Paul is "a Jew of the Diaspora, a Jew from a Hellenized city, a Jew speaking and writing Greek, a Jew influenced by a Greek environment and a Greek atmosphere..." but at the same time attempts to build a case for a Paul who was a Palestinian Jew who had gone astray and as such showed influences of the Hellenistic world in which he lived. He tells us, in fact, that Paul despised Greek learning. See also Ibid., pp. 450-466.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 186-187. Klausner says that *λόγος* is the equivalent of the Rabbinic מאמר or מדרש.

⁴²Ibid., p. 458.

⁴³Ibid., pp. 463-464.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 466. See also pp. 482-485.

⁴⁵Hugh Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus. On p. viii, Schonfield tells the reader that the background against which he will write is "Jewish." This work, I believe, is closer to the genre of a novel than to that of a scholarly work, but it should be mentioned as the work of a Jew writing on Paul.

⁴⁶Ellis Rivkin, "Prolegomenon," pp. LV-LVI.

⁴⁷Schoeps, Paul, pp. 25-26.

- 48 Kaufman Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," Jewish Encyclopedia, p. 85a.
- 49 Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, p. 30.
- 50 Ibid., p. 68.
- 51 Ibid., p. 88.
- 52 Ibid., p. 18. Montefiore also says that at least three factors must partially come from non-Jewish stimuli: Paul's universalism, his Christology, and his mysticism. Ibid., pp. 82-83. Schoeps says that Montefiore enumerated eight traits of Paulinism not to be found in Rabbinism: the "deified Messiah, pessimism about sin and despair over evil which reigns in the heart of man, [Paul's] teaching about the Law, his neglect of the certainty of the repentance and forgiveness of the Jews, his mystical doctrine of the Savior, his strong interest in the mission to the heathen and the universalism of his doctrine of salvation offered equally to Jews and Gentiles, his antithesis of works and faith, the anthropological dualism implied in the contrast between *noema* and *opsis*." Schoeps, Paul, pp. 25-26.
- 53 Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, p. 81.
- 54 M. Friedländer, "The 'Pauline' Emancipation from the Law: a Product of the Pre-Christian Diaspora," Jewish Quarterly Review 14 (1902): 265.
- 55 Ibid., pp. 269-270.
- 56 Ibid., p. 280.
- 57 Erwin R. Goodenough, By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935), pp. 1-10, 258-262.
- 58 Sandmel, The First Christian Century, p. 17.
- 59 Sandmel, "Judaism, Jesus, and Paul," p. 236.
- 60 Schoeps, Paul, p. 28.
- 61 Ibid., footnote #3. I believe that this is a poor translation and that that of the Revised Standard Version, "If anyone stirs up strife, it is not from Me; who ever stirs up strife with you, shall fall because of you," is better. However, note that Kittel says that this verse may be corrupt. It is also possible that the problem is not from Schoeps, but from Knight translating from the German.

- ⁶²Ibid.
- ⁶³Ibid., pp. 28-29.
- ⁶⁴Ibid., p. 29. Schoeps gives other examples but space prohibits listing them all. See pp. 27-32.
- ⁶⁵Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 162.
- ⁶⁶Leo Baeck, "On Greek and Jewish Preaching," in "The Pharisees" and Other Essays, p. 114.
- ⁶⁷Sandmel, The First Christian Century, p. 111.
- ⁶⁸Schoeps, Paul, p. 33.
- ⁶⁹Ginzberg, Louis, The Legends of the Jews (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1968), Vol. V, p. viii. cf. Sandmel, "Judaism, Jesus, and Paul," p. 237 and Samuel Sandmel, Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature (New York: Ktav, 1971), p. 1.
- ⁷⁰Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 204. Klausner, who does not use Philo in the same manner as the others, says that "Christians" borrowed Philo's method of Biblical allegory. However, it is probably more correct to say that both used the same form of allegory.
- ⁷¹Schoeps, Paul, pp. 33-34. This is an extrapolation on my part. What Schoeps says is that it is "hardly possible to establish securely any influence on Paul of the neoplatinist philosophy as Philo expounded or rather distorted it."
- ⁷²Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 114. See also idem. "Greeks, Jews, and Christians," in Graduate Comment 4:4 (1961), p. 7. "Early Christianity, especially that Christianity represented by Paul, was a blend, as was Philo, of Judaism and Greek philosophy and the thought patterns from Greek religion."
- ⁷³Klausner is not alone in this. Also Kaufman Kohler and the English scholar C.H. Dodd believe that Paul used the Wisdom of Solomon for Romans at least.
- ⁷⁴Schoeps, Paul, p. 43.
- ⁷⁵Ibid., p. 20.
- ⁷⁶"... I want you to understand this mystery..." (Romans 11:25) and others like it. See also Romans 16:25-26, I Corinthians 15:51-52, and Colossians 4:3 (if genuine - this will be discussed later). In I Corinthians 1:21-22, 2:1 note the

use of the word "wisdom" and in Colossians 4:3, the use of *λόγος*.

- 77 Sandmel, Philo's Place in Judaism, p. 6.
- 78 Sandmel, "Judaism, Jesus, and Paul," pp. 238-239.
- 79 Sandmel, The First Christian Century, p. 131.
- 80 Sandmel, "Judaism, Jesus, and Paul," pp. 238-239.
- 81 Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, pp. 115-116.
- 82 Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 79b.
- 83 Simon Dubnow, דברי ימי עם קולם, Vol. 2, p. 289.
- 84 Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, Chapters VI & VII. Sandmel's views on the pre-Pauline period of Christianity are quite unique. In a nutshell, he says that the entire body of post-Pauline Christian literature which we have available (which, excepting Paul's epistles, is everything, that is, we have no pre-Pauline literature), was an effort by the Church to neutralize the unmanageable effects of Paul's teachings. Thus, although a Jewish Christianity must have existed prior to Paul's appearance on the scene, we know nothing about it. And the "Petrine" or Jewish Christianity taken as axiomatic since the writings of F.C. Baur and the Tübingen School in the middle of the nineteenth century, was the major element of this neutralizing attempt of the Church's, and as it is portrayed to us, it did not exist.
- 85 Baeck, "The Faith of Paul," p. 145. This is a supposition on Baeck's part. In all of Paul's epistles, there is recourse to the earthly life of Jesus only once or twice: Paul borrows from Jesus his beliefs on divorce and he claims that he received the sacrament of the Eucharist "from the Lord" (I Corinthians 11:23) but the exact meaning of this latter is open to question.
- 86 Ibid. Baeck adds: [by the Romans] "for having been hailed King of the Jews." This is a clear case of editorializing.
- 87 Ibid. Baeck attributes all of these views to the early Christians. But he is rather ambiguous as to how much of this was directly assimilated by Paul.
- 88 Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 440.
- 89 Leipoldt, J., Jesus und Paulus - Jesus oder Paulus? (Leipzig, 1936), p. 70. cf. Schoeps, Paul, p. 43.

- ⁹⁰Schoeps, Paul, pp. 45-46.
- ⁹¹That is, only Schoeps considers Paul's eschatology prevalent enough in his thought to warrant an "approach" via that means.
- ⁹²Sandmel, "Judaism, Jesus, and Paul," pp. 235-236.
- ⁹³Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 19.
- ⁹⁴Schoeps, Paul, p. 47.
- ⁹⁵Ibid.
- ⁹⁶Ibid., pp. 47-48.
- ⁹⁷Sandmel, The First Christian Century, p. 177.
- ⁹⁸The Pentateuch was certainly fixed at this time and Paul quotes freely from it, although his quotes indicate that he was using the Septuagint and probably quoting from memory. The Prophets were probably also well established, although with the exception of Isaiah, Paul relies less heavily on these books. But we do know that that section known as The Writings was at that time not yet fixed. Psalms seems to have been accepted as "canonical" although if the Qumran documents can serve as any indication, there were psalms in use which do not exist in our canon. Paul quotes freely from the Psalter. However, from other books of The Writings, Paul quotes rarely: once from Proverbs (Romans 12:20), twice from Job (Romans 11:35, I Corinthians 5:19), and never from any of the "scrolls," Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, or the books of Chronicles.
- ⁹⁹Essenism was a great scholarly catch-all for unidentifiable doctrines and sources. See Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 85a where Kohler says that Paul relied upon Essene teachings. Similarly, attempts have been made to link both Jesus and John the Baptist with the Essenes.
- ¹⁰⁰Galatians 1:14.
- ¹⁰¹Philippians 3:5 - Kaufman Kohler handles the problem quite simply - Galatians is a forgery and Philippians 3:5 is an interpolation into a genuine epistle. This dispenses with the problem but neither view is generally accepted and it serves little purpose other than to explain the issue away.
- ¹⁰²Claude G. Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul," Jewish Quarterly Review 6 (1894); 430.

- 103 In Philo, the oneness of God is represented by "אֵלֶּס," "The Existant," not "Θεός," which Philo treats as but an aspect or attribute of אֵלֶּס.
- 104 See Dubnow, דברי ימי עם קולנס, p. 289; Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 467-470; Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul," pp. 430-431; and Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, pp. 14, 68.
- 105 See Sandmel, First Christian Century, p. 131 and Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 23.
- 106 Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, pp. 23, 45. In addition, Rubenstein adds, "In addition to Paul's yearning for immortality, he shared with his fellow Jews a certain tendency to rationalize suffering as an emblem of God's distinctive favor." Rubenstein's basic assertion is that the Jews as a nation were collective masochists and in Paul, this tendency was particularly manifest.
- 107 See Sandmel, The First Christian Century, p. 131; Baeck, "On Greek and Jewish Preaching," p. 114 (see above p. 22 and "Notes to Chapter I", note #66), and Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 171. Rubenstein adds, "The goal of God, man, and the world in both Judaism and Pauline Christianity may be the restoration of the primordial undifferentiated unity out of which all three have arisen." Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 86b. Kohler adds yet another common aspect of the religiosity of Paul and the rabbis: "Paul made Jewish holiness his watchword," but quite frankly, I have not the vaguest idea what he means by that.
- 108 See Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 81a and Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 22.

Notes to Chapter II

- ¹Acts 7:58.
- ²Acts 8:1 -- Kohler's assertion that Saul was charged with Stephen's murder by the Sanhedrin is totally unfounded. Kaufman Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," Jewish Encyclopedia, p. 81b.
- ³Acts 8:3.
- ⁴Acts 9:2.
- ⁵Acts 9:4.
- ⁶Acts 9:10-30. It is in Acts 9:11 that we first learn that Saul was from Tarsus. This fact is mentioned only in Acts - never in the Epistles.
- ⁷Acts 11:19.
- ⁸Acts 11:25.
- ⁹Acts 13:9.
- ¹⁰Acts 15:1-3.
- ¹¹Acts 15:4-5.
- ¹²Acts 15:6-11.
- ¹³Acts 15:12-21.
- ¹⁴Acts 15:22-34.
- ¹⁵Morton Scott Enslin, The Literature of the Christian Movement (Part III of Christian Beginnings), p. 416.
- ¹⁶Joseph Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 217.
- ¹⁷Acts 16:37. In Acts, Paul will make this claim twice more: Acts 22:26, 18. He never makes this claim in the Epistles.
- ¹⁸I realize that Acts, at this point, does not specifically mention the preaching to the Gentiles as the reason for the Jews' anger at Paul. But in the four chapters cited, it is only after he has converted Gentiles that the Jews' ire is aroused. We will find this issue arising again where this area of contention is more explicit. In Acts 22:22, it says, "Up to this word they listened to him ..." "This word" is

Gentile. The reason that the Jews are angered by Paul's admission of Gentiles is his refusal to order them to be circumcised and to make the Law of Moses incumbent upon them. See both Acts 15 and Acts 21.

¹⁹Acts 18:18.

²⁰Acts 18:22.

²¹Acts 18:24. The New Oxford Annotated Bible comments: "An Alexandrian well versed in Scriptures would probably interpret them allegorically." The New Oxford Annotated Bible, Revised Standard Version (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 1346.

²²Acts 19:8.

²³Acts 20:16. Note that here and in Acts 20:6 Paul adjusted his itinerary to conform with the Jewish ceremonial calendar.

²⁴Acts 20:21. As I have already stated, repentance is one of the primary Jewish concepts missing in the Epistles.

²⁵Acts 21:21.

²⁶Acts 21:39. The New Oxford Annotated Bible says, "probably Aramic (sic)," p. 1351.

²⁷Acts 22:3.

²⁸Acts 22:16. Note here the meaning of baptism. This will become more significant later.

²⁹In Acts, each time Paul tells the story of his conversion, the tale becomes more elaborate. This version is more elaborate than that of Chapter 9 (which is Luke's recounting, not Paul's) and less elaborate than that of Chapter 26.

³⁰Acts 22:30.

³¹Acts 24:27.

³²Acts 28:30-31.

³³Romans 15:24,28.

³⁴See Samuel Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, pp. 143-144.

³⁵Hugh Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus, p. 152. Schonfield claims that Galatians tells of a private meeting between Paul and Peter, James, and John whereas Acts tells of

the Council, prior to which the decision had already been made.

- ³⁶Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 145.
- ³⁷Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 224.
- ³⁸Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 82a.
- ³⁹Hans Joachim Schoeps, Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History, p. 64.
- ⁴⁰Ibid., p. 63.
- ⁴¹For a complete discussion of all of the above, see Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, pp. 144-154.
- ⁴²Ibid., pp. 141-144. Also, on the final point, see Claude G. Montefiore, "Jewish Conceptions of Christianity," The Hibbert Journal 28 (1929-1930): 249.
- ⁴³Schoeps, Paul, p. 263.
- ⁴⁴Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 212-214.
- ⁴⁵Ibid., p. 214. Klausner contradicts himself as to the authorship of Acts. Klausner believes that Luke wrote the whole book (Ibid., p. 217) and that Luke was Paul's physician. But Paul probably died sometime around 64 A.D. (although admittedly, this is conjecture), and Klausner says that Acts was not completed until 95-100 A.D. (p. 214). However, he also says that Luke wrote Acts but dies before it was finished and that it was then edited and published by someone else (Ibid., p. 231). This last statement is pure conjecture on Klausner's part; there is no evidence whatsoever for this assertion.
- ⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 216-218.
- ⁴⁷Ibid., p. 221.
- ⁴⁸Ibid., p. 222.
- ⁴⁹Except for the belief that Luke was a Greek and used Josephus, for which there is scholarly consensus, everything that Klausner has written about the person of Luke is either conjecture and supposition or based on material not accepted as reliable.
- ⁵⁰Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 228.

- ⁵¹Ibid., p. 232.
- ⁵²Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 155.
- ⁵³Ibid., pp. 13, 156, 187, 205.
- ⁵⁴Ibid., p. 156.
- ⁵⁵Montefiore, "Jewish Conceptions of Christianity," p. 249; idem., Judaism and St. Paul: Two Essays, pp. 19, 90. Montefiore says that at the time of his writing, it was very much in vogue to accept the Book of Acts as historical, citing the works of both Lake and Harnack (Judaism and St. Paul, p. 19). He himself, however, citing Loisy, avers that many of the details of Paul's life as found in Acts, especially those portions about Gamaliel, are quite suspect (Judaism and St. Paul, p. 90).
- ⁵⁶David Flusser, "Paul of Tarsus," Encyclopaedia Judaica, p. 190. Flusser properly describes the status of the Epistles as to which are accepted as genuine by a consensus of scholars (see next section) and which are not, but he does not question the validity of Acts or mention that others have done so.
- ⁵⁷Heinrich Graetz, History of the Jews, Vol. II, pp. 219-232. Graetz does not deal with the problem at all. His writing, however, indicates an unquestioned acceptance of Acts as historical.
- ⁵⁸Ernest Jacob, "Paul," Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, p. 415b.
- ⁵⁹Eric Werner, "'If I Speak in the Tongues of Men...' St. Paul's Attitude to Music," American Musicological Society Journal 13:1-3 (1960): 18-23. Werner is not writing about Paul in our sense at all, rather, he is writing about Paul's attitude to music. But the tenor of his article, like that of Graetz, indicates his acceptance of the historicity of Acts.
- ⁶⁰S.M. Schiller-Szinessy, "St. Paul from a Jewish Point of View," The Expositor, IV (1886): 326 note #4. Schiller-Szinessy accepts Acts and the Pauline authorship of all thirteen epistles, the arguments against which "are so weak as to require no refutation" and avers that Hebrews, which in itself does not claim Pauline authorship, but has had this authorship ascribed to it by Church tradition, was written by Paul in Aramaic. Schechter's attack on Schiller-Szinessy's failure to deal with this problem is thus well-founded (See "Notes to Chapter I", note #3).

- 61 Richard Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 38. Rubenstein's acceptance of Acts is tacit.
- 62 Hugh Schonfield, The History of Jewish Christianity from the First to the Twentieth Century; idem, The Jew of Tarsus. At one point, Schonfield says that he accepts the "we-passages" as historical and genuine but further states that they were written by a Jew and not by Luke (Jew of Tarsus, pp. 166-167). There is, of course, no basis for this view. Later, however, Schonfield expresses his complete reliance on Acts (Jew of Tarsus, p. 246).
- 63 Leo Baeck, "The Faith of Paul," in Judaism and Christianity, p. 142. In this essay, Baeck acknowledges that Acts is indeed a secondary source which "are (sic) of some help, but only when their information is confirmed by the letters." However, the essay itself creates a picture of Paul which is in fact dependent on Acts. In the write-up of the lecture on which this essay is based (Leo Baeck, "Paul of Tarsus," Synagogue Review XXVI (1952): 323-325), Baeck speaks of events in Paul's life which are found only in Acts (for example, his going to Jerusalem as a young man and his study with Rabban Gamaliel). But for reason which space and time do not permit me to discuss fully, I do not believe that this write-up was done by Baeck himself, for it contains items which are quite contradictory to other items mentioned by Baeck and in places give the impression that the author does not understand what he is writing.
- 64 Samuel Belkin, "The Problem of Paul's Background," The Journal of Biblical Literature 54 (1935): 41, 45. Belkin acknowledges "problems" with Acts and then proceeds to use it.
- 65 Jakob J. Petuchowski, "Paul and Jewish Theology: A New View of the Christian Apostle," Commentary 28 (1959): 231-236. This work is a review of Schoeps's Paul, but in his prefatory remarks, Petuchowski tells us that Acts is unreliable (p. 232) but also that Paul was reportedly a student of Rabban Gamaliel and that there is "reason to believe that Paul, in his personal practice, remained an observant Jew to the end of his life" (p. 231).
- 66 See Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 86a-b. Kohler accepts de facto those parts of Acts which he does not claim are spurious.
- 67 Schoeps, Paul, p. 51. I find these statements to be contradictory. How can something be tendentious and a later accretion although possibly based upon historical incidents and yet be "indispensable" for the reconstruction of Paul's life?

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 263.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 273. This statement refers to scholarship which is non-eschatological in its view of Paul. But it is equally applicable to the non-eschatological Paul of Acts.

⁷⁰See Ibid., p. 24: "Paul according to his own statement reproduced in Acts 23:6 (underlining mine - remember, Schoeps has said that the speeches of Paul in Acts do not enter into the question of authentic testimony) came from a family of Pharisees..." (It is the words "family of" which cannot be authenticated).

⁷¹See Ibid., pp. 51-53.

⁷²By analogy, consider the legends that have grown up in the United States about George Washington or Abraham Lincoln.

⁷³Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 148.

⁷⁴Samuel Sandmel, A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament, pp. 90-91, and Enslin, Literature of the Christian Movement, p. 295.

⁷⁵cf. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 237.

⁷⁶Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 86a-b.

⁷⁷Sandmel, A Jewish Understanding, p. 84.

⁷⁸Baeck, "The Faith of Paul," p. 140.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 152 note #26. What Baeck means by this I am not sure, for the statement is clearly absurd. Eschatology is as we shall see, crucial to Paul's thought. What Baeck may mean is the structured eschatology outlined in these verses.

⁸⁰Ibid. This does not necessarily indicate interpolation. Paul dictated his epistles and therefore, frequently went off on tangents, sometimes, as in this case, returning to his original subject and sometimes, as is frequently the case in Galatians, not.

⁸¹Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 86a-b.

⁸²Ibid. But see above, note #80.

⁸³Ibid., pp. 79a, 85b.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 82a.

- ⁸⁵Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, pp. 145-146.
- ⁸⁶Ibid.
- ⁸⁷Baeck, "The Faith of Paul," p. 140
- ⁸⁸Gerald Friedlander, Hellenism and Christianity, pp. 86-87.
- ⁸⁹Ernest Jacob, "Paul," p. 415b.
- ⁹⁰Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 82a.
- ⁹¹Enslin, Literature of the Christian Movement, p. 283.
- ⁹²Ibid., p. 287
- ⁹³Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 577.
- ⁹⁴Flusser, "Paul of Tarsus," p. 190; Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 4; Schoeps, Paul, p. 51.
- ⁹⁵Sandmel, A Jewish Understanding, pp. 94-95.
- ⁹⁶Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 79a. Kohler says that Galatians Ephesians, I, II Timothy, Titus, "and others" (underlining mine) are spurious. What "and others" means is ambiguous.
- ⁹⁷Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 242.
- ⁹⁸Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 242-244; Sandmel, A Jewish Understanding, pp. 94-95.
- ⁹⁹Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 242-244.
- ¹⁰⁰Ibid., pp. 237-238.
- ¹⁰¹Ibid.
- ¹⁰²See Samuel Sandmel, The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity, pp. 205-207 note #22; idem, The Genius of Paul, Chapters VI-VII (also p. 118); idem, "The Pastoral Epistles," Salt 4:4 (Winter, 1967): 3-4; and Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 245.
- ¹⁰³Sandmel, "The Pastoral Epistles," pp. 3-4; Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 244-251.
- ¹⁰⁴Sandmel, "The Pastoral Epistles," p. 4.
- ¹⁰⁵Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 251.

- 106 Ibid.
- 107 Baeck, "The Faith of Paul," pp. 139-140; Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus, p. 32.
- 108 Schoeps, Paul, p. 52. This, however, is not what Baeck said. Baeck said that the oddness motif in descriptions of Socrates may have been borrowed by the author of Paul and Thecla for his description of Paul. See Baeck, "The Faith of Paul," p. 140.
- 109 Schonfield, The History of Jewish Christianity, p. 45.
- 110 Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus, Book 2, Chapter 10; idem, Saints Against Caesar, p. 121.
- 111 Schoeps, Paul, p. 53.
- 112 An exception to this is an article by Harris Hirschberg in which he attempts to decipher many allusions to Paul in the Talmud. Many of his allusions are extremely far-fetched and many are pointed out as alluding to Simon Magus. This article is not used by any of the later writers on Paul. Harris Hirschberg, "Allusions to the Apostle Paul in the Talmud," Journal of Biblical Literature 62 (1943): 73-87.
- 113 Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus, p. 27ff. Schonfield uses Talmudic, midrashic, and Mishnaic quotes to describe even the Judaism of Tarsus.
- 114 Schiller-Szinessy, "St. Paul from a Jewish Point of View."
- 115 Belkin, "The Problem of Paul's Background," p. 41 note #1. "If, therefore, we find ideas in Rabbinical writings of the second or third century agreeing with Pauline ideas, we may unhesitatingly assert that these doctrines were in existence in Rabbinic circles in St. Paul's time, and that they have not found their way into Rabbinism through the teaching of St. Paul." This is a statement by Thackeray in The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, pp. 25-26, which Belkin says that he agrees with. And thus Belkin feels that he may draw on first and second century Tannaitic sources with impunity. What neither Thackeray nor Belkin consider is the possibility of parallel influences or independent thought. Two or three hundred years is a long time when speaking of ideas. Thackeray's statement is not necessarily so (although I agree that simply because ideas are found in common, we cannot assume that the rabbis got them from Paul).
- 116 Davies, W.D., Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology (London: S.P.C.K., 1948).

- 117Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 135, 176-178.
- 118Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 79a.
- 119Friedlander, Hellenism and Christianity, p. 85; Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 79a.
- 120Emil S. Hirsch, a rabbi in Chicago in the latter part of the nineteenth century, said that Paul was aware of Alexandrian antecedents. I am not altogether certain as to what he means. Emil G. Hirsch, "Paul the Apostle," Chicago, 189-, p. 4.
- 121Schoeps, Paul, p. 53.
- 122Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus, p. 202. -

Notes to Chapter III

- ¹Joseph Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 303-432.
- ²Hugh Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus. To the best of my knowledge, these are the only Jews who have attempted this. I have not read a work by Scholem Asch entitled The Apostle, which I presume is about Paul (from a reference in a review of Schonfield's The Jew of Tarsus (Kenneth W. Clark, "Review of Hugh Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus," The Crozer Quarterly 26 (1949): 83-84)). Asch, however, considered his work a novel, not an attempt to portray the truth.
- ³This is from Acts but we have no reason to believe otherwise. The important point being that it was outside of Palestine.
- ⁴Galatians 1:14.
- ⁵Philippians 3:5.
- ⁶Richard Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, pp. 34, 47-53.
- ⁷Ibid., p. 6.
- ⁸II Corinthians 11:32-33.
- ⁹George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim (New York: Schocken Books, 1971), Vol. I, p. 324. cf. Samuel Sandmel, The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity, p. 50 note #48. (note: Sandmel lists the reference as p. 384, but I believe that he is using the original Harvard University Press edition).
- ¹⁰Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 287-300.
- ¹¹Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," Jewish Encyclopedia, p. 80b.
- ¹²Samuel Sandmel, Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature, (New York: Ktav, 1971), p. 85.
- ¹³Leo Baeck, "On Greek and Jewish Preaching" in "The Pharisees" and Other Essays, p. 115.
- ¹⁴Hans Joachim Schoeps, Jewish Christianity: Fractional Disputes in the Early Church, p. 47. One problem not discussed in the body of my essay is that of the terms "disciple" and "apostle." Mark and Matthew both call Jesus's original followers disciples. Luke, on the other hand,

calls them apostles, and disciples is a term almost synonymous with "followers." Paul himself obviously considers apostleship the highest form of divine inspiration (see I Corinthians 12:28), hence Schoeps's implication that the Lucan definition is actually an older form.

¹⁵Samuel Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, pp. 76-78.

¹⁶Romans 3:20 (Moffat translation).

¹⁷In I Corinthians 11:1, Paul says, "Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ." Sandmel thinks that in some ways, Paul saw himself as an analogue to Moses: as Moses was the messenger of the Old Covenant, so Paul was the messenger of the New (The Genius of Paul, p. 106). Rubenstein too thinks that "Paul regarded himself as God's 'chosen instrument' to carry Christ's name before the Gentiles" (see for example Romans 1:5, 11:13, and Galatians 2:7, and, should Ephesians be by Paul, Ephesians 3:8) and therefore greater than Moses and presaged by the earlier prophets (Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 128). Schonfield carries this idea several steps further by saying that Paul conceived of himself as Jesus - an extension of his own original belief that he was the Messiah (Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus, pp. 78-80). This is absurd. As Schonfield's reviewer, Kenneth W. Clark said, "It has been difficult for scholars to develop a rational argument for the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, but this should be easy beside the attempt to do so for Paul" (Clark, "Review of Schonfield," p. 84).

¹⁸Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 112; Hans Joachim Schoeps, Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History, pp. 74-82; Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus. A possible exception: his enemies are Jews and not Judaizing Christians in I Thessalonians 2:14-16. This is the only set of verses in an epistle considered genuine which Sandmel says may be an interpolation.

¹⁹Romans 11:1, II Corinthians 11:22, Galatians 1:13-14, Philipians 3:5-6.

²⁰Leo Baeck, "Judaism in the Church" in "The Pharisees" and Other Essays, pp. 73-74; Claude G. Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul," Jewish Quarterly Review 6 (1894): 432; Ellis Rivkin, "Prolegomenon," p. XIX; Sandmel, The First Christian Century, p. 90; Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 141.

²¹Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, pp. 117-118.

²²Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 454-458.

- 23 Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 84b. Kohler's source for this citation may be J. Reudel Harris, "The Teaching of the Apostles," 1887, but his citation is unclear.
- 24 Rivkin, "Prolegomenon," p. XIV.
- 25 Ibid., pp. XLIII, XLV.
- 26 Rivkin, "Prolegomenon," p. XLVII note #27; idem, "The Meaning of Messiah in Jewish Thought," Union Seminary Quarterly Review XXVI:4 (Summer, 1971): 399; idem, The Shaping of Jewish History, p. 74.
- 27 Although he does not say so in his writings, Rivkin does not accept Acts and does not use it in drawing his conclusions.
- 28 Rivkin, "Prolegomenon," p. LIII.
- 29 In Against Apion. Rivkin, "Prolegomenon," p. LVII.
- 30 Samuel Sandmel, "Paul Reconsidered" in Two Living Traditions: Essays on Religion and the Bible, p. 202.
- 31 Sandmel, The First Christian Century, p. 14.
- 32 Ibid., p. 92.
- 33 Ibid., pp. 32, 54 note #65.
- 34 Sandmel, Philo's Place in Judaism, p. 3.
- 35 Sandmel, The First Christian Century, pp. 89-90. Sandmel says that another possible interpretation of *καὶ ὅσον ἰσχυροτέρως* is that Paul's "attitude toward Scripture was kindred to that of the Pharisees."
- 36 Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 45.
- 37 See Claude G. Montefiore, "Rabbinic Judaism and the Epistles of St. Paul," Jewish Quarterly Review 13 (1901): 173.
- 38 cf. Leviticus 19:18. This is also stated by Jesus in Mark 12:31, Matthew 22:39, and Luke 10:27, but there is no mention by Paul of Jesus's having said this.
- 39 II Corinthians 13:1 cf. Deuteronomy 19:15.
- 40 Romans 11:28-29.
- 41 Herbert Loewe, in C.G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, A Rabbinic Anthology (New York: Schocken Books, 1974), p. 689 note #95,

ascribes this doctrine to Romans 11:16-24. I cannot see it in these verses and am presuming this to be an enumeration error by Loewe.

⁴²Schoeps, Paul, p. 231.

⁴³I Corinthians 1:22.

⁴⁴I Corinthians 9:20-23.

⁴⁵I Corinthians 1:21-22, 2:1.

⁴⁶This is but one of the reasons that Ephesians is not accepted by many scholars. But if my hypothesis is correct, then this would add to, rather than detract from, the epistle's credibility.

⁴⁷Romans 11:25, 16:25-26, I Corinthians 15:51. The word is also used in Colossians 4:3 in conjunction with the word "λογος," but we have already discussed the questionable reliability of Colossians.

⁴⁸Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 25.

⁴⁹See, for example, Paul's attitude toward the Law of Moses in Romans 7. Rivkin, Rubenstein, and other Jewish writers point to this chapter to show Paul's belief in the essential sanctity of the Law. But the tenor of this chapter is radically different from the rest of the Pauline literature in which those under the Law are cursed (Galatians 3:10-13) and the power of sin is the Law (I Corinthians 15:56). In light of Paul's inconsistency, Jacob's appellation of "first Christian theologian" for Paul is a misstatement (Ernest Jacob, "Paul," Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, p. 416).

⁵⁰Schoeps, Paul, p. 231. Schoeps's statement that Paul must have remembered the advice of Hillel, "When you come to a town, behave according to its customs" (Ber. Rabba 48 on Genesis 18:8, Sh. Rabba 47. Note the relatively late date of the sources) is an overstatement of this case.

Notes to Chapter IV

- ¹See "Notes to Chapter I", note #85.
- ²Claude G. Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul," Jewish Quarterly Review 6 (1894): 461; Joseph Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 435; Ellis Rivkin, "St. Paul and the Parting of the Ways," reprinted from an article in The Jewish Heritage (no other information given); Sandmel, Samuel, The Genius of Paul, p. 109; Hans Joachim Schoeps, Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History, pp. 55-58.
- ³Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 109. Sandmel also adds that Paul had a fear of over-humanizing Jesus (p. 216).
- ⁴Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 435-437. Klausner believes that Paul knew Jesus during the latter's visit to Jerusalem although at that time, he would have been one of his opponents rather than a follower (p. 315). Klausner also believes that because the flesh and blood Jesus strove to re-establish the Jewish state (sic Klausner), he was first de-politicized by the Twelve (p. 437) and then abandoned by Paul lest political overtones incur the wrath of Rome (pp. 438-439, 442, 475-478).
- ⁵Galatians 1:12.
- ⁶I Corinthians 15:4-8.
- ⁷All of the preceding are listed by Samuel Sandmel in The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity, pp. 162-163.
- ⁸This point is added by Schoeps in Paul, p. 61. Schoeps also believes that certain formal phrases and expressions may have been derived from the earlier Christian community (pp. 60-61).
- ⁹Romans 8:3-9.
- ¹⁰These should not be confused with "body" and "soul." To Paul, "body" meant "organism" whereas "soul" was an ill-defined entity, the approximate meaning of which was the driving force behind (or within) the organism. Spirit and flesh refer to types of substance. Thus man could (after baptism) have a spiritual body or (prior to baptism) an animate or "fleshly" body.

- ¹¹Paul frequently calls the body a "temple of God" or "of the Holy Spirit" (I Corinthians 3:16, 6:19, II Corinthians 6:16), a "tent" (II Corinthians 5:4), or, in reference to the spiritual man, a "home" (II Corinthians 5:6).
- ¹²For Paul's view on the free-will of man, see Romans 8:28-30. That the rabbis' view was exactly the opposite can be seen in Bereshith 33b: אמר ר' חנינא: הכל בידי שמים חוץ מיראה שמים, שנאמר: "ועתה ישראל מה יי אלהיך שאל מעמך כי אם ליראה אה-יי (דברים י' י"ב)" כלום יראה-שמים דבר קטן הוא, והרי אמר ר' חנינא משום ר' שמעון בן יוחאי: אין לו להקדוש-ברוך-הוא בביה גנזיו אלא אוצר של יראה-שמים, שנאמר: "יראה יי היא אוצרו" (ישעיה ל"ג, ו'?)
That the rabbis viewed man essentially as a unity may be seen in Leviticus Rabba 4:5: לעתיד לבוא הקב"ה אומר לנפש מפני מה חטאת לפני אמר לפניו רבון העולמים אני לא חטאתי הגוף הוא שחטא משעה שיצאתי ממנו כצפור טהורה פורחת באויר אני מה חטאתי לפניך אומר לגוף מפני מה חטאת לפני אמר לפניו רבון העולמים אני לא חטאתי נשמה היא שחטאה משעה שיצאה ממני כאבן שהושלך על גבי קרקע אני נשלך שמה חטאתי לפניך מה הקב"ה עושה להן מביא נשמה וזורקה בגוף ודן שניהם כאחד שנאמר (חללים נ' ד') יקרא אל השמים מעל וגו' יקרא אל השמים מעל להביא את הנשמה ואל הארץ להביא את הגוף לדין עמו.
- ¹³Claude G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul: Two Essays, pp. 83, 166. This is Montefiore's mature view. In his first essay, "First Impressions of Paul," he errs completely in saying that Paul saw man as essentially divided into two great divisions: Jew and Gentile (Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul", p. 431) and by equating "flesh" to the יצר הרע (Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul," p. 437).
- ¹⁴Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 486. See also pp. 470-472, 553-554.
- ¹⁵Ibid., pp. 486-489.
- ¹⁶Romans 3:9, 23-24.
- ¹⁷Romans 5:12-13. C.H. Dodd says that this makes mankind a victim of corporate sinfulness. C.H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, p. 103.
- ¹⁸Leo Baeck, "Paul of Tarsus," Synagogue Review XXVI (1952): 325. See "Notes to Chapter II," note #63 for my doubts about the actual authorship of this write-up. This topic is not mentioned in Baeck's essay ("The Faith of Paul") at all - thus there is no other source for Baeck's thought on the matter.

- 19 Emil G. Hirsch, "Paul the Apostle," Chicago, 189-, pp. 13-15; Ernest Jacob, "Paul," Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, pp. 415-416; Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 490, 521-522; Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, pp. 58-59.
- 20 Heinrich Graetz, History of the Jews, Vol. II, p. 229.
- 21 Richard Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, pp. 153-154.
- 22 Hugh Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus, p. 94.
- 23 Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul," pp. 433-436. Montefiore reasons thus: for Paul, idolatry equals sin, therefore the Gentile is a sinner. Also, since knowledge of the Law causes sin, the Jew is a sinner. Therefore, both are sinners and both are in need of Christ's redemption. But here, Montefiore is working entirely within the framework of the Jewish conception of "sin equals transgression" and assumes that Paul is doing likewise.
- 24 Ibid., p. 452.
- 25 Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 219.
- 26 Schoeps, Paul, p. 260.
- 27 Shalom Spiegel, The Last Trial, p. 108. Spiegel quotes II Corinthians 4:4, Ephesians 2:2, 6:12 to prove his point.
- 28 Ernest Jacob, "Paul," p. 416; Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 519; Claude G. Montefiore, "Rabbinic Judaism and the Epistles of St. Paul," Jewish Quarterly Review 13 (1901): 199; Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 11; Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, pp. 58-59; idem, "Reflections on the Problem of Theology for Jews," Journal of Bible and Religion XXXIII:2 (April, 1965): 105 note; Schoeps, Paul, p. 196.
- 29 Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, pp. 11-13.
- 30 Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, pp. 58-59.
- 31 See Leo Baeck, "Judaism in the Church," in "The Pharisees" and Other Essays, p. 84; idem, "Two World Views Compared" in "The Pharisees" and Other Essays, pp. 136-137.
- 32 Romans 6:3, 5, 7-9. See also Galatians 2:20, II Corinthians 3:18, I Corinthians 2:10-16.
- 33 Leo Baeck, "Romantic Religion," in Judaism and Christianity, p. 241.

- 34 This is much more obvious in the Greek where the verb which we translate as "to justify" is δικαιωω and "righteous" is δίκαιος .
- 35 See Montefiore, "Rabbinic Judaism and the Epistles of St. Paul," p. 205; Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 150; Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, pp. 91-92; Schoeps, Paul, pp. 128-134 (Schoeps, judging from his interpretation of II Corinthians 5:21, which he understands as similar to the laying of hands upon the sacrificial beast, does not adequately understand this concept - he sees sin as being expiated rather than annulled. But so too does he not seem to understand that there is a difference between the Pauline and Rabbinic concepts of sin); Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus, pp. 94-95.
- 36 Romans 5:10 and II Corinthians 5:18. Also in the questionable epistles Ephesians 2:16 and Colossians 1:20.
- 37 Kaufman Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," Jewish Encyclopedia, p. 83b.
- 38 Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul," p. 455.
- 39 Galatians 3:28. A similar concept appears in Ephesians 2:11 and Colossians 3:11.
- 40 Romans 8:14 and Galatians 3:26.
- 41 That this is Paul's conception of salvation is understood by Klausner (in From Jesus to Paul, pp. 491-493, 520-523) who also acknowledges the resemblance, though not the identification, of the concept to the Greek mysteries. He further admits that this position is far too extreme for any Jewish position but nonetheless insists that it is Jewish in origin and for Paul is a "Jewish belief with a pagan coloring" (p. 493 - underlining Klausner's). Rubenstein, following Schweitzer, also understands the process of salvation as I have described it but fails to distinguish adequately between the spiritual body and the body of the flesh (Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, pp. 24-25). The concept, as I have described it, is also found in Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 84b, and Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, pp. 79-93. The process is not understood adequately by Montefiore (see note #38 above), Schoeps, who views it much too closely to the Jewish idea of expiatory atonement (see note #35 above), and Rivkin, who sees it akin to that concept of the Pharisees in that it offers an escape from death. That may be so but the process is entirely different (Rivkin, "Paul and the Parting of the Ways," p. 4).

- ⁴²This similarity is most strikingly seen in Galatians 2:20 - "I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me."
- ⁴³II Corinthians 6:2.
- ⁴⁴"[They who do not know God and who do not obey the gospel of the Lord Jesus] shall suffer the punishment of eternal destruction and exclusion from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his might, when he comes on that day to be glorified in his saints, and to be marvelled at in all who have believed, because our testimony to you was believed." I Thessalonians 1:9-10. "... For the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable, and we shall be changed. For this perishable nature must put on the imperishable, and this mortal nature must put on immortality." I Corinthians 15:52-53. In writing to an audience where he apparently expected Jews to be present, Paul also dispelled the concept of ישראל חלק בעולם הזה in the same manner that Amos dispelled the idea that the Day of the Lord would mean a priori a victory for Israel. See Romans 2:5-11.
- ⁴⁵"...for salvation is nearer to us now than when we first believed. It is far on in the night, the day is almost here;" Romans 13:11-12. "I mean, brethren, that the appointed time has grown very short..." I Corinthians 7:29. "... the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night." I Thessalonians 5:2 (Note: this "thief in the night" analogy appears in Matthew 24:43-44 and Luke 12:39-40 but there is no ascription to Jesus by Paul).
- ⁴⁶I Thessalonians 4:13-15.
- ⁴⁷See I Corinthians 15:42-54.
- ⁴⁸That Paul believed that Christ's return was imminent is attested to by Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul," pp. 464-466 (Montefiore misses, however, the problem caused by the delayed Parousia); Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 537-538; Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, pp. 88-89; Schoeps, Paul, p. 88.
- ⁴⁹Schoeps, Paul, pp. 99-103; Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 532-533; mentioned by Sandmel, The First Christian Century, p. 7; idem, A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament, pp. 71-72. Both Sandmel and Rivkin think that too much emphasis has been placed on eschatological expectation in Paul. Sandmel, The First Christian Century,

- pp. 11, 41 note #14; idem, The Genius of Paul, p. 93 note; Ellis Rivkin, "The Meaning of Messiah in Jewish Thought," Union Seminary Quarterly Review XXVI:4 (Summer, 1971): 400; idem, The Shaping of Jewish History, p. 76. The only specific references to an "age" which I can find in the genuine epistles are I Corinthians 15:23-28 and Galatians 1:3-4.
- ⁵⁰Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, pp. 169-170.
- ⁵¹Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, pp. 36, 83, 96-97; idem, A Jewish Understanding, p. 57; Schoeps, Paul, pp. 58-59; Zeitlin, Who Crucified Jesus?, p. 1. Zeitlin's calling the crucifixion "an everlasting covenant" is an overly Judaized statement.
- ⁵²See Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 526, 541-545.
- ⁵³Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 19.
- ⁵⁴Leo Baeck, "The Faith of Paul," in Judaism and Christianity, pp. 147-148.
- ⁵⁵Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 525; Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul," pp. 453-456; Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 154; Schoeps, Paul, p. 127.
- ⁵⁶Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 525; Schoeps, Paul, p. 136. Schonfield sees a parallel to the Teacher of Righteousness in the "Fragment of a Zadokite Work" (Schonfield was unaware of the Qumran Scrolls). He says that the Teacher of Righteousness was the "Just One" referred to by Ananias in Acts 9. Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus, p. 52.
- ⁵⁷The "suffering servant" is probably implied in "...that Christ died for our sins in accordance with Scriptures." I Corinthians 15:3.
- ⁵⁸Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul," p. 449; Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 71; Schoeps, Paul, pp. 94, 151.
- ⁵⁹Perhaps not genuine. From Colossians 1:15.
- ⁶⁰Philippians 2:6-8. Sandmel sees in this passage a possible allusion to a primordial rebellion by the angels. Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 67. Rubenstein believes that it is a contrast between Adam and Christ. Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, pp. 158-159.
- ⁶¹Friedlander says at his resurrection. This is ostensibly

based on a speech in Acts 13:33. Aside from the fact that this is based on Acts, I do not believe that this is indicated in the verse at all. Gerald Friedlander, Hellenism and Christianity, p. 93. Schonfield has the incarnation occurring at Jesus's baptism. This is in agreement with the Gospel According to Mark but not with any of the Epistles, in which Jesus's baptism is never mentioned. Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus, p. 204.

- 62 See Romans 1:3 and Galatians 4:4-5. The Romans verse seems to substantiate the view that Jesus became the Son of God at the resurrection, the Galatians verse, at birth. The confusion indicates that the precise moment of incarnation was, for Paul, insignificant compared to the fact of incarnation.
- 63 Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 479. Klausner points out that Paul never called Jesus the Son of Man.
- 64 Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 67.
- 65 This view is held, essentially as I have described it, by Emil Hirsch, "Paul the Apostle," p. 13; Friedlander, Hellenism and Christianity, p. 104 (Friedlander believes that Paul took the idea directly from Philo. He points out the functional similarities which do exist, but he does not, indeed, he cannot, demonstrate direct contact); Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 204, 478-479 (Klausner cites the Wisdom of Solomon as the Jewish source for the term "Son of God." He further believes that Paul absorbed this concept from Apollos, who, according to Acts 18:24, was an Alexandrian Jew whom Paul met in Ephesus - p. 133); Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 81a; and Sandmel, The First Christian Century, pp. 131-132; idem, The Genius of Paul, pp. 67-75; idem, A Jewish Understanding, p. 51. Montefiore falls short of either full understanding or full explanation, to wit: "He was God's own Son in a special and peculiar sense." Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, p. 61; see also idem, "First Impressions of Paul," p. 449. Schoeps believes that Christ approximates a gnostic heavenly being (Paul, p. 154) and that ultimately, Paul's concept of the "Son of God" goes back to Jesus himself (Paul, p. 158) - if there is an earlier origin, it is unknown.
- 66 Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus, pp. 192-193. He also believes that the title "Son of God" was a regal one in the orient (p. 102 note #1).
- 67 Rivkin, "The Meaning of Messiah in Jewish Thought," p. 401; idem, The Shaping of Jewish History, p. 76.

- 68 Rivkin, The Shaping of Jewish History, p.77.
- 69 Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 474, 480-481.
- 70 Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 73.
- 71 Romans 5:17-19. See also I Corinthians 15:20-22, 47;
II Corinthians 5:17.
- 72 II Corinthians 5:17.
- 73 Such is the concept as it is understood by Hirsch, "Paul the Apostle," p. 13; Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 493-495, 517-518; Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul," p. 449; and Schoeps, Paul, p. 190. Schoeps and Schonfield both say that this refers to archetypal man - אדם הקדמון. Schoeps, Paul, p. 94; Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus, pp. 203, 208. Rubenstein believes that the function of the Messiah is to return man to the Garden of Eden and the eternal life promised to Adam. Hence the Messiah is the Last Adam. Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 144. I believe, however, that all of this is much ado about nothing. That Paul believed that man inherited his sinfulness from Adam is unquestionable. But as for a "doctrine" of the Second Adam, it did not exist. It was merely a homiletical device used by Paul to prove a point - that point being the salvation of Christ. He used it in the Corinthian correspondence, thought it was clever, and so used it again in Romans.
- 74 Schoeps, Paul, p. 147. To say that Paul heard the Akedah story in the Rosh Hashanah liturgy involves two major assumptions: that this had already become the traditional scriptural reading for the holiday and that Paul went to the synagogue on Rosh Hashanah to hear it.
- 75 Schoeps, Paul, pp. 141-149; idem, "The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul's Theology," Journal of Biblical Literature 65 (1946): 385-392.
- 76 Spiegel, The Last Trial, pp. 82-85.
- 77 See Romans 7:7-25 for Paul's personal struggle with the unfulfillability of the Law.
- 78 Galatians 2:16, 3:10-14, 19-20.
- 79 That Paul did not recognize the Jewish (or Pharisaic) concept that perfect obedience to the Law was indeed impossible and therefore not expected is pointed out by Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul; idem, "Rabbinic Judaism

and the Epistles of St. Paul," pp. 167, 174-175; Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 499-500; Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 33; Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 58; Schoeps, Paul, pp. 185, 213 (Schoeps recognizes Paul's concept of man as sinner but says that it means that man is unable to refrain from sinning. This, as we have shown, is not a sufficient explanation).

- 80 Schoeps says that Paul found this concept in the Septuagint translation of Deuteronomy 33. And although he has not published such a statement, Sandmel too has indicated to me that he believes that this is where this concept comes from. Schoeps, however, also finds it in Midrash Tehillim 68:18 and Josephus, Antiquities, 15:5;3. These last two sources, however, are both later than Paul. Schoeps, Paul, p. 182 note #2. Sandmel and Rubenstein both believe that by "angels," Paul might here mean demons. Sandmel, "Reflections on the Problem of Theology for Jews," p. 106; Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 156.
- 81 This is in direct contradiction to Schoeps's statement that "Paul in fact contrasts the Law with the promise which at a prior stage of revelation had been given to Abraham (Galatians 3:15-18), and therefore, as an earlier disclosure, stands nearer to the inmost will of God." Schoeps, Paul, p. 180. The "fact" is correct, the conclusion drawn from it is not. Rather, what it shows is that the Law is not the sine qua non of righteousness. Paul's entire apostleship is based on the premise that the later revelation is the more valid one.
- 82 Romans 4:3-5.
- 83 Romans 4:11-12.
- 84 See note #81 above.
- 85 Those who hold similar views on Paul's abrogation of the Law are Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul," pp. 446-447; and Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, pp. 55-57; idem, "The Confrontation of Greek and Jewish Ethics: Philo, De Decalogo," CCAR Journal (January, 1968): 61-62. Schoeps's view on the facts of the abrogation alone is relatively similar, although Schoeps believes that Paul thought that by applying the thirteenth principle of Rabbi Ishmael, the Law cancels itself. Schoeps, Paul, p. 177. Schonfield's view that Paul did not abrogate the Law for Jews is indefensible on the basis of the evidence. Romans 3:20, for example, states that "... no human being will be justified in his sight by works or the Law, since through the Law comes knowledge of sin." "No human being" includes

Jews. Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus, p. 230; idem, The History of Jewish Christianity from the First to the Twentieth Century, p. 42. Kohler's statements that being a member of the Church meant being above the Law and serving a higher Law and that "the original attitude of Paul to the Law was accordingly not that of opposition as represented in Romans and especially in Galatians, but that of a claimed transcendency," are, to the best of my understanding, incorrect. The statements are unsupported by Kohler. Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 84a-b. Rubenstein, like Schonfield, believes that Paul did not mind the observance of the Law by Jewish Christians, merely by Gentiles. He cites I Corinthians 9:20 to show that Paul himself lived by the Law when in the company of Jews. I believe that this is true, but it is totally non-demonstrable. Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p.121.

- 86 We should note that when Paul says that he is abrogating the Law, he is doing only that; he is not abrogating the Bible. See Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 29.
- 87 Schoeps, Paul, pp. 184-190. The quote is from p. 190.
- 88 Montefiore, "Rabbinic Judaism and the Epistles of St. Paul," p. 168.
- 89 This idea is also mentioned by Hirsch, "Paul the Apostle," p. 11, in addition to those sources previously listed.
- 90 Sandmel, The First Christian Century, pp. 120-121; idem, The Genius of Paul, pp. 33, 49-53.
- 91 Romans 1:20, 2:14.
- 92 Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 122.
- 93 Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 520-521.
- 94 Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 81b.
- 95 Shabbath 30a, 151b, Nidda 61b, Pesikta Rabbati 51b, Jer. Kilaim IX, 3. Schoeps also says that the quote on Shabbath 151b is from Simon ben Gamaliel, "Who -- unless a later Tannaite was meant -- was certainly known to Paul as the son of his personal teacher"; a conjecture based on the unreliable Gamaliel account in Acts. Schoeps, Paul, pp. 171-172.
- 96 Graetz, History of the Jews, Vol. 2, pp. 224-226; Baeck, "The Faith of Paul," pp. 160-163; idem, "Judaism in the Church," pp. 72-73; Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul,

p. 104; Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 40; Schoeps, Paul, pp. 171-172; Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus, pp. 66, 146.

- 97 This is contrary to Baeck's statement that "Paul fought not against the 'law' but against the 'present' validity of the law ..." Baeck, "The Faith of Paul," p. 163. Baeck, and all other scholars who rely on Sanhedrin 97a ignore Paul's statements in Romans 3:20, 4:15, 5:20, I Corinthians 15:56, II Corinthians 3:7-9, Galatians 3:10-13, 19 all of which deny the efficacy of the Law while it was "in force."
- 98 Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 41.
- 99 Schoeps, Paul, p. 184.
- 100 Rivkin, "The Meaning of Messiah in Jewish Thought," p. 400; idem, The Shaping of Jewish History, p. 75; Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, pp. 41-49; idem, "Paul Reconsidered" in Two Living Traditions: Essays on Religion and the Bible, pp. 204-205.
- 101 See especially Graetz, History of the Jews, Vol. 2, pp. 224-226; Ernest Jacob, "Paul," p. 416; Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 549; Schoeps, Paul, pp. 168-171; Solomon Zeitlin, The Rise and Fall of the Judean State, Vol. II, p. 334.
- 102 Schoeps sees early reference to baptism in Jeremiah 14:8 "מקוה ישראל מושיעו" with a pun being made on the word "מקוה"; there Israel's Messiah equals the baptismal spring. Schoeps, Paul, p. 112. He similarly sees reference to the Eucharist in the eating of manna in the desert and the drinking of water from the Rock of Moses (p. 115).
- 103 Klausner sees scriptural reference to baptism in Ezekiel 36:25-26 "וורקתי עליכם מים טהורים". Similarly, he sees Talmudic references, references in Josephus, and in the synoptics' stories about John the Baptist. Klausner also says that baptism was an important component in the Judaism of both the Pharisees and the Essenes and that the analogy given by Paul in I Corinthians 10:2 between baptism in Christ and baptism in the Red Sea indicates that Jews were baptized in the name of Moses. The Jewish origins of the Eucharist are, according to Klausner, the holiday and common meals common in Israel in ancient times. He also believes that the Last Supper in particular was a seder (thereby ignoring the scholarship which shows that the gospel writers themselves were not sure as to whether the Last Supper was on the fourteenth or fifteenth of Nisan).

He finds another parallel to the Eucharist in the blood of the sacrifice (Exodus 24:5-8), in that the blood of the sacrifice was the blood of the old covenant and the blood of the Christ, the blood of the new. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 508-515.

- 104 Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 83a. Kohler believes that the use to which Paul put baptism is thoroughly Greek, but also says that the practice did exist in Judaism prior to Paul's time.
- 105 Solomon Zeitlin, "A Review of Klausner's מִישׁוֹן דֵּר פֶּאָרְלִיט," Jewish Quarterly Review 31 (1940-1941): 309. Zeitlin disagrees with Klausner's assertion that proselytes were not baptized until after the destruction of the Temple.
- 106 Baeck, "The Faith of Paul," pp. 160-161. This is found only in this later essay. Here he says that the concept of the "kingdom of God" is insignificant for Paul, for he has no eschatology, rather, that the מֶלְכּוּת הָאֱלֹהִים has come and that man has already been resurrected through baptism. For the statement that the מֶלְכּוּת הָאֱלֹהִים has come, Baeck relies on Sanhedrin 97a, as I have explained in the last section. Baeck does not here recognize the difference between man in the flesh and man in the spirit.
- 107 Jakob J. Petuchowski, "'Do This in Remembrance of Me ...' (I Corinthians 11:24)," Journal of Biblical Literature 76 (1957): 295. Petuchowski says that a זִכָּר, a remembrance for people, is the essential function of the Eucharist and as such, has parallels in Jewish literature, most notably in the statement in the Passover seder זִכָּר לְמִקְדָּשׁ כְּהִלֵּל. The weakness of this article is its heavy reliance on Mishnaic ordinances - all, of course, post-Pauline.
- 108 Ernest Jacob, "Paul," p. 416. Jacob's assertion that these were sacraments (underlining mine) prior to Paul is without sound basis. It may be, however, a mere misuse of the word "sacrament" by Jacob.
- 109 Schoeps, Paul, p. 112. Schoeps says that it is the mystery element of death and rebirth of a deity which must have come from non-Jewish sources.
- 110 Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 511, 514. Klausner too says that the mystical elements in the sacraments are pagan in origin.
- 111 Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 83a.

- 112 Simon Dubnow, דברי ימי עם קולם, Vol. 2, p. 289. It is only on this point of the origin of the sacraments being in the Greek mysteries that Dubnow significantly differs with Graetz.
- 113 Baeck, "Romantic Religion," p. 221. "... and there is nothing which connects his religion more obviously with the ancient mystery cults than his doctrine of the sacraments." This is a much earlier essay than "The Faith of Paul."
- 114 Sandmel, A Jewish Understanding, p. 86. Sandmel is here referring to I Corinthians 11:23-25; the question here also being, "Does 'For I have received from the Lord ...' mean a revelation or is it a genuine tradition of Jesus?"
- 115 Baeck, "The Faith of Paul," pp. 157-159.
- 116 Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 90.
- 117 I Corinthians 10:16.
- 118 A noteworthy exception is the view of Rubenstein, especially on the Eucharist. Rubenstein borrows from Freud (Sigmund Freud, Moses and Monotheism) the notions that 1.) it is the supreme form of identification with the object of desire to eat it and 2.) that the Eucharist is the re-enactment, repressed in Judaism, of the primal crime (not necessarily a historical fact) in which the brothers in a family group, in order to obtain the power of the father and the possession of the mother, murdered the father and, suffering from intense feelings of guilt, sought both to destroy the evidence and identify with the murdered father, and so ate him. Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, pp. 78-86. Since this primal crime and the desire to identify with the father is basic in the sub-conscious of all men, Rubenstein is convinced that "the transformation of the Lord's Meal from one eaten with Christ to one in which Christ is eaten would have taken place with or without Paul" (p. 94) or else the object of desire would have to be replaced (that is, I suppose, that the "religion" would have died). However, says Rubenstein, Paul did originate the sacrificial Eucharist - although he does not have sufficient evidence to prove it (p. 95). The superiority of this form of "worship" is that while other primitive sacrifices were eaten either before or during slaughter, "Christ alone was ... the sacrificial victim to whom no harm can come" (p. 99) and therefore, there is no guilt or fear of reprisal - merely the fundamental goal of unity.

- 119Romans 1:17, 4:13, Galatians 3:26, Philippians 3:9.
- 120Zeitlin, The Rise and Fall of the Judean State, p. 333. Compare this to the aforementioned view of Rivkin that Paul substituted Christ for the Law.
- 121Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 517.
- 122The only exception is "... if you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved" (Romans 10:9). C.H. Dodd has pointed out that this is the only time that Paul places salvation on the belief in a specific proposition. C.H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, p. 177.
- 123Baeck, "Romantic Religion," pp. 202-203, 203-204. This is an early essay. In his later essay, "The Faith of Paul," he is not as harsh.
- 124Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," pp. 85b, 87a.
- 125Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, pp. 217-219.
- 126Schoeps, Paul, p. 205.
- 127Ibid., p. 204.
- 128Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, pp. 147-148. In this essay, Montefiore does say that "faith" is no intellectual belief, but he does not seem to appreciate the full import of his own statement. In his three essays on Paul, he uses the terms "faith" and "belief" interchangeably.
- 129Montefiore, Claude G., "Jewish Conceptions of Christianity," The Hibbert Journal 28 (1929-1930): 253-254.
- 130Baeck, "The Faith of Paul," pp. 164-168; Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 591; Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 114; Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, pp. 21, 36; Schoeps, Paul, p. 237.
- 131See Sandmel, The First Christian Century, p. 187.
- 132The statements of Flusser, Klausner, and Baeck to the contrary are wrong. Flusser, David, "Paul of Tarsus," Encyclopaedia Judaica, Vol.13, pp. 191-192; Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 534; Baeck, "Judaism in the Church," p. 74. Baeck says that Paul announces his independence from Judaism. My own reading of Paul and that of more learned critics shows that Paul does nothing of the sort.

- 133 Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 453. I find this statement at odds with the view mentioned above (see note #132) that Paul abrogated the election of Israel.
- 134 Klausner and Schoeps both believe that the Epistle to the Romans was addressed to a mixed community of Jews and Gentiles, and that Romans 9-11 was addressed to the יְהוּדִים, the ἡσυχασταὶ καὶ θεοὶ, that is, half proselytes who accepted most of the precepts of the Law of Moses but who, lacking circumcision, were not full Jews. Klausner adds that these "God-fearers" were unsatisfied with paganism and were looking for a middle path between paganism and Judaism and found it in Christianity. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 136. Zeitlin, on the other hand, believes that no such group existed until later in the Rabbinic period. Solomon Zeitlin, "Beginnings of Christianity and Judaism," Jewish Quarterly Review 27 (1937): 389. Schoeps's hypothesis that Saul was a missionary prior to his conversion and therefore already involved in attempting to convert the Gentiles cannot be supported on the basis of the texts. Schoeps, Paul, pp. 219-229.
- 135 See Schoeps, Paul, pp. 262, 235-245; Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, pp. 127, 129, 133, 139; Ernest Jacob, "Paul," p. 416.
- 136 This is I Thessalonians 2:15. Sandmel says that "many scholars" believe that this is an interpolation, but he does not say whether or not he is one of them (see "Notes to Chapter III," note #18). Sandmel, A Jewish Understanding, p. 83. Acts, on the other hand, is replete with anti-Jewish sentiment. Flusser, "Paul of Tarsus," p. 191. Kohler says that many of Paul's epistles, especially Romans, show fierce Jew-hatred and that most of the antagonistic passages are second century Christian interpolations. However, the antagonistic passages simply do not exist. Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 85b.
- 137 Schoeps, Paul, pp. 220-222.
- 138 Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," p. 85b.
- 139 In addition to Schoeps and Kohler, see Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 211-212, 444-449, 528-535.
- 140 Sandmel, The First Christian Century, pp. 80-82; idem, The Genius of Paul, pp. 19-20.
- 141 Hence we get a confusing statement like "... no trace of ethical antinomianism can be elicited from the Epistles of Paul." Worded in this fashion, the statement is absurd, for Paul was antinomian almost to the extreme.

His ethical sense was maintained by no force of Law and expounded in no ethical system. But the statement is correct insofar that Paul never lost his sense of the ethical. Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul," p. 473 cf. Jowett (Jowett also points out the paradox (although Paul did not see it as such) that Paul's ethics is in complete conformity to the Law). The citation from Jowett is unclear.

¹⁴²Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 549, 551-552; Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 117.

¹⁴³Baeck, "Judaism in the Church," p. 80; Schoeps, Paul, p. 198.

¹⁴⁴Baeck, "Judaism in the Church," pp. 79-80; see idem, "Romantic Religion," p. 192; Ernest Jacob, "Paul," p. 416.

¹⁴⁵Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, pp. 548-549; Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 94. The same idea is expressed, although the words "interim ethics" are not used, in Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul," p. 457.

¹⁴⁶Montefiore, "First Impressions of Paul," p. 458.

Notes to Chapter V

- ¹Samuel Sandmel, "Paul Reconsidered" in Two Living Traditions: Essays on Religion and the Bible, p. 198. Sandmel says that the question of Paul's background was Montefiore's primary inquiry. That may be, but it was the underlying goal of defending Judaism which was foremost in Montefiore's thought.
- ²Ibid., p. 200.
- ³Walter Jacob has said that Montefiore "felt no need to defend Judaism, to emphasize the defects of Christianity, or to write apologetically." Walter Jacob, "Claude G. Montefiore's Reappraisal of Christianity," Judaism 19:3 (Summer, 1970): 328. I think that he is wrong on every point. I find both defensiveness and apologia in the sources which Jacob himself has read. The emphasis on the defects of Christianity can be seen in those articles intended for Christian audiences. These do not appear in Jacob's footnotes.
- ⁴Kaufman Kohler, "Saul of Tarsus," Jewish Encyclopedia, p. 83b.
- ⁵Ibid., p. 82b.
- ⁶Ibid., p. 86a.
- ⁷Krister Stendahl, "Introduction" in Leo Baeck, "The Pharisees" and Other Essays, p. vii.
- ⁸Ibid., p. xv.
- ⁹Leo Baeck, "The Faith of Paul" in Judaism and Christianity, p. 164.
- ¹⁰Solomon Zeitlin, "Studies in the Beginnings of Christianity," Jewish Quarterly Review 14:1 (1923): 22-29.
- ¹¹For the sake of analogy, please excuse the bad botany. Peaches, pears, and cherries are all in the same family (Rosaceae, that is, Rose).
- ¹²Kenneth W. Clark, "Review of Hugh Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus," The Crozer Quarterly 26 (1949): 83-84.
- ¹³Jakob J. Petuchowski, "Paul and Jewish Theology: A New View of the Christian Apostle," Commentary 28 (1959): 234.

- ¹⁴For example, Schoeps uses Rashi to show how "most rabbinic exegetes" (in this case, not Paul) treated Deuteronomy 21:23. Rashi, who lived a thousand years later, should be almost irrelevant to Pauline studies.
- ¹⁵Petuchowski, "Paul and Jewish Theology," p. 233.
- ¹⁶Samuel Sandmel, The Genius of Paul, p. 85.
- ¹⁷Richard Rubenstein, My Brother Paul, p. 2.

Bibliography

Books

- Baeck, Leo. Judaism and Christianity. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Atheneum, 1970.
- Baeck, Leo. "The Pharisees" and Other Essays. New York: Schocken Books, 1966.
- Cohon, Beryl David. Men at the Crossroads between Jerusalem and Rome, Synagogue and Church: The Lives, Times, and Doctrines of the Founders of Talmudic Judaism and New Testament Christianity. South Brunswick, New Jersey: T. Yoseloff, 1970.
- Dodd, C.H. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. London: Fontana Books, 1963.
- Dubnow, Simon. דברי ימי עם קולם. Volume 2. Tel Aviv: D'vir, 1965.
- Enslin, Morton Scott. The Literature of the Christian Movement: Part III of "Christian Beginnings". New York: Harper & Row, 1956.
- Friedlander, Gerald. Hellenism and Christianity. London: P. Vallentine & Son's (Successors), 1912.
- Graetz, Heinrich. History of the Jews. Volume 2. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1893.
- Klausner, Joseph. ארץ ישראל בימי בית השני: מחקרים בהיסטוריה של הבית השני. Jerusalem: Mada, 1954.
- Klausner, Joseph. From Jesus to Paul. Translated by William F. Stinespring. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1945.
- Montefiore, Claude Goldsmid. Judaism and St. Paul: Two Essays. New York: Arno Press, 1973.
- Montefiore, Claude Goldsmid. "Liberal Judaism and Hellenism" and Other Essays. London: MacMillan & Co., 1918.
- Rivkin, Ellis. The Shaping of Jewish History: A Radical New Interpretation. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971.
- Rubenstein, Richard. My Brother Paul. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Sandmel, Samuel. The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity: Certainties and Uncertainties. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Sandmel, Samuel. The Genius of Paul: A Study in History. New York: Schocken Books, 1970.

Sandmel, Samuel. A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament. New York: University Publishers, Inc. (Ktav), 1960.

Schoeps, Hans Joachim. Jewish Christianity: Fractional Disputes in the Early Church. Translated by Douglas R.A. Hare. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, c1969.

Schoeps, Hans Joachim. Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History. Translated by Harold Knight. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, c1961.

Schonfield, Hugh J. A History of Jewish Christianity from the First to the Twentieth Century. London: Duckworth, 1936.

Schonfield, Hugh J. The Jew of Tarsus: An Unorthodox Portrait of Paul. London: MacDonald & Co., 1946.

Schonfield, Hugh J. Saints Against Caesar: The Rise and Reactions of the First Christian Century. London: MacDonald & Co., 1948.

Spiegel, Shalom. The Last Trial: On the Legends and Lore of the Command to Abraham to Offer Isaac as a Sacrifice: The Akedah. New York: Pantheon, c1967.

Zeitlin, Solomon. The Rise and Fall of the Judean State: A Political, Social, and Religious History of the Second Commonwealth. Volume 2. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1969.

Zeitlin, Solomon. Who Crucified Jesus? New York: Bloch Publishing Co., c1964.

Articles

Baeck, Leo. "Haggadah and Christian Doctrine" (Hebrew Union College Annual XXIII:1). Cincinnati, 1950-1951, 549-560.

Baeck, Leo. "Paul of Tarsus" (Synagogue Review XXVI). London, 1952, 323-325.

- Belkin, Samuel. "The Problem of Paul's Background" (Journal of Biblical Literature LIV). Philadelphia, 1935, 41-60.
- Clark, Kenneth W. "[Review of] Hugh J. Schonfield, The Jew of Tarsus" (The Crozer Quarterly XXVI). 1949, 83-84.
- Enelow, Hyman G. "Jewish Elements in St. Paul" (in Selected Works of Hyman G. Enelow, Volume 4). Kingsport, Texas: Kingsport Press, 1935, 475-480.
- Friedländer, M. "The 'Pauline' Emancipation from the Law: a Product of the Pre-Christian Diaspora" (Jewish Quarterly Review XIV). London, 1902, 265-301.
- Hirsch, Emil G. "Paul the Apostle." Chicago, 189-.
Also in Twenty Discourses. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1906.
- Hirschberg, Harris. "Allusions to the Apostle Paul in the Talmud" (Journal of Biblical Literature LXII). Philadelphia, 1943, 73-87.
- Jacob, Walter. "Claude G. Montefiore's Reappraisal of Christianity" (Judaism XIX:3). New York, Summer, 1970, [328]-343.
- Jacob, Walter. "Leo Baeck on Christianity" (Jewish Quarterly Review LVI:2-3). Philadelphia, 1965-1966, [158]-172, [195]-211.
- Montefiore, Claude Goldsmid. "First Impressions of Paul" (Jewish Quarterly Review VI). London, 1894, 428-474.
- Montefiore, Claude Goldsmid. "Jewish Conceptions of Christianity" (The Hibbert Journal XXVIII). London, 1929-1930, 246-260.
- Montefiore, Claude Goldsmid. "Rabbinic Judaism and the Epistles of St. Paul" (Jewish Quarterly Review XIII). London, 1901, 161-217.
- Petuchowski, Jakob Josef. "'Do This in Remembrance of Me...'" (I Corinthians 11:24)" (Journal of Biblical Literature LXXVII). Philadelphia, 1957, 293-298.
- Petuchowski, Jakob Josef. "Paul and Jewish Theology: A New View of the Christian Apostle" (Commentary XXVIII). New York, 1959, 231-236.

- Rivkin, Ellis. "The Meaning of Messiah in Jewish Thought" (Union Seminary Quarterly Review XXVI). Summer, 1971, 383-406.
- Rivkin, Ellis. "Paul and the Parting of the Ways" (The Jewish Heritage). Washington, 1938.
- Rivkin, Ellis. "Prolegomenon" (in Oesterly and Loewe, eds. Judaism and Christianity). New York: Ktav, 1969.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "The Confrontation of Greek and Jewish Ethics: Philo, De Decalogo" (CCAR Journal). New York, January, 1968, 54-63.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "Greeks, Jews, and Christians" (Graduate Comment IV:4). Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1961, 4-7.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "The Jewish Scholar in Early Christianity" (Jewish Quarterly Review LXXVII). Philadelphia, 1967, 473-481.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "Judaism, Jesus, and Paul: Some Problems of Method in Scholarly Research" (Vanderbilt Studies in the Humanities I). Nashville, Tennessee, Vanderbilt University Press, 1951, 220-250.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "The Pastoral Epistles" (Salt IV:4). Philadelphia, Winter, 1967, 1-5.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "Paul Reconsidered" (in Two Living Traditions: Essays on Religion and the Bible). Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1972, 195-211.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "Reflections on the Problem of Theology for Jews" (Journal of Bible and Religion XXXIII:2). Wolcott, New York, April, 1965, 101-112.
- Schechter, Solomon. "[Review of] Schiller-Szinessy, 'St. Paul from a Jewish Point of View'" (Jewish Chronicle CMXXI - New Series). London, November 19, 1886, 14.
- Schiller-Szinessy, S.M. "St. Paul from a Jewish Point of View" (The Expositor IV). London, 1886, 321-335.
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim. "The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul's Theology" (Journal of Biblical Literature LXV). Philadelphia, 1946, 385-392.