

A QUEST FOR HISTORICAL TRADITIONS OF THE APOSTLE
PAUL IN NONPAULINE SOURCES

by
THE REVEREND RAOUL COMNINOS

submitted to the faculty of
THEOLOGY AND RELIGION STUDIES
in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY
in the department of
SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY, ETHICS AND HISTORY OF
CHRISTIANITY
at the
UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND

Supervisor:
PROFESSOR ALRAH PITCHERS

Date submitted: February 2003

Declaration

I, Raoul Corninos, hereby declare that this thesis is entirely my own work and has not been submitted for any degree or examination to any other University.

Abstract

Two assumptions shape modern Pauline studies. They are that the Apostle Paul wrote letters, and that his theology can be reconstructed from these letters. The problem is that one cannot decide which of the letters is authentic unless one first knows something about Pauline theology. Much of the modern picture of Paul is biased by the same theology it claims to discover. One way of bypassing this problem is to turn to sources not written by Paul. In Christian literature of the first and second centuries, Paul features prominently as the champion of various Pauline Schools. Scholars have previously ignored this literature for reconstructing historical traditions about Paul. Yet it contains valuable historical information that provides an objective basis upon which one can evaluate the modern approach to Paul's letters and theology.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Professor Alrah Pitchers for his tireless and constructive criticism without which I would not have had the patience or temerity to complete this work. He is a true friend without guile.

Thanks are also due to Gerald Truter, my former Session Clerk, and to my congregation in Richards Bay who were generous in giving me the time I needed to complete this work.

For My Parents

Table of Contents

<i>Declaration</i>	2
<i>Abstract</i>	3
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	4
<i>Table of Contents</i>	6
CHAPTER 1	9
THE ELUSIVE PAUL	9
MY DAUNTING TASK.....	9
CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF HISTORICAL SOURCES.....	17
<i>Early Text Criterion</i>	19
<i>Hierarchy of Attestation</i>	19
<i>Bracketing of Singularity</i>	20
<i>Bracketing of Believability</i>	20
<i>Bracketing of Paulinism</i>	20
<i>Ideological Criticism</i>	20
<i>Simplicity</i>	20
<i>Non liquet ("It is not clear one way or another")</i>	21
<i>Sequitur ("It follows")</i>	21
<i>Features of Legend</i>	21
<i>Comparison with the Genuine Letters of Paul</i>	22
<i>Final Caveat</i>	22
MAPPING THE TERRAIN.....	24
CHAPTER 2	26
MARCION'S PAUL	26
MY AIMS IN THIS CHAPTER.....	26
WAS MARCION A HERETIC?.....	27
SOURCES FOR THE STUDY OF MARCION	28
<i>Major Sources</i>	28
<i>Secondary Sources</i>	28
<i>Excluded Sources</i>	29
WAS MARCION A GNOSTIC?.....	30
MARCION AND THE BIBLE.....	32
MARCION'S CANON	34
MARCION'S ALLEGED ANTI-SEMITISM.....	38
TERTULLIAN'S ANTI-SEMITISM.....	40
SOME PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS.....	44
CHAPTER 3	47
THE APOCRYPHAL PAUL	47
1. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS.....	48
2. THE ACTS OF PAUL	49
<i>Historical Traditions in the Acts of Paul</i>	54
<i>Some Pauline Ideas in the Acts of Paul</i>	59
<i>Some Preliminary Conclusions</i>	60
3. ACTS OF PETER.....	60
<i>Historical Traditions in Acts of Peter</i>	61
4. THE APOCALYPSE OF PAUL.....	62
SOME PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS	62
CHAPTER 4	65

ANTI-PAULINE POLEMIC.....	65
THE PSEUDO-CLEMENTINES.....	66
<i>Kerygmata Petrou (KII)</i>	67
<i>AJ II-Source</i>	67
PAULINE TRADITIONS IN ANTI-PAULINE POLEMIC	68
SOME PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS	75
CHAPTER 5.....	77
THE Gnostic PAUL.....	77
SECRET PAULINE TRADITIONS.....	78
GNOSTIC USE OF THE PAULINE CORPUS.....	79
HISTORICAL TRADITIONS IN GNOSTIC SOURCES	80
THE NAG HAMMADI LIBRARY	81
1. <i>The Prayer of the Apostle Paul (I,1) (Pr. Paul)</i>	81
2. <i>The Gospel of Truth (I,3 and XII,2) (Gos. Truth)</i>	81
3. <i>The Tripartite Tractate (I,5) (Tri. Trac.)</i>	82
4. <i>The Gospel of Thomas (II,2) (Gos. Thom.)</i>	82
5. <i>The Gospel of Philip (II,3) (Gos. Phil.)</i>	83
6. <i>The Hypostasis of the Archons (II,4) (Hyp. Arch.)</i>	84
7. <i>The Exegesis on the Soul (II,6) (Exeg. Soul)</i>	85
8. <i>The Dialogue of the Savior (III,5) (Dial. Sav.)</i>	85
9. <i>The Apocalypse of Paul (V,2) (Apoc. Paul)</i>	85
10. <i>The Interpretation of Knowledge (XI,1)</i>	86
11. <i>The Treatise on the Resurrection (I,4) (Treat. Res.)</i>	86
SOME PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS	87
CHAPTER 6.....	90
THE APOSTOLIC PAUL.....	90
1. THE EPISTLE OF CLEMENT TO THE CORINTHIANS (1 CLEM.).....	93
<i>Pauline Citations and Allusions in Clement</i>	94
<i>Historical Pauline Traditions in Clement</i>	94
2. THE EPISTLES OF IGNATIUS (IGN.).....	96
<i>Pauline Citations and Allusions in Ignatius</i>	96
<i>Historical Pauline Traditions in Ignatius</i>	97
<i>A Collection of Pauline Phrases and Themes in Ignatius</i>	98
3. POLYCARP (POL. PHIL.).....	99
<i>Pauline Citations and Allusions in Polycarp</i>	99
<i>Historical Pauline Traditions in Polycarp</i>	101
4. THE EPISTLE OF DIOGNETUS.....	102
<i>Pauline Ideas in Diognetus</i>	103
<i>Pauline Citations and Allusions in Diognetus</i>	103
SOME PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS	103
CHAPTER 7.....	106
THE LUKAN PAUL	106
THE TEXT OF ACTS.....	110
THE DATE OF ACTS	111
SOURCES FOR ACTS.....	112
<i>Pauline Traditions in the Antiochene Source</i>	114
<i>Pauline Traditions in the Pauline Source</i>	115
<i>Pauline Traditions in the "We" Passages</i>	116
SOME PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS	117

CHAPTER 8.....	119
THE MODERN PAUL.....	119
KRISTER STENDAHL	120
E.P. SANDERS	121
ALAN SEGAL.....	123
JOHN G. GAGER	127
SOME PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS	128
CHAPTER 9.....	131
THE ANCIENT PAUL.....	131
PAUL'S LIFE BEFORE HIS CONVERSION.....	131
PAUL'S CONVERSION	131
PAUL'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE JERUSALEM CHURCH.....	132
PAUL'S ITINERARY.....	133
FELLOW TRAVELERS AND COLLEAGUES	134
PAUL'S MISSIONS	134
OPPOSITION, SUFFERING AND PERSECUTION.....	135
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	136
ARREST AND DEATH.....	137
CHAPTER 10.....	138
THE FUTURE PAUL	138
<i>The Ancient Paul challenges the paradigm of modern critical studies that interprets Paul as a devout Jew faithful to Torah.....</i>	<i>138</i>
<i>The Ancient Paul challenges the view that Paul's mission was separate from the authority of the Jerusalem Church.....</i>	<i>140</i>
<i>The Ancient Paul challenges those who assert Paul was disinterested in the historical Jesus</i>	<i>142</i>
<i>The Ancient Paul challenges the modern critical rejection of the Pastoral Letters, Ephesians, and Colossians as non-Pauline</i>	<i>143</i>
<i>The Ancient Paul challenges the commonly held belief that Paul's ministry ended at Rome</i>	<i>145</i>
<i>The Ancient Paul challenges the modern hermeneutical key to Paul.....</i>	<i>146</i>
APPENDIX A.....	150
COMPLETE LIST OF PAULINE CITATIONS FROM THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS	150
APPENDIX B.....	152
DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE HISTORICAL PAULINE TRADITIONS IN CANONICAL ACTS.....	152
<i>List of Pauline Traditions in the Antiochene Source.....</i>	<i>152</i>
<i>List of Pauline Traditions in the Pauline Source (Pauline Source).....</i>	<i>153</i>
<i>List of Pauline Traditions in the "We" Passages.....</i>	<i>162</i>
<i>List of Pauline Traditions that Qualify as Lukan Redactions.....</i>	<i>163</i>

Chapter 1

THE ELUSIVE PAUL

For not even the question who Paul really was has yet been adequately explained ... the real Paul ... remains confined in seven letters and for the most part unintelligible to posterity ... However, when he is rediscovered—which happens almost exclusively in times of crisis—there issues from him explosive power which destroys as much as it opens up something new.¹

I have followed the footnote style of Turabian.² For abbreviations to ancient works, I have used the SBL Handbook.³ Translations from the Bible are from the Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version (1989). I have employed American spelling throughout the thesis.

My Daunting Task

Let us assume for a moment that the Pauline Corpus did not exist and that we were not in possession of any of the letters now attributed to Paul in the New Testament. Let us assume further that despite not having any of these letters we wished to establish something about Paul's life and theology. Where would we turn for our information? The first place would be to those writings within the New Testament that reveal something about Paul, namely Acts, 2 Peter and (possibly) James. However, what if none of *these* texts had survived? Where would we then turn to know something about Paul?

In this hypothetical situation, the scholar of Paul is not destitute for a single reason: Paul the Apostle features prominently in noncanonical literature. Paul exerted great influence after his death and was taken up as a champion by a

1 E. Käsemann, "Paul and Early Catholicism," in *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 252.

2 Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations* (Chicago: University of Chicago 1993).

3 Patrick H. Alexander and Society of Biblical Literature, *The SBL Handbook of Style: for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999).

number of different groups. These groups revered and championed Paul and their writings reveal important information about Paul. In this thesis, I am concerned with these writings. From them I intend to reconstruct a picture of the historical Paul. By "historical Paul," I mean the Paul that is recoverable through historical analysis. (See the section that follows later in this chapter, "The Historic versus the Historical Paul.")

The aim of this thesis is straightforward although the task is daunting. I intend to reconstruct a portrait of the historical Paul based on (mostly) noncanonical Pauline sources. For three good reasons no one has previously undertaken such a task:

First, there exists an abundance of primary material on the life of Paul, which renders secondary material superfluous. Why unearth the historical Paul in the Acts of Paul and Thecla, when one has the Epistle to the Romans?

Second, these noncanonical sources developed and expanded Paul along theological lines and therefore the historical elements have for the most part receded into the background. A simple reading of the sources reveals that they are not primarily interested in the historical Paul (allusions to the historical Paul are sparse) but use the figure of Paul as a way of establishing the authority of the group.

Third, much of the material that we have on Paul in these sources is late and for critical reasons cannot always be trusted. The Acts of Paul, for example, is full of fantastic legends, which belong more to the realm of science fiction than to the realm of history.

For these three reasons, no one has analyzed historical traditions about Paul in non-Pauline sources *with a view to reconstructing Paul's life and thought*. Why then should I do so now?

In my view, despite these important reservations, the task of analyzing

historical traditions in noncanonical sources must proceed since such a study can yield major dividends in the study of Paul. Using critical methods (these will be outlined shortly) one can identify and extrapolate genuine historical Pauline traditions within these sources. That is precisely what I intend to do in this work. I intend to *identify* historical Pauline traditions in (mostly) noncanonical sources, *analyze* the traditions based on set criteria, *collate* the traditions, and finally *compare* the portrait of Paul from these traditions with that of modern critical Pauline studies. This is the fourfold nature of my method.

It is a test to see whether the modern approach can survive an external critique, which is based on an entirely different methodology. It is a test to see whether the Critical Paul (Paul as interpreted through letters deemed authentic by the majority of modern critical scholars: Romans, Galatians, Philippians, First and Second Corinthians, First Thessalonians, and Philemon) looks anything like the Ancient Paul (Paul as interpreted within noncanonical Pauline literature.) If there is a resemblance, where does it lie? If there is dissimilarity, what are the reasons for it? If the historical Paul as seen by his early champions is vastly different from Paul reconstructed by his modern champions, then the early Church was either mistaken, or modern critics have missed the man from Tarsus.

Some Pauline groups or "Schools" (e.g., the group reflected in the Pseudo-Clementines) reveal a picture of Paul that is more consistent with the Critical Paul than others do. By analyzing these sources, I hope to shed some light on the way one might continue today in Pauline studies. For example, there are several points at which Marcion's picture of Paul corresponds to that offered by modern critics. They also diverge at several points. An analysis of the two approaches yields interesting points of discussion for the future of Pauline studies.

I propose a regressive method apropos of the historical Paul in this study. By

regressive I do not mean a return to early forms, but a way of going backwards. The traditional approach to Paul has been *ingressive*. Beginning with the Pauline Corpus, it has utilized tried methods of Historical, Textual, Source, and Redaction Criticism, et al., to unearth Paul through his letters—correctly—if we assume that the questions surrounding the authenticity of Paul's letters are resolved. But what if that presupposition were erroneous?

Critical scholars cannot agree on what constitutes the Pauline Corpus. The consensus today is that there are seven genuine letters but that keeps changing. Baur regarded only four letters to have been written by Paul. He wrote as follows:

There is a very essential difference between the four main letters of the Apostle (Rom., 1-2 Cor., Gal.) and the shorter ones in the collection of his letters ... the authenticity of several of the latter, if not all, can be seriously doubted.⁴

I can state the problem another way. Modern critical Pauline studies are predicated on two interrelated assumptions. First, that Paul left a written legacy that is recoverable through critical analysis of the genuine Pauline letters. Second, that the historical Paul was a devout Jew with strong ties to Second Temple Judaism. (See chapter 8.)

Although this second assumption is relatively recent, it now dominates Pauline studies, and although it is meant to result from the first assumption, it serves as its logical *prius* because in order to determine which of Paul's letters is authentic, one must entertain certain presuppositions about the nature of Pauline thought. In other words, before one can decide which letters are Paul's, one must assume one knows how Paul's letters read.

However, what if scholars held no prior assumptions about Paul's theology? What if they did not think Paul *had to be* preoccupied with certain matters, notably Jewish, such as the Law and Circumcision? In that case, they would

4 Werner Georg Kümmel, *The New Testament: the History of the Investigation of its Problems*, 1st British ed. (London: SCM, 1973), 128.

have no conclusive way of determining which letter is Paul's and which is the product of a Pauline School operating in Paul's name. Pauline scholarship has shown that the canonical legacy of Paul in the New Testament presents us with Types of Pauline Theology and has forced the conclusion that Paul can be reconstructed from one but not from all these Types.

At present, there are four Types: the Critical Paul (defined above), the Deuterocanonical Paul⁵ (the Paul of Ephesians and Colossians), the Paul of the Pastoral Letters, and the Lukan Paul (the Paul of canonical Acts). Critical scholars have settled on the first Type as historical but that is not self-evident. Baur established this position: "For the history of the apostolic age the Pauline epistles take precedence over all the other New Testament writings, as an authentic source."⁶

The problem, as I have noted, is determining which of the letters is authentic. The Church Fathers provide no consensus on the Pauline Corpus, making the external evidence inconclusive. Modern arguments from style are also inconclusive since there are conflicting styles and where a common style exists, one could explain it as a product of a Pauline School.

By *School* I do not mean an organized seat of institutional learning but a group who regarded Paul as an Apostle and as an authority and who fashioned and taught a Type of Paul consistent with their religious perspective. The literature of the late first and second centuries attests to several competing claims for Paul: the Marcionite Paul, the Gnostic Paul, the Orthodox Paul, the Apocryphal Paul, and the Apostolic Paul.⁷ Sometimes these groups are not that easily distinguishable. Cyril of Jerusalem, for example, found it necessary to warn catechumens against slipping into a Marcionite meeting by mistake

5 Some scholars group the Pastorals with the Deuterocanonical Paul. I have not done so to avoid any confusion.

6 Kümmel, 135.

7 The one School that I do not address in this thesis is the Paul of the Apologists and Heresiologists. This would have expanded my task beyond reasonable bounds.

(Cat. 18.26).

Let me provide an example of how prior assumptions about Paul's theology affect the way in which the interpreter reads the Pauline text. A common argument put forward about the Pastorals is that they cannot be Pauline because they differ in style from the other letters of Paul. Kümmel's view is classic: "It cannot be denied that the language and style speak decisively against the Pauline origin of the Pastorals."⁸ However, what are we to make of the following similarities in style?

Let a woman learn in silence with full submission. I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she is to keep silent. For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. Yet she will be saved through childbearing, provided they continue in faith and love and holiness, with modesty. (1 Tim. 2.11-15)

Women should be silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be subordinate, as the law also says. If there is anything they desire to know, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church. (1 Cor. 14.34-35)

Observing these two passages together should lead the impartial reader to conclude that the same author wrote them and that the author was Paul. Is that the conclusion drawn by the vast majority of critical scholars? Hardly, for to concede that the two passages were written by the same pen would be to concede the unthinkable, that the Apostle Paul was a misogynist, and since *that* cannot be correct, scholars are forced to conclude, illogically, that now *because of* the similarities in style neither passage could have originated with Paul. Ehrman makes this very argument:

Paul does, however, seem to say something similar in his undisputed letters, in the harsh words of First Corinthians 14.34-35. Indeed this passage is so similar to that of 1

8 Werner Georg Kümmel and Paul Feine, *Introduction to the New Testament*, Rev. ed. (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon 1975), 373.

Timothy 2.11-15, and so unlike what Paul says elsewhere that many scholars are convinced that these ... are words that Paul himself never wrote; rather, they were inserted into the letter of First Corinthians by a scribe who wanted to make Paul's views conform to those of the Pastoral Epistles.⁹

Ehrman plays the game with devious skill. First, he argues Paul could not have written Timothy because of the *differences* in style and then he argues Paul could not have written Timothy because of the *similarities* in style. What emerges as all-important is that one safeguards Paul's attitude to women. Everything else becomes secondary. The belief that Paul ought to read in a certain way has ensured that an important method for determining authenticity is not only ignored, but cleverly inverted.

This is the problem in essence: the precipice that supports the current paradigm of Pauline scholarship hinges on a form of shrewd circuitous reasoning. Scholars confidently reconstruct Paul through those letters that conform in advance to a certain Pauline Type, and regard both canonical and noncanonical texts that do not conform to their Type to be of less historical value. This method is unsatisfactory since it cannot provide an objective basis for determining which Pauline Type most closely approximates to the historical Paul.

My method therefore proceeds without the Pauline Corpus. I only turn briefly to Paul's letters at the end of the study to see how they correspond with my conclusions, that is, after I have collated and assessed historical Pauline traditions according to the proposed methodology.

Some may feel that the evidence for Paul in noncanonical sources is scant and

9 Bart D. Ehrman, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University 2000), 370.

unreliable and that such a procedure is therefore fruitless. Baur¹⁰ was the first to shut the door on these works, but in recent times, the likes of Koester has reopened it:

These writings (noncanonical writings) have all received much less attention than the New Testament itself and therefore much of the wealth of often very valuable and very early traditional materials in these writings remains largely unexplored.¹¹

The historical Paul is not identical with the Paul of the respective Schools that developed in his name, but one must pursue the possibility that these sources preserve in some degree the memory and theology of Paul.¹² In terms of ancient historiography, the testimony for Paul is voluminous. There is more evidence for Paul in the second century than for world figures like Augustus in the first century.

Skepticism is not warranted for another reason. It assumes the untenable position that the early theologians had no concern for historical exactness since their pressing theological exigencies compelled them to reinvent or reinterpret traditions that they had received. While this is true of some of this literature, it is not true of all of it.

10 "The epistles of the Apostle are then the only authentic documents for the history of his apostolic labors, and of the whole relation in which he stood to his age ... so do they present the truest and the most faithful mirror of the time." Cited in Kümmel, *The New Testament: the History of the Investigation of its Problems*, 135.

11 H. Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament: History and Literature of Early Christianity*, 2d ed., vol. 2 (New York: Walter De Gruyter, 2000), 68.

12 I noted with interest while reading a solid new introduction to the New Testament put out by the University of South Africa that the entire status of noncanonical writings has radically changed in the past twenty years or so. These works, which scholars might have mentioned in footnotes a mere fifteen years ago, are now given a great deal more attention. I hesitate to use the word "revolution"—but that is an accurate way of describing what is happening in the area of New Testament Studies. The one institution that appears completely insulated from these strides in the world of scholarship, at least in this country, is the Church. See Gerhard van den Heever and Eben Scheffler, *From Jesus Christ to Christianity: Early Christian Literature in Context*, 1st ed. (Pretoria: University of South Africa, 2001), 3, 311.

Criteria for the Evaluation of Historical Sources

As a starting point, I turn to methods used by those engaged in the quest for authentic traditions of the historical Jesus. By employing methods used in this quest, I am not suggesting that Paul and Jesus are analogous figures. Paul does have several traits in common with Jesus, not least of which is that he is a religious Jew living in the first century. Nonetheless, Paul is a disciple of Jesus, and Paul's life, important as it is for understanding early Christianity has no soteriological significance. Paul is not the object of faith and therefore the results of Pauline research can never hold the same importance as the results of research into the historical Jesus.

What do I hope to achieve by approaching Paul vis-à-vis these methods? Let me set the boundaries. I have no interest here in the quest for the historical Jesus. My focus is on some of the *methods* used by scholars in the quest for the historical Jesus. The reason I turn to these methods is that they have been tested over time and are useful for discovering historical traditions encrusted in secondary sources. Since scholars have tried to find Jesus in sources *not written by Jesus*, they have honed critical skills in this area; and since I intend to reconstruct Paul from secondary sources *not written by Paul*, I draw on a wealth of experience dating back to the first critical life of Jesus written by Reimarus in the eighteenth century. Those familiar with the history of the quest for the historical Jesus will also appreciate the degree to which the study of Paul and the study of Jesus intersect at crucial junctures.

In this thesis, one will perceive the influence of the methodology of Crossan.¹³ I turn to Crossan for several reasons. First, his method treats all sources, canonical and noncanonical equally. Second, his results do not depend on independent judgments rendered on an *ad hoc* basis, but are made from a highly objective organization of ancient texts. Third, Crossan's method is thoroughly modern (some may see this as a disadvantage.) Fourth, Crossan

13 John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993).

draws on the vast experience of research in this field over the past several hundred years. Finally, Crossan's conclusions regarding the historical Jesus are so disappointing theologically, that they almost guarantee the objectivity of his method.

Crossan defines his method as a "triple triadic process." First, there is the reciprocal interplay of social anthropology, Hellenistic and Greco-Roman history, and literature. Crossan asks how analysis of comparative data can shed light on the quest. Second, there is the textual problem. Three steps are involved here:

A. Crossan draws up an *inventory* of canonical and noncanonical texts.

B. Stratification: Crossan positions these texts in *chronological sequence*.

C. Attestation: Crossan identifies the number of independent *attestations* for each "complex" of the Jesus tradition.¹⁴

Finally, Crossan "*manipulates*" the inventory. This has three parts to it. A. The sequence of the strata is established. The earlier the texts the more probable are their reliability. B. "Hierarchy of Attestation," which means finding those complexes with the highest number of independent attestations. C. The

14 For example, the complex "Jesus and the Children" is attested in the following texts: Gospel of Thomas 22.1.2; Mark 10.13 16; Matthew 19.13 15; Luke 18.15-17; Matthew 18.3; John 3.1-10. That makes a total of 6 units. However, there are only four sources since Matthew 19 and Luke 18 are dependent on Mark 10.

bracketing of singularity: avoidance of any complex¹⁵ with only one attestation. Here the possibility of invention is high.

The above method is a sophisticated way of finding units of tradition that are *early* and *well attested*. My method differs from Crossan's since my subject and its sources are different from his. The nature of ancient texts determines the methods that one employs. The aim however is the same: to discover units of tradition that are early, well attested and reliable.

I will employ the following criteria in evaluating units of tradition:

Early Text Criterion

The earlier the text, the more probable is its reliability. I employ this criterion in a modified form. For example, with Marcion, the witness of Justin though more reliable than Clement, is not more reliable than Tertullian, even though he antedates him, since Tertullian works with a copy of Marcion's *Antitheses* on his desk and claims to be in possession of one of Marcion's letters (Cam. Chr. 2.14; Marc. 1.1.6, 4.4.3).

Hierarchy of Attestation

This criterion suggests that traditions that are supported in a number of independent attestations are more likely to be historical than those with a single attestation. Scholars engaged in the quest for the historical Jesus regularly employ this criterion.

15 Here is an example of a complex: **22.+ PROPHET'S OWN COUNTRY (1\4)**. 22: indicates where the complex is to be found in the stratum i.e., number 22. +: indicates that the complex goes back to Jesus (a indicates the opposite, and a + indicates that the complex is of mythological character as to render the question of its historicity irrelevant). 1: indicates the number of the stratum. In this case, it is the first. 4: indicates the number of independent attestations. The methodological rule that Crossan follows is that the lower the number on the left of the stroke and the higher the number on the right, the greater the probability that the complex goes back to Jesus himself. Crossan, 436.

Bracketing of Singularity

The bracketing of singularity avoids traditions with only one attestation since here the possibility of invention is high.

Bracketing of Believability

The bracketing of believability avoids complexes that are fanciful or exaggerated and prefers complexes in writers and groups who display greater respect for historical exactitude.

Bracketing of Paulinism

This criterion avoids traditions that do not specifically name Paul as the person represented in the story, even though Paul is implied. For example, the Pseudo-Clementines contain several passages of anti-Pauline polemic and as such are of great value. Unfortunately, these writings identify Paul as *Simon*, compounding the problem of historical enquiry (chapter 4).

Ideological Criticism

By "Ideological Criticism," I mean the need to penetrate beyond the ideological agenda of each Type of Paul. This is a modified principle of dissimilarity that prefers complexes that transcend the ideological agenda of the group or person claiming Paul as their champion. Many Pauline Types are accessible only through the writings of detractors from whom one gains a jaundiced portrait. However, a strong ideological agenda does not necessarily preclude a writer from presenting a reliable complex. Tertullian for example, whose treatise *Adversus Marcionem* is an apologetic against Marcion, is often historically accurate since he demonstrates care not to misrepresent his opponent's position (chapter 2). Each complex must be examined and evaluated within its context in order to determine its reliability.

Simplicity

The criterion of simplicity is that "all things being equal, the simplest

explanation that covers the largest amount of data is to be preferred."¹⁶ This rule of interpretation goes back to John Calvin. The following is typical, taken from his commentary on Psalm 139: "It seems enough to hold by the plain sense of the words."

Non liquet ("It is not clear one way or another")

This criterion¹⁷ acts as a counterweight to the temptation to make judgments because things seem reasonable or plausible. It is an important scholarly discipline not to go beyond the evidence.

Sequitur ("It follows")

I employ this criterion in cases where a narrative contains several historical traditions (e.g., canonical Acts). By following the logical course of the narrative, one can determine whether a tradition is true or false by asking whether or not "it follows." For example, if it is apparent that tradition A is true, then it is likely that a dependent tradition, A1 is also true. This criterion is useful when there is no other evidence to support a tradition that appears true. A tradition that "follows" is one that *it would not make sense to invent*.

Features of Legend

This criterion rejects legendary features of a tradition. Dibelius' definition of legend will serve as my own, namely, a story in which there is emphasis on the miraculous element and the pious character of the people involved.¹⁸ With legend, these elements dominate the narrative in a way that renders historical inquiry impossible. Included under this criterion will be those traditions characterized by teratological elements, that is, where a "wonder world" is presented with characters such as cannibals and talking animals (e.g., the story

16 John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, 1st ed., The Anchor Bible Reference Library (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 67.

17 Ibid., 113.

18 Martin Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (London: SCM, 1956), 106.

of the lion in the Acts of Paul and Thecla).¹⁹

Comparison with the Genuine Letters of Paul

This criterion is one of the most commonly used in the study of Paul. Scholars compare traditions in secondary sources (e.g., Acts) with traditions in the so-called genuine letters to establish authenticity. I will use this criterion as sparingly as possible, since I am trying to avoid the Pauline Corpus. In addition, a secondary source is sometimes nearer to the historical truth than a primary source. One finds this in canonical Acts (chapter 7). Baur first used the criterion consistently and critically.²⁰

It is possible that investigation into noncanonical sources will not produce much fruit, but I take solace in the words of Harvey as quoted by Sanders:

We shall find that those bare biographical statements, which are established with a high degree of historical certainty, but which seem at first to convey little information that is of interest to the theologian, take on considerable significance.²¹

Final Caveat

What do I mean by the historical Paul? Brown puts the matter into perspective with salient words on the quest for the historical Jesus:

It's a major mistake to think that the "historical (or reconstructed) Jesus," a totally modern portrayal, is the same as the total Jesus; i.e., Jesus as he actually was in his lifetime.²²

Brown makes a familiar distinction between the historical Jesus, the Jesus recoverable through historical analysis and the total Jesus or real Jesus. That

19 Wilhelm Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha: Writings Relating to the Apostles; Apocalypses and Related Subjects*, trans. R. McL Wilson, Rev. ed., 2 vols., vol. 2 (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992), 78.

20 Ferdinand Christian Baur, "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthumus in der alten Kirche, der Apostel in Rom," *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* (1831): 103.

21 E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 8.

22 Raymond Edward Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 828.

distinction applies by analogy to Paul because Paul, like Jesus, is a historical figure only recoverable through historical analysis. Meier places a similar constraint:

(The) 'historical Jesus' will always remain a scientific construct, a theoretical abstraction that does not and cannot coincide with the full reality of Jesus of Nazareth as he actually lived²³ ... Jesus of history is a modern abstraction and construct.

Robinson meaningfully outlined these distinctions in a seminal essay. In it he wrote as follows:

The term 'historical Jesus' is not simply identical with 'Jesus' or 'Jesus of Nazareth', as if the adjective 'historical' were a meaningless addition. Rather the adjective is used in a technical sense, and makes a specific contribution to the total meaning of the expression. 'Historical' is used in the sense of 'things in the past which have been established by objective scholarship ... such usage is nearest the original, etymological meaning of the term 'history'.²⁴

These insights underscore the limitations of modern historiography. Accurate facts about historical figures do not necessarily lead to a better understanding of those figures. Noncanonical writers were not disinterested in the facts of Paul's life, but they also realized that facts alone could not capture who Paul was, and so they resorted to the ancient art of storytelling to convey the power of Paul's person. One of the dominant impressions of the various portraits of Paul in noncanonical sources is the lack of interest in historiography in the modern sense. Ancients were more interested in persons than bare facts.

For the champions of Paul, as I will show in the following chapters, Paul was not merely a historical figure but also a father, a saint, a theologian, an Apostle—larger than life. With Paul, mythology has married itself to history in a way analogous to the way the Christ of faith is married to the Jesus of

²³ Meier, 1.

²⁴ James McConkey Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus* (London: SCM, 1959), 26-27.

history, which is why the champions of Paul see no problem writing in the name of their beloved Paul and continuing his legacy.

Perhaps the value of this study will be its resultant skepticism. The surefootedness now associated with Pauline studies may end if scholars applied similar criteria to Paul as their colleagues have applied to Jesus. A new approach may convince us that we are as near to the historical Paul as we are to the historical Jesus. Perhaps the results will show that all we own with certainty is the Paul of faith, the Paul that the Church saw fit to domesticate, embellish, and remold according to its own apostolic values and traditions. Would that conclusion leave us in a state of anxiety? First Jesus, now Paul? The answers to these questions will depend on how much value the Church continues to accord with the Protestant principle *Sola Scriptura* and how much it is prepared to trust the Fathers in their critical decisions of faith.

Mapping the Terrain

In the following six chapters, I present an analysis of noncanonical Pauline sources. I identify, analyze, collate, and compare the traditions. I resist the temptation to make arguments based on traditions that I regard to be historically probable until I have presented all the traditions. This is to ensure the objectivity of the process. I therefore ask the reader to be patient as I evaluate and present the traditions. At the end of each chapter, the reader discovers a list of historical traditions that I deem to be historically probable.

The first Pauline Type that I analyze is Marcion's Paul (chapter 2). I begin with Marcion because Marcion is the furthest away from the historical Paul—at least in terms of chronology and in terms of the boundaries set by this thesis. Since Marcion's writings are no longer extant, an analysis of Marcion's Pauline traditions is not possible. What I hope to achieve is to look at the implications that the study of Marcion poses for the historical Paul. Marcion holds the key to the most important questions surrounding Paul, such as what constitutes the Pauline Corpus and what was Paul's relationship to Second

Temple Judaism? As I proceed through the various Pauline Types, I move closer to the historical Paul.

The second Pauline Type I investigate is the Apocryphal Paul (chapter 3). The presentation of the material for the Apocryphal Paul differs from the presentation of material for Marcion's Paul since with the Apocryphal Paul I am dealing with extant texts, unlike Marcion who left no written legacy. I analyze these texts and present the traditions at the end of the chapter. Because the traditions are scant, I do not focus on only one aspect of Paul, such as his life or his theology, but make use of whatever historical information the sources yield. This process of analyzing and presenting traditions continues through to chapter 6.

In chapter 7, I depart from the scope of this thesis with an analysis of the Lukan Paul. I have done this for two reasons. First, Luke belongs to a tradition of Pauline literature that has no contact at all with the Pauline Corpus, making him invaluable for my purposes. Second, the distinction between canonical and noncanonical is an artificial construct, at least in terms of scholarship.

In chapter 8, I offer a critical evaluation of the "New Paul" through a dialogue with several of its key exponents.

In chapter 9, a pivotal chapter, I present all the traditions and catalogue them around themes in the life of Paul.

In the last chapter, I offer proposals for Pauline scholarship in view of the results of chapter 9.

Chapter 2

MARCION'S PAUL

When Marcion ... met the holy Polycarp on one occasion, and said 'Recognize us, Polycarp,' he said in reply to Marcion, 'Yes indeed, I recognize the firstborn of Satan.' (Mart. Pol. 22.2)

My Aims in this Chapter

I begin with Marcion since Marcion is the chief Paulinist of the second century. Unlike other Schools who saw Paul as *a* champion, Marcion saw *only* Paul. His theological vision is dominated, as was Luther's, by the Pauline Gospel.

No one regards Marcion as a faithful Paulinist. Instead, they see him as someone who largely distorted Paul's Gospel for his own ends. Such a perspective is so common among scholars that it is generally asserted and hardly ever argued. It is, after all, easy to dismiss a heretic who cannot speak for himself and who stands on the side of the vanquished in the annals of Church history.

This chapter rectifies that false perception of Marcion, but not out of misguided loyalty to the heretic. No resuscitation will take place here. My interest in Marcion is strictly Marcionitic. Marcion interests me only as far as he can reveal Paul. The bulk of this chapter therefore corrects erroneous beliefs that have served to disconnect Marcion from Paul. *For if I can prove that Marcion was a faithful Paulinist, Marcion must have something to teach me about the historical Paul.*

Three erroneous beliefs have severed the vital nerve between Marcion and Paul. These are that Marcion was a Gnostic, that Marcion corrupted the original Pauline Canon, and that Marcion was anti-Jewish. I intend to show

that none of these beliefs is plausible.²⁵

Was Marcion a Heretic?

Marcion, that shrewd Paulinist, grossly misunderstood Paul, corrupted the Pauline text, divorced Paul from Second Temple Judaism, and married Paul to an obscure form of Gnostic philosophy. At least, that is the position of the Heresiologists. Marcion's position, revealed in a critical reading of the chief source, Tertullian's brilliant *Adversus Marcionem* (Marc.), brings us face to face with another possibility, namely, that Marcion (*contra* Tertullian) stood in close relation to Paul and closely represented his thinking, that his *Corpus Paulinum* was the authentic one, that Paul originally had meager ties to Judaism, and that if anything was alien to Paul's thinking, it was Judaism, not Gnosticism.

Marcion posed a significant challenge to orthodoxy for centuries. Harnack was a little too flattering when he described him as "the most important figure in the history of the Church between Paul and Augustine,"²⁶ but no less an opponent than Jerome gave Marcion the epithet "the Master" (Cron.).

Marcion was the first *critical* Paulinist to have emerged in the history of the Church. Marcion was also the first to use Paul alone as the basis for his theological paradigm. The Gnostics, the Apostolic fathers, and the Apocryphal writers all championed Paul, but alongside other figures like Peter and John and Thomas. Marcion saw one Apostle.

Marcion was a heretic but one should not ignore even heretics. Marcion forced the Orthodox to reconsider their interpretation of Paul. In addition, Marcion holds the keys to two daunting questions facing Pauline scholars: What constitutes the *Corpus Paulinum*? Has this Corpus undergone textual redaction and corruption? The early Christian Apologists and Heresiologists

25 In this chapter I expand the research that I began in my Master's thesis, PCR Conninos, "Was Paul Saul?: The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Second Temple Judaism" (University of the Witwatersrand, 1997).

26 Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: Gospel of the Alien God* (Durham: Labyrinth, 1989), ix.

(Tertullian in particular) accused Marcion of corrupting the genuine letters of Paul by removing from them whatever failed to conform to Marcion's theology. Marcion alleged that the opposite was true, that the Heresiologists altered the true message of Paul by making Paul appear more Jewish than he really was.

Sources for the Study of Marcion

No work of Marcion has survived. He is accessible only through the writings of his detractors. Hoffmann warns us:

We should not mistake the accusations of Marcion's opponents for the substance of his opinions. The early characterizations are not based on a first-hand acquaintance of the teacher or his work but are without exception construed as attacks on his followers. It was Semler who first recognized the bearing of such animadversions on the nature of the patristic reports, sensible as he was that the purpose of the fathers was not to be fair but to be victorious in battle with the heretics.²⁷

Studies on Marcion are plagued by uncritical use of ancient sources. Anti-Marcionite literature spans at least five centuries. One must avoid indiscriminately cutting and pasting references to Marcion and reconstructing him based on this amalgam.

Major Sources

The most valuable sources for reconstructing the life and thought of Marcion are these: Tertullian: *Adversus Marcionem* (Marc.), *De carne Christi* (Carn. Chris.); Justin Martyr: *Apologiai* (Apol.); *Dialogus cum Tryphone* (Dial.); *Diognetus* (Diog.); Irenaeus: *Adversus Haereses* (Haer.); Clement of Alexandria: *Stromata* (Strom.); and Adamantius (Adam.).

Secondary Sources

The following are sources of secondary importance: Ignatius *Epistulae* (Ign.);

27 R. J. Hoffman, "How then Know This Troublous Teacher? Further Reflections on Marcion and His Church," *Second Century* 6, no. 3 (1987/1988): 179-181.

Hippolytus: *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* (Haer.); Origen: *Contra Celsum* (Cels.); *Commentarius in Evangelium Joannis* (Comm. Jo.); Cyprian: *Epistola S. Cypriani Ad Iubaianum, Contra Epistolam Stephani De Haereticis Baptizandis, Consilia Carthaginiensia, Epistula LXX*; Eusebius: *Historia Ecclesiastica* (Hist. Eccl.); Cyril of Jerusalem: *Catechesis*; Epiphanius: *Panarion* (Pan.); Pseudo-Tertullian: *De Praescriptione Haereticorum* (Praescr.); Jerome: *passim*. Jerome is not an independent witness, and found his information in one of two sources: Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem* and Origen's commentary on Galatians (now lost).

Excluded Sources

The essay of Dahl has in the mind of many, proved that the existence of the so-called "Marcionite Prologues" in the Latin Catholic Bible is best explained without reference to Marcion. The most obvious argument for a Marcionite origin is derived from the order of Paul's letters presupposed by the Prologues, which is identical to Marcion's *Apostolikon*. Dahl feels that this can be explained if we assume "an edition of Paul's letters similar to that of Marcion circulated even outside Marcionite circles."²⁸

I have also excluded the following sources: The Speech of the Elder used by Irenaeus (Haer. 4.27-32), which is best understood apropos of Valentinian Gnosis, not Marcionism; the anonymous heretical treatise opposed by Augustine in *Contra Adversarium Legis et Prophetarum*, Polycarp; the following books of the New Testament in which some have seen reference to Marcion: The Pastorals, Ephesians, Colossians, The Epistles of John, Second Peter; the following apocryphal writings: The apocryphal letter to the Laodiceans (Harnack was the first to propose that the letter was a Marcionite forgery); Third Corinthians (3 Cor.); The Epistle to the Apostles (Ep. Apos.); The *Didascalia* and the Acts of Paul.

28 N. A. Dahl, "The Origin of the Earliest Prologues to the Pauline Letters," *Semeia* 12, no. 233-277 (1978): 263.

The following sources must be regarded as untrustworthy, either through the late age of the document or the ineptness of its author: Ephraem Syrus (*circa* 306-73); Eznik of Kolb (fifth century). Efforts to reconstruct Marcion from Syrian and Armenian writers have failed.²⁹ Apart from the very late dating of these witnesses, they attribute to Marcion undocumented mythological speculations, which would not have escaped the attention of Tertullian had they been part of Marcion's worldview. On Eznik, I refer the reader to Williams³⁰ and on Marcionism in Syria, I refer the reader to Gunther.³¹

I also reject the *Syntagma* sources: pseudo-Tertullian (Haer.), Epiphanius (Pan. 42), and Filastrius. These sources display traits of legendary style. For example, Marcion's apparent excommunication by his father, and his "seduction by a virgin."³² Epiphanius' testimony cannot be trusted unless verified by other witnesses. He is the third witness to Marcion's Canon (after Tertullian and Adamantius) and the most unreliable. Despite his claim to the contrary, he does not have a copy of the *Apostolikon* at his disposal (Pan. 42).

Was Marcion a Gnostic?

To what degree did the Gnostic teachers Cerdo and Saturninus influence Marcion? The tradition that Marcion associated with Cerdo is supported by Irenaeus (Haer. 1.27.1), Tertullian (Marc. 1.2) and by the *Syntagma Tradition*. Harnack³³ would have none of it, preferring to interpret Marcion as a biblical theologian.

Rudolph claims that Marcion's distinctiveness does not remove him entirely from the Gnostic orbit: "(Marcion) cannot be understood without it and thus

29 H. J. W. Drijvers, "Marcionism in Syria: Principles, Problems, Polemics," *The Second Century* 6, no. 6 (1987): 153-172.

30 C. S. C. Williams, "Eznik's Resume of Marcionite Doctrine," *Journal of Theological Studies* 45 (1944): 65-73.

31 J. J. Gunther, "Syrian Christian Dualism," *Vigiliae Christianae* 25, no. 2 (1971): 81-93.

32 G. May, "Marcion in Contemporary Views: Results and Open Questions," *Second Century* 6, no. 3 (1987, 1988): 129-152.

33 Harnack, 131, 132.

belongs to its history."³⁴ Gunther holds a similar position: "Marcion's admiration for Paul does not necessarily make him less of a Gnostic than Cerdo was."³⁵ The same position is adopted by Blackman³⁶ and Balás³⁷ and May,³⁸ who rejects Marcion as a biblical theologian because of the alleged adulterations in Marcion's text. Aland³⁹ says there are three characteristics of Marcion's thought that show a relation to Gnosticism: the sharp distinction between the Creator and the "alien" God, the idea of salvation from the world, and the use and evaluation of the Old Testament. The first two points are worth noting, but the third is plainly wrong, as I will presently demonstrate.

Gager⁴⁰ asserts that the either-or, Gnostic-biblical approach is too simplistic. Although he does not admit the importance of Cerdo or other Gnostics, Gager feels Marcion possessed some degree of philosophical sophistication and was influenced by Epicurean Philosophy in particular. This accusation is first leveled by Tertullian in the *Adversus Marcionem* and is supported by Marcion's rejection of allegory and by Marcion's use of the Epicurean argument from evil: God can be either good or omnipotent.

Gager thinks that Marcion's theology is not typically Gnostic because it lacks mythological and cosmological speculation. Marcion's god is absolutely unrelated to the creator god (there is not even a genealogical tie), he has no idea of any kind of kinship between man's inner self and the highest good,

34 Kurt Rudolph and R. McL Wilson, *Gnosis: the Nature and History of An Ancient Religion* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1983), 313.

35 Gunther: 90.

36 E. C. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence* (London: SPCK, 1944), 69.

37 D.L. Balás, "Marcion Revisited: A Post-Harnack Perspective," in *Texts and Testament: Critical Essays on the Bible and Early Church Fathers*, ed. W. E March (San Antonio: Trinity University 1980), 98.

38 May: 146-147.

39 Barbara Aland, "Marcion: Versuch einer neuen Interpretation," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 70 (1973): 420-427.

40 John G. Gager, "Marcion and Philosophy," *Vigiliae Christianae* 26, no. 1 (1972): 53-59.

and he does not believe that salvation comes through Gnosis.⁴¹

I concur with Gager. To view Marcion as *either* a biblical *or* Gnostic thinker is outdated, and presupposes a false distinction between Paulinism and Gnosticism in the second century. The Gnostic writings reveal an intricate Pauline theology and the letters of Paul exhibit, if not overt, then latent Gnostic motifs. The judgment of Streeter as far back as 1925 still holds true: "Marcion was the most Christian of the Gnostics."⁴²

Gnostic motifs in Marcion's theology were taken a step further by his followers, especially Apelles: "Apelles was first a disciple of Marcion and afterwards an apostate" (Tert. Carn. Chr. 1, Marc. 3.11.2). One must also bear in mind that those who have cut Paul off from the Gnostics have done so because they have not been able to accept that there are Gnostic features in Paul's theology and yet "many aspects of Pauline Theology (not to speak of Paul's opponents in First Corinthians) cannot be explained, unless we recognize that a considerable formation of Gnostic thought had already taken place before Paul."⁴³

Marcion and the Bible

Did Marcion have a formative role in the creation of the Christian Bible? Harnack⁴⁴ sees Marcion as fighting against a four Gospel Canon, and although not the creator of the Canon, the one who gave it its initial impetus. Knox thinks Marcion's Canon provided the structural principle and became the organizing idea of the Catholic New Testament.⁴⁵

41 Ibid.: 59.

42 Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates* (New York: Macmillan, 1925), 156.

43 Helmut Koester, "Paul and Hellenism," in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed. J.P. Hyatt (London: Carey Kingsgate, 1965), 191.

44 Harnack, 131, 132.

45 John Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon* (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1942), 31.

Campenhausen rejects Harnack's view and believes Marcion to have been the creator of the "idea and reality of the Christian Bible."⁴⁶ Campenhausen observes that the Canonical arrangement of Marcion's Canon, a Gospel followed by the *Apostolikon*, is nowhere else attested or attempted before Marcion. Marcion chose his Gospel because Paul probably used it. Koester writes similarly, "The employment of the term *Canon* as a technical designation for a written document by Marcion appears a revolutionary novelty."⁴⁷ What is certain is that the order of Marcion's Canon is attested nowhere else, which weakens Marcion's claim that he was preserving the original.⁴⁸ Hoffmann dates Marcion some three decades earlier than Harnack, sees him as the first collector of the New Testament, and the writer of the Epistle to the Laodiceans, which underlies the catholicized canonical Ephesians.⁴⁹ Finally, I note that even as conservative a scholar as Westcott defended Marcion's claim to be the founder of the idea of a New Testament Canon.⁵⁰

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

Although there is no evidence for the formation of a ten-letter *Corpus*

46 Hans Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972), 149, 53, 72-73.

47 Helmut Koester, "From the Kerygma-Gospel to the Written Gospels," *New Testament Studies* 35, no. 3 (1989): 381, D.S. Williams, "Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel," *JBL* 108, no. 3 (1989): 477-96.

48 Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 334.

49 R. J. Hoffman, *Marcion and the Restitution of Christianity* (Chico, California: Scholars, 1984), chapter 8.

50 B.F. Westcott, *General Survey of the History of the New Testament Canon* (London: 1855, 1896), 318.

Paulinum before Marcion, the remark by Balás is difficult to ignore, "Since Marcion claimed to have restored the original text, he himself could not have initiated the notion of the Canon."⁵¹

Marcion's Canon

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

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

In addition to a single Gospel, we must add Marcion's *Apostolikon*, consisting of ten letters of Paul in the following order: Galatians, First Corinthians, Second Corinthians, Romans, First Thessalonians, Second Thessalonians, Ephesians (under the name "To the Laodiceans"), Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon. The Pastorals and Hebrews are missing. Instead, there is a work composed by Marcion himself, now lost to us, *Antithesis*, or book of contradictions, which served as an introduction to Marcion's New Testament. It did not, however, form part of Marcion's Canon.⁵² Finally, Marcion never used or even mentioned any apocryphal writings.⁵³

That Marcion spurned Acts is significant. Frend in a helpful article writes, "Why he (Marcion) should want to exclude Acts is obscure."⁵⁴ The insinuation is clear: Marcion would have snatched at the opportunity to incorporate into his Canon the work of one so Pauline and anti-Jewish. Besides, if Marcion had edited Luke, then he could have done the same with Acts. Either Marcion did not know of the existence of Acts, or the

⁵¹ Balás, 103.

⁵² Campenhausen, 161-162.

⁵³ Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 334.

⁵⁴ W. H. C. Frend, "Marcion," *Expository Times* 80, no. 11 (1969): 330.

discrepancy between Luke's Paul and Paul himself led Marcion to reject the work. Alternatively, Acts had not yet been written. It is possible that Marcion rejected Acts because he believed Acts had been written with the express purpose of forging Paul's ties to Judaism. There is more support for this view in the testimony of Irenaeus where Marcion is placed among the poorly esteemed group of Encratites, Montanists, and Valentinians (Haer. 3.13.3). Irenaeus here inadvertently points to Marcion's critical skill as a biblical scholar by indicating that Marcion rejected Acts because it conflicted with the testimony of Galatians. Irenaeus then refutes Marcion by harmonizing the differences, without making clear what they are, or how he resolves them.

Knox⁵⁵ argues for the existence of Primitive Luke, a work that lies behind both the canonical Gospel of Luke and Marcion's Luke. The presence of Markanisms in Marcion's Luke rules out the possibility that Marcion's Luke is identical to Primitive Luke. However, Knox will not accept either the view that Marcion's Luke is a mere abridgement of canonical Luke. Rather, he thinks the latter is an anti-Marcionite tract. Paul-Louis Couchaud⁵⁶ and West support this view.⁵⁷ West sees the existence of Primitive Luke as a source of canonical Luke, Marcion's Luke, and the Gospel of Matthew.⁵⁸

On Marcion's alleged excisions of the Pauline text, consider the words of our chief hostile witness, Tertullian, "But what serious gaps Marcion has made in this epistle especially, by withdrawing whole passages at his will, will be clear from the unmutilated text of our own copy-*nostrum instrumentum*" (Marc. 5.13). He also says, "Marcion expressly and openly used the knife since he made such

55 J. Knox, "Acts and the Pauline Letter Corpus," in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 279-287.

56 Cited in Blackman, 40.

57 H. P. West, "A Primitive Version of Luke in the Composition of Matthew," *New Testament Studies* 14, no. 1 (1967): 75-95.

58 For a contrary view see Wilshire who tries to show the inconsistencies in Knox's method, L. E. Wilshire, "Was Canonical Luke Written in the Second Century? - A Continuing Discussion," *New Testament Studies* 20, no. 3 (1974): 246-253.

an excision of the Scriptures as suited his own subject matter" (Praescr. 38).

The apologetic argument made by Tertullian still prevails today almost without question: Marcion excised from the text whatever failed to support his theological position. Even the sympathetic Harnack believed Marcion guilty of textual corruption.

(Marcion who) was not capable of translating himself into the consciousness of a Jew, and had not yet learned the method of special interpretation, had only the alternative, if he was convinced of the Truth of the Gospel of Christ as Paul proclaimed it, of either giving up his Gospel against the dictates of conscience, or striking out of the Epistles whatever seemed Jewish.⁵⁹

I prefer to scrap Tertullian's canards for the following reasons:

First, Tertullian (Marc. 4.2; 3.4) has not satisfactorily explained why Marcion allegedly excised his text. A modern example is Grant who denies that Marcion was a textual or historical critic: "He took the Gospel of Luke and ruthlessly edited it to suit his own doctrines."⁶⁰ If Grant is correct, how do we explain the following "Jewish" elements, retained by Marcion?⁶¹ Marcion retains the quotation from Malachi 3.1 in Luke 7.25, the reference to Moses and the Prophets (Luke 16.29), the identification of Jesus as the Son of David (Luke 18.38), the statement of Jesus that he wants to celebrate Passover (Luke 22.15), and the reference to the two sons of Abraham in Galatians 4.22. In addition, the extremely Jewish character of Romans 2.12-16 poses no problem for Marcion (Marc. 5.13) nor does Romans 10-11, which outlines Paul's plans for the Jews. We can be relatively sure that the following passages were not in Marcion's text of Romans: the *πρῶτον* of 1.16; 1.19 2.1; 3.31 4.25; 9; 15 16—but think how much that leaves of the Epistle *intactus*!

59 Adolf von Harnack, *The History of Dogma*, vol. 1 (Boston: 1897), 282.

60 Robert McQueen Grant, *The Letter and the Spirit* (London: SPCK, 1957), 119.

61 Williams, "Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel," 482.

According to Blackman, at least one hundred Marcionite readings of the New Testament are dogmatically neutral.⁶² He retains many verses from the Old Testament.⁶³ If Marcion wished to edit his Canon for theological ends, why so many gaping inconsistencies?

Second, Tertullian's allusions to, and citations of Marcion's *Apostolikon* cannot be treated uncritically. Clabeaux has provided many negative characteristics of Tertullian's method, with respect to Marcion's text and to his general use of Scripture.⁶⁴ For example, when Tertullian wants to win an argument, he freely alters Marcion's text. He cites Marcion's text more faithfully when dealing with the more important Pauline letters such as Romans, Corinthians and Galatians, and he often transposes scriptural citations. For example, his word order is often at a variance with the older Latin versions: "Tertullian is notorious for the variation of vocabulary in his scriptural citations."⁶⁵ Tertullian also deletes sections of the text for economic or apologetic reasons.

Third, Tertullian charges Marcion with deleting material from Luke that is not in canonical Luke, but is to be found in Matthew or Mark.⁶⁶ This implies either that Tertullian confused certain passages of Scripture or that his edition of Luke contained harmonization with the other Gospels or that Tertullian's charge that Marcion used only Luke is false.

Fourth, Campenhausen makes the point that Marcion's rigorous dogmatic revision is not peculiar to Marcion.⁶⁷ For example, Matthew and Luke both revised and corrected Mark. The author of the Fourth Gospel also manipulates his sources. Koester writes, "Marcion's editorial work in the

62 Blackman, 51.

63 See Harnack, *Marcion: Gospel of the Alien God*, 112f. for a full list

64 J. J. Clabeaux, "A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus Attested by Marcion," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series* 21 (1989): 40, 46, 52.

65 Ibid.: 52.

66 For example, the saying of Jesus in Matthew 5.17 about the Law and the Prophets. Williams, "Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel," 477-96.

67 Campenhausen, 160-161.

production of his new scriptural Canon did not differ fundamentally from the way in which these writings were handled by his contemporaries."⁶⁸ The distinctive feature of Marcion's recension is that he nowhere expands his sources but on every occasion abbreviates them.

Fifth, Marcion's Canon underwent several amendments at the hands of his followers. Tertullian charges that Marcion's disciples are "every day reshaping this Gospel of theirs" (Marc. 4.5.7 and Adam. 2.18). When Tertullian's Marcionite text of Luke is compared with that proffered by Epiphanius, there is considerable discrepancy. Passages thought to be retained by Tertullian are said by Epiphanius to have been excised, and passages thought by Epiphanius to have been retained have been excised according to Tertullian.

Sixth, Marcion refused to recognize any corruptions or interpolations in the Old Testament and regarded it as reliable.⁶⁹

In the light of these considerations, it seems likely that the Fathers exaggerated Marcion's textual infidelity in order to discredit his claim to be a faithful interpreter of Paul. Tertullian himself fights this view in many instructive passages: "He simply amended what he thought was corrupt; though, indeed, not even this justly, because it was not really corrupt (Marc. 4.4) ... I say that my Gospel is the true one; Marcion that his is. I affirm that Marcion's Gospel is adulterated; Marcion that mine is" (Marc. 4.5, 5.14).

Marcion's Alleged Anti-Semitism

Many regard Marcion as the "Jew hater" of the early Church. A vigorous modern example is Martyn:

Marcion's ontological antitheses, unlike Paul's apocalyptic antinomies, became anti-Judaic, with disastrous results, extending into the anti-Judaism that is yet present in some segments of the Church. Marcion misunderstands Paul, and his misunderstanding, being a matter

68 Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 9.

69 Harnack, *Marcion: Gospel of the Alien God*, 67, 86.

ultimately of horrible consequence, must not be repeated.⁷⁰

Martyn makes the seasoned blunder of identifying anti-Judaism with anti-Semitism, and yet the former is not necessarily the logical implication of the latter. Baeck was as cynical when he remarked that Marcion was the best Paulinist and thus the worst theologian before Luther.⁷¹ Schoeps, also a Jewish scholar of no mean stature, perhaps the finest Pauline scholar of the past 100 years, described Marcion as "*ein schwerer Sexualneurotiker und Verdrängertyp*."⁷²

Marcion's negative attitude to Judaism cuts to the heart of this discussion since Marcion argued that his rejection of the Old Testament had its rationale in Paul's rejection. Since scholars are reluctant to concede that Marcion understood Paul correctly, they are compelled to suggest that Marcion rejected the Old Testament because he was an anti-Semite.

Few studies have paid sufficient attention to Marcion's attitude to the Jews. The reason is that "Marcion's anti-Judaism is considered to be so obvious and extreme that it scarcely warrants analysis."⁷³ Wilson redresses the imbalance and observes a curious tension in Marcion's view of Judaism. On the one hand, Marcion denigrates Judaism and the symbols precious to its life and faith. On the other hand, "there is little to suggest Marcion was anti-Jewish."⁷⁴ What led Marcion to this position?

Wilson summarizes the major views: Marcion's view of the Old Testament speaks from his disquiet of the problem of Theodicy (Blackman); Marcion rejected the God of the Old Testament, not the Jewish people (Goppelt); Marcion's dispute was not with Jews but with Gentile Judaizers (Rengstorff);

70 J.L. Martyn, "Paul and His Jewish-Christian Interpreters," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 42 (1988): 8.

71 Cited in Ibid.

72 Gager: 54.

73 S. G. Wilson, "Marcion and the Jews," in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity: Separation and Polemic* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University 1986), 45.

74 Ibid.

Marcion was initially a Jew (Harnack);⁷⁵ Marcion was driven primarily by a need to reassess the relationship of Christianity and Judaism following the Bar Cochba revolt.⁷⁶ Wilson's view is that Marcion's attitude to the Jews was stimulated by Jewish Christian debate. Aware that the interpretation of the Old Testament among Orthodox Christians was forced and exaggerated, Marcion felt that it undermined the faith and felt himself siding with the intellectual position of the Jews. He therefore takes it on himself to correct the situation.⁷⁷

Wilson falls short of conceding that Marcion's anti-Judaism is derived logically from Marcion's Paulinism. Since Paul is not anti-Judaic to Wilson's mind, Marcion could not have derived his view from Paul. How then does Wilson explain Marcion's claim that *Paul* is the reason for Marcion's rejection of the Old Testament? Wilson insists that Marcion's Paul is a distortion since it is based on the exaggerated Paulinism of Galatians and on a Gnostic version of Paul current in Asia Minor. This does not follow.

Ironically, Tertullian's anti-Semitism sheds the most light on Marcion and his relationship to the Jews.

Tertullian's Anti-Semitism

Tertullian often insinuates that a position or opponent is wrong simply on the mere fact that it is Jewish. Efrayimson, in a superb article writes, "The device

75 Because of Tertullian's anti-Semitism, I am compelled to reject as untenable the tempting view that Marcion was Jew, Adolf von Harnack, *Neue Studien zu Marcion* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1923), passim. The view is also held by Hoffman, "Hoffman How," 88, 182. Harnack suggested that Marcion's juxtaposition of law and faith is based on his resentful departure from his Jewish past. The fact that there was a large Jewish community in Pontus in the second century, and that Jewish scholarship was well established in that province proves nothing. Marcion's belief in two gods is un-Jewish, and presupposes a polytheistic background. Furthermore, had Marcion been Jewish his enemies would have used it to express their incredulity at his rejection of the Old Testament as canonical.

76 Balás, 99.

77 Wilson, 57-58.

appears in roughly two-thirds of his writings, throughout his career, and against every major opponent."⁷⁸ Below I cite three examples of Tertullian's anti-Semitism (translations mine):

Finally, it would be the kind of thing a Jew would do (*ceterum, Judaicae fidei ista res*), to believe in God and refuse to consider the Son too. For what other difference would there be between us and that bunch, except this disagreement? What need would we have of the Gospel? (Prax. 31.1-2)

Efroymsen makes the following remark, "Tertullian thus argues that Monarchianism is Jewish; he does not argue that to be Jewish is wrong: this is assumed."⁷⁹

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

Report has introduced a new calumny about our God. Not that long back, a desperate and corrupt man in that city of yours, a man who had even deserted his own religion, a Jew carried about in public a caricature of us with this label: Onocoetes. This figure had the ears of an ass, and was dressed in a toga, with a book. And the crowd believed the Jew (*et credidit vulgus Judaeo*)! But then, what other people could be the source of our bad name? (Nat. 1.14.1-2)

Marcion, on the other hand, forged an impressive intellectual alliance with contemporary Jews who supported his vision of the severance of Christianity and Judaism. Ironically, in this ostensible "Jew Hater" the Jews found a theological ally. In Tertullian, Marcionite heresy and Jewish error are lumped together and the hatred of both is disturbingly intense:

78 D. P. Efroymsen, "Tertullian's Anti-Jewish Rhetoric: Guilt by Association," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 36, no. 1 (1980): 26.

79 Ibid.

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

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

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

Let the heretic now give up borrowing poison from the Jew—the asp, as they say, from the viper: let him from now on belch forth the slime from his own particular devices, as he maintains that Christ was a phantasm: except that this opinion too will have had other inventors, those so to speak premature and abortive Marcionites whom the Apostle John pronounced Antichrists. (Marc. 3.8)

This last passage is damning. Tertullian defines the Jews as the precursors of Marcion. In his treatise *de Resurrectione Mortuorum* he makes the same point with added gusto, but reverses the roles by accusing the Marcionites of being latter day Sadducees (Res. 2.1-2). Commenting on Jesus' answer to the Sadducees about marriage after the resurrection, he writes the following: "Here you have the Lord affirming against the Jewish heretics precisely what is now being denied by these Christian Sadducees: the resurrection of the whole man" (Marc. 36.7).

Tertullian crudely associates Jews and Marcionites, proving that a kinship existed between the two groups. The relationship was based on mutual self-interest and a common hostility to the claim that Jesus was the Messiah of God the Creator. Marcion believed the following according to Tertullian:

So then, since heretical madness was claiming that Christ had come who had never been previously mentioned, it followed that it had to contend that that Christ was not yet come who had from all time been foretold: and so it was compelled to form an alliance with Jewish error (*ita coacta est cum Iudaico errore sociari*), and from it to build up an argument for itself (*et ab eo argumentationem sibi struere*) on the pretext that the Jews, assured

that he who has come was an alien, not only rejected him as a stranger but even put him to death as an opponent, although they would beyond doubt have recognized him and treated him with all religious devotion if he had been their own. It can have been no Rhodian law, but a Pontic one, which assured this shipmaster that the Jews were incapable of making a mistake respecting their Christ; although, even if nothing of this sort were found to have been spoken in prophecies against them, human nature alone, and by itself, wide open to deception, might have persuaded him that the Jews could have made a mistake, being men, and that it would be wrong to use as a precedent the judgment of persons who had likely enough been mistaken. (Marc. 3.6)

In this passage, Tertullian sets out to dispute the view of Marcion that the Christ who was revealed came from a previous unknown God, and not the God of the Jews, the Creator. Tertullian repeats Marcion's argument, which is a simple yet poignant one: if Christ were the Messiah, then the Jews would have recognized him. Since, the Jews rejected him; he must have come from a god other than the God of the Jews. Rather than burden the Jews with the responsibility for murdering the Messiah, Marcion exonerates them by professing that they were incapable of such a mistake. Tertullian claimed that Marcion not only learned this argument from the Jews, but also had formed an alliance with them in the matter. Tertullian's response is threefold: Jewish disobedience was foretold in the Scriptures, all humans are capable of error, and Jews especially are the sort of people who commit an error of this magnitude (*quos credibile fuerat errasse*). "Jewish blindness and sinfulness in rejecting Jesus is on Tertullian's side of the argument, not on Marcion's."⁸⁰

Marcion's reading of the Old Testament led him to the belief that the Jewish Messiah was still to come and establish his earthly kingdom (Marc. 3.21.1; 3.23.6; 4.6.3; 3.4.4; 4.6.3). It is therefore false to argue that Marcion rejected the Old Testament. What Marcion did was deny that the Old Testament had significance *for Christians*, and that the latter had no claim to it by means of bizarre allegorical, typological, or esoteric interpretations. In accord with

80 Ibid.: 29.

modern biblical scholars, Marcion saw that nowhere in the Old Testament is it prophesied that the Messiah would suffer and die on a cross (Marc. 3.18.11). We do not know how Marcion reconciled his two Christologies (a Jewish Christ and a Gentile Christ), although it is likely that his need to accord a place to Israel is based on Paul's own views in Romans 10. It is peculiar that Romans 9 with its anti-Jewish sentiments is absent from Marcion's text, and that Romans 10 with its belated hope for the salvation of the people of Israel is retained (Marc. 5.14.6).

In addition, perplexing Jewish elements in Marcion's theology are inconsistent with the view that Marcion's chief aversion was Judaism. The strict dietary and purificatory laws of the Marcionites are well attested and not easily distinguishable from the Jewish practices that Paul rejected. (It seems that Marcion was no doting Paulinist.) Irenaeus makes Marcion the spiritual father of the Encratites, thereby establishing a Jewish provenance for their asceticism (Haer. 1.28.1). He also esteemed the Law and cited many Old Testament prophecies. The oldest extant dated inscription from a place of Christian worship is of a Marcionite Church, and it reveals a link with Judaism with its identification of the community as "synagogue."⁸¹ Finally, it is also no mere coincidence that there is no record of persecution of Jews by Marcionites. Hoffmann's words provide a fitting conclusion:

There is no compelling evidence to support the judgment that Marcion's theology is anti-Jewish in design, and the familiar view that his "rejection" of the Old Testament made him the arch-anti-Semite of the ancient Church is uninformed.⁸²

Some Preliminary Conclusions

Marcion was a committed Paulinist, and yet few are willing to concede that his rejection of Judaism *as revelation for Christians* is the logical implication of his Paulinism. Harnack wrote, "The Pauline method of thought was absolutely

81 W. Dittenburger, *Orientis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae* (Leipzig: 1903), 608.

82 Hoffman, *Marcion and the Restitution of Christianity*, 231.

closed to him."⁸³ Ironically, modern critics and not ancient critics have been disinclined to find the roots for Marcion's expurgation of the Gospel in Paul himself. Tertullian understood the antecedents for Marcion's theology (legitimately or otherwise) in Paul's separation of Law and Gospel:

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

The knife of historical interpretation has severed the vital nerve connecting Marcion to Paul. Yet why Marcion chose as his patron someone who apparently espoused a theology entirely different from his own remains an enigma that Marcion's critics are unwilling to solve. Simply put, *why would Marcion have chosen Paul as the principal support for his rejection of the Old Testament and Judaism, if Paul's position were precisely the opposite?* It will not do to attribute to Marcion a lack of theological sophistication that would excuse his deviant reading of Paul. Critics love to carve the heretic up as they carve their way out of the dilemma: make Marcion out to be a simpleton and the problem goes away.⁸⁴

Marcion's Paul and the modern Critical Paul converge at the following points. Marcion rejected the book of Hebrews as Pauline. He is the only Paulinist of the second century to have done this. In this, every modern critic supports him. Marcion rejected the Pastorals as Pauline as do most scholars. Marcion rejected Acts as a source for the life of Paul. Modern scholars are now very aware of the discrepancy between Luke's Paul and the Paul of the letters.

83 Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, 2d ed. (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1924), 201 note.

84 So for example, Clabeaux: "the success of Marcion's movement was not due to the depth or consistency of his theology." J. J. Clabeaux, "Marcion," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 516.

Marcion rejected spurious secret Pauline traditions, which were the exclusive property of the Gnostics. Marcion made no claim to special gifts of the spirit, to prophecies, or to revelations.⁸⁵ Marcion never mentions the apocryphal writings. The words of Paul in the letters are his sole source of authority.⁸⁶ Finally, Marcion felt a special obligation to safeguard the integrity of Second Temple Judaism as a religion.

I have given good reasons for believing that Marcion understood Paul well, and that his un-Jewish Paul was based on a faithful reading of the historical Paul. This is not to say that the historical Paul is identical with Marcion's Paul. Marcion, like all disciples, took the theology of Paul a step further, sometimes for the worse. He may have excised certain portions from the authentic *Corpus Paulinum*, but he had little reason to do so as he could have made his case with the *Corpus Paulinum* used by his opponents. It is more likely that Marcion excised portions added by Catholic devotees, who in line with the tradition initiated by Luke, sought to tame Paul by bringing him in line with apostolic Christianity.

If one assumes that Marcion's connection with Paul's letters is not an arbitrary one, then one is led to the conclusion that Marcion and Paul have something in common, namely, a rejection of Judaism *as revelation for Christians*. The fact that Paul's theology lent itself to the kind of canonization evidenced in Marcion's *Corpus Paulinum* suggests that Pauline theology had an exclusive ring to it and that *Paul must share some blame for the resultant appropriation of his thinking by Marcion*.

I am still some way from the historical Paul, but the journey has begun. In the next chapter, I move closer to Paul as I examine the extant Pauline traditions in the Apocryphal writings. The analysis of the texts proper can now begin.

85 Blackman, 42.

86 Marcion did not include his own *Antithesis* in his Canon.

Chapter 3

THE APOCRYPHAL PAUL

And he saw Paul coming, a man small in size, bald headed.
Bandy legged, of noble mien, with eyebrows meeting, rather
hooked nose, full of grace. Sometimes he seemed like a man,
and sometimes he had the face of an angel. (Acts of Paul 3.3)

I have taken my translations of the Apocrypha in this chapter from Elliott⁸⁷ and Schneemelcher.⁸⁸ Where necessary I have consulted the *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*.⁸⁹

I do not use the term *apocryphal* in the same way as James,⁹⁰ in its common or popular sense of connoting "false or spurious." I use the term to denote a group of writings so designated from antiquity—without consideration for their heretical status.

This chapter differs in format from the previous chapter because I am here dealing with historical Pauline traditions *proper*. With Marcion, I had no extant writings from which to work. With the apocryphal writings, I have collated traditions and present them here. Each section begins with a date and place of writing. I have based these for the most part on scholarly consensus. Then there follows the Pauline tradition and a brief comment. At the end of the chapter 3, I present a list of Pauline traditions that I deem historically probable. Only *four* Apocryphal sources are considered in this section: the (lost) Gospel according to the Hebrews (cited by Jerome), the Acts of Paul,

87 J. K. Elliott and M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon 1993), *passim*.

88 Schneemelcher, *passim*.

89 Constantin von Tischendorf, Ricardus Adelbertus Lipsius, and Maximilianus Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* (Hildemheim: Olms, 1959), *passim*.

90 M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament Being the Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, Epistles and Apocalypses: with Other Narratives and Fragments* (Oxford: Clarendon 1969), xiv.

the Acts of Peter, and the Apocalypse of Paul. I have selected these works for their content apropos Paul.

The aim of this chapter is to present and comment on relevant Pauline traditions in apocryphal sources. I intend to show that although the apocryphal Acts offer only sparse historical traditions, the few that are yielded are significant.

1. The Gospel according to the Hebrews

The Gospel according to the Hebrews, which is cited by Jerome, was written in the second century, probably in Egypt. The Gospel contains two Pauline traditions relevant for our purposes. The first reads as follows:

The Gospel also entitled 'according to the Hebrews' which I lately translated into Greek and Latin, and which Origin often quotes, contains the following narrative after the resurrection: 'Now the Lord, when he had given the cloth to the servant of the priest, went to James and appeared to him.' For James had taken an oath that he would not eat bread from that hour on which he had drunk the cup of the Lord until he saw him risen from the dead. Again, a little later, the Lord said, 'Bring a table and bread,' and forthwith it is added: 'He took bread and blessed and broke it and gave to James the Just and said to him, "My brother, eat your bread, for the Son of Man is risen from those who sleep."' (Jerome, *Vir. Ill.* 2)

Here Jerome records that in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, now lost, the Lord went to James and appeared to him. Paul confirms this tradition in First Corinthians 15.7. Also mentioned by Jerome is a Eucharist celebration of the resurrected Lord with James, the wording of which is remarkably similar to the words of the institution as they are found in First Corinthians 11.25-26.

These two traditions recorded by Jerome seem to go back to a phase in the earliest Christian tradition since Paul himself admits that he depends on tradition in these two instances: "I received from the Lord" (1 Cor. 11.23) and "I delivered to you as of first importance" (1 Cor. 15.3).

The second relevant tradition cited by Jerome reads as follows:

But in the Gospel which is written in Hebrew and which the Nazarenes read, 'the whole fountain of the Holy Spirit shall descend upon him. And the Lord is spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.' (Jerome, Comm. Isa. 11.2)

The value of this tradition is unclear since I cannot determine whether Jerome intends to conclude his quotation from the Gospel before or after the Pauline sentence begins. If the quotation from the Gospel that Jerome identifies *included* the Pauline sentence "And the lord is Spirit ..." one can conclude that Paul inherited it from an earlier tradition. If Jerome, as an explanation of the Gospel quotation added the sentence himself, then he would simply be quoting Second Corinthians 3.17 directly. The Gospel of Thomas 17 pushes the evidence in favor of the *first* possibility since it too contains an almost identical saying (see chapter 5). The conclusion I draw is that the Gospel of Hebrews contained the citation and that Paul inherited it from earlier tradition.

I conclude from these traditions using the criterion of comparison with the genuine letter of Paul (chapter 1), that Paul was linked to the earliest shared traditions of the Church, traditions which are also linked to the key figure of James, and which concern the resurrection and the Eucharist. Paul's claim in First Corinthians to have transmitted these traditions is accurate.

2. The Acts of Paul⁹¹

The next body of literature I consider is the *Acts of Paul*. The *Acts of Paul* as a complete work, although referred to in ancient sources, was not known until recent times. What was known were three complexes of texts: The Acts of Paul and Thecla, the Correspondence between Paul and the Corinthians (*Third Corinthians*) and the *Martyrdom of Paul*. We now know that these

91 The most important treatment of the Paul of the Acts of Paul is that of Dennis Ronald MacDonald, *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon*, 1st ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983).

three works formed part of a greater work, the *Acts of Paul*, although they may have had an independent existence prior to their inclusion in the *Acts of Paul*. This is particularly the case with Third Corinthians which was included in the Syriac collection of Paul's letters and which was once regarded as authentic. In fact, the only source in which the correspondence is an integral part of the *Acts of Paul* is the Coptic Papyrus. This has lead Testuz (the editor of the Papyrus Bodmer) as well as Klijn and Rordorf, to argue that the two letters were written independently of the *Acts of Paul*.⁹² I will not include Third Corinthians in this study since the author is obviously dependent upon the Pauline Corpus undermining the work as an independent testimony to Paul.⁹³

Of the five extant anonymous apocryphal Acts (Andrew, John, Paul, Peter, Thomas) only the *Acts of Paul*⁹⁴ has real value for the study of Paul. This is because it contains historical material about Paul that is lacking in the other Acts. Even here, the traditions are doubtful. The problem is twofold. First, much of the narrative is fanciful. Second, one finds the existence of independent Pauline traditions that have no corroboration elsewhere. According to the criterion set out in chapter 1, the bracketing of singularity, a tradition is of less value to the historian when it is found only once. With regard to the *first* problem, Meier writes as follows:

(In the Apocryphal Acts) we are faced with a field of rubble, largely produced by the pious or wild imaginations of certain second century Christians ... much of the apocryphal material stems from "pop" rather than learned Christian circles and reflects neither early reliable traditions nor elevated theology,

92 Cited in G. Luttikhuisen, "The Apocryphal Correspondence with the Corinthians and the Acts of Paul," in *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla*, ed. J.N. Bremmer (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 75-91.

93 See Vahan Hovhannessian, *Third Corinthians: Reclaiming Paul for Christian Orthodoxy*, Studies in Biblical Literature, vol. 18 (New York: P. Lang, 2000). Hovhannessian places the composition of Third Corinthians in the late second century period, associating it with other examples (such as Irenaeus and Tertullian) of a rehabilitation of Paul among the Orthodox. In this, he is probably correct.

but instead curiosity, fascination with the bizarre and miraculous (not to say magical), and sheer desire for religious entertainment.⁹⁵

Rordorf concurs and by way of example notes one of the many historical anomalies in the *Acts of Paul*:

It is striking to see that Paul, who bears the responsibility for the conversion of a large number of women at Iconium, is merely cast out of the city, while Thecla, one of his innocent victims, is condemned to an ordeal by fire.⁹⁶

Schneemelcher too admits the limitations: "The traditions which are worked up in it do not read back to the period of primitive Christianity."⁹⁷

However, the fact that the material is fanciful does not obviate the need to pursue the possibility that historical traditions exist in it. Through Form and Redaction criticism the extraneous layers can be peeled away to reveal a historical core.

Two facts speak in favor of the work as containing genuine historical nuclei. First, it was highly regarded by at least some notable figures in antiquity. Although Tertullian is known to have rejected it as spurious,⁹⁸ Hippolytus uses the work without hesitation (Comm. Dan. 3). He mentions the fable of Paul and the baptized Lion and accepts the story as orthodox. Origen (Fr. Prin. 1.2.3) is the first to mention the work by name. Jerome rejects it (Vir. Ill. 7). Eusebius claims it does not belong to the undisputed books, but distinguishes it from other Acts of Andrew and John and the Acts of the

95 Meier, 115.

96 W. Rordorf, "Tradition and Composition in the Acts of Thecla: The State of the Question," *Semeia* 38, no. 38 (1986): 48-49. See also W. Rordorf, "Die neronische Christenverfolgung im Spiegel der apocryphen Paulusakten," *New Testament Studies* 28 (1981).

97 Schneemelcher, 232.

98 In his *de Baptismo* 17 (200 AD) Tertullian asserts that a certain Presbyter in Asia Minor "out of his love for Paul" wrote the work and was later removed from office for his efforts.

other Apostles.⁹⁹

The second fact that speaks in favor of the work containing genuine historical nuclei is that, as Ramsay argued, the episodes show knowledge of first century roads, customs, and historical figures, such as Queen Tyrphaena.¹⁰⁰ Harnack, who felt it was impossible to determine which parts of the *Acts of Paul* are based on fact and which are fictitious, accepted as historical the following: Thecla lived at Iconium, Paul converted her, she met Tyrphaena, she suffered for her faith, and she was baptized and evangelized.¹⁰¹

More recently, Boughton denied that the *Acts of Paul* "supplements the canonical New Testament with historically accurate sources of information."¹⁰² In her estimation the parts of the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* that describe events not found in canonical texts do not transmit oral or written sources from the Apostolic age that supplement or redefine the Canon. Instead, such narrative tales constitute a hagiographer's attempt to make the obscure debates and austere saints of the first century relevant to second century audiences.

Howe adds a dissenting voice in perhaps one of the most penetrating essays on the *Acts of Paul* in recent times, and shows some pointed contrasts between the canonical Paul and the Paul of the *Acts of Paul*. There are three chief

99 *Acts of Peter* is denounced as apocryphal in the *Decretum Gelasianum*, the Stichometry of Nicophorus, and in the Catalogue of the 60 Canonical Books. Schneemelcher, 216.

100 William Mitchell Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire Before AD 170*, 2d ed. ([S.l.: s.n.], 1893), 375-428.

101 Cited in E.M. Howe, "The Acts of Paul and Thecla," in *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to Professor F.F. Bruce on His 70th Birthday*, ed. D.A. Hagner (Exeter: Paternoster, 1980), 47.

102 L.C. Boughton, "From Pious Legend to Feminist fantasy: Distinguishing Hagiographical License from Apostolic Practice in the Acts of Paul/Acts of Thecla," *Journal of Religion* 71, no. 3 (1991): 363. Boughton's paper challenges directly the interpretation of the *Acts of Paul* by feminist scholars like Eleanor McLaughlin and Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Women of Spirit: Female Leadership in the Jewish and Christian Traditions* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979).

differences: the attitude to celibacy and virginity, the attitude to marriage, and the role of the woman in leadership.¹⁰³ Howe stumbles upon something that a great many scholars seem to overlook, namely, the presence of historical data on Paul in the *Acts of Paul* that is confirmed by several parallels to New Testament (see the traditions that follow). The assumption is that where these parallels exist, the writer of *Acts of Paul* must be dependent upon the data of the New Testament. In many cases however, literary dependence on the New Testament cannot be established, making the *Acts of Paul* an important independent witness to several Pauline traditions. Obviously, the converse is true. If *Acts of Paul* is dependent on the canonical Acts then that undermines the work's role as an independent witness to traditions contained in it.

According to Herczeg, there exist 55 clear parallels to the New Testament, distributed among the canonical texts as follows:

Matthew 8 parallels, Mark 6 parallels, Luke 2 parallels, Acts 16 parallels, 1 Corinthians 4 parallels, 2 Corinthians 2 parallels, Galatians 2 parallels, 1 Timothy 3 parallels, 2 Timothy 5 parallels. There is a single allusion to Romans, Philemon, Ephesians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 2 Peter, and Revelation. Luke and John are hardly quoted or alluded to. The two letters that have a Hellenistic theological basis, Ephesians and Galatians, are hardly mentioned.¹⁰⁴

I have examined the parallels adduced by Herczeg but am not convinced that they can only be accounted for on the basis of dependence. Ancient tradition was fluid and one should be careful of always seeking to postulate literary borrowing of some kind.¹⁰⁵ As I will presently show, one can account for similarities without necessarily postulating dependence.

103 Howe, 46.

104 This is not a direct quote; P. Herczeg, "New Testament Parallels to the Acta Pauli Documents," in *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla*, ed. J.N. Bremmer (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 143.

105 Samuel Sandmel, in a well-known article, "Parallelomania," has warned against the conviction that a similarity is enough to prove a debt. S. Sandmel, "Parallelomania," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962): 1-13.

As to the question of direct or indirect dependence upon canonical Acts: Schneemelcher is a name associated with the view that *Acts of Paul* supplements the Canon.¹⁰⁶ Schneemelcher thinks that the writer of *Acts of Paul* knew canonical Acts but was not dependent upon it. My view is that the writer of *Acts of Paul* never knew the canonical Acts. The reason for this is that the core narratives found in canonical Acts are entirely lacking in *Acts of Paul*. The missionary itinerary is also completely different.

Historical Traditions in the Acts of Paul

What follows is a list of units of tradition in the *Acts of Paul* that I have collated. I have left out all legends like Paul baptizing the lion (as these contain features of legend). Units that have no explanatory criteria attached, I regard as so apparently probable or improbable that they need no further explanation. For the basic reconstruction of the text of *Acts of Paul*, I depend entirely on Schneemelcher's edition, which in turn is based on the collection of Hennecke founded in 1904.¹⁰⁷

I ask the reader to note that some units of tradition appear in **bold** and some do not. Units in bold I regard as historically probable. Units not in bold I regard to be beyond the burden of proof.

1. **Paul converted just outside Damascus** (*Acts of Paul* 1). This tradition is confirmed with stunning accuracy in Acts 9.2.
2. **Paul receives the command to go to Damascus and later to Jerusalem** (*Acts of Paul* 1). This tradition is confirmed in Acts 9.
3. **Paul goes to Antioch** (*Acts of Paul* 2). This tradition is confirmed in Acts 11.26.
4. **Paul comes to Iconium** (*Acts of Paul* 3). Iconium is mentioned in

¹⁰⁶ Schneemelcher, 232.

¹⁰⁷ Edgar Hennecke and Wilhelm Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*, 5th ed. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1987).

relation to Paul in the following places: Acts 13.51; 14; 16.2 and Second Timothy 3.11.

5. **Paul's fellow travelers are Demas and Hermogenes.** On Demas, see Colossians 4.14, First Timothy 4.10, and Philemon 24. Hermogenes is mentioned in the New Testament only in Second Timothy 1.15.
6. Onesiphorus welcomes Paul. Compare with Second Timothy 1.16 and also Second Timothy 4.19.
7. Physical description of Paul. The following description of Paul is found in the *Acts of Paul*

And he saw Paul coming, a man small in size, bald headed. Bandy legged, of noble mien, with eyebrows meeting, rather hooked nose, full of grace. Sometimes he seemed like a man, and sometimes he had the face of an angel. (Acts of Paul 3.3)

This description, according to Grant, goes back to the poet Archilochus and is motivated by the desire to portray Paul as a spiritual general.¹⁰⁸ Malina and Neyrey argue that the portrait "is first and foremost that of a noble or ideal male. He is essentially masculine and virile according to the conventions of antiquity."¹⁰⁹ Murphy-O'Connor thinks we have here an ideological presentation of Paul based on the idea that character traits can be deduced from physical features.¹¹⁰ Howe hints that the description of Paul's physiognomy may be historical. In Acts, Paul is identified with Hermes, "the short, stocky, winged messenger of the gods." In his letters, Paul's physical

108 Robert M. Grant, "The Description of Paul in the Acts of Paul and Thecla," *Vigiliae Christianae* 36, no. 36 (1982): 13.

109 Cited in M.P. Aymer, "Hailstorms and Fireballs: Redaction, World Creation, and Resistance in the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*," *Semeia* 79, no. 79 (1997): 51.

110 J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul: A Critical Life* (Oxford: Clarendon 1996), 44-45.

presence was thought to be weak and his speech of no account. Paul also refers to a "bodily ailment."¹¹¹ Whatever we make of this description, the fact that it appears only once in our traditions speaks against it.

8. **Paul causes trouble in Iconium:** "Tamarisk, this man will overturn the city of the Iconians and your Thecla too" (*Acts of Paul* 3.9). On Paul the Iconian troublemaker see Second Timothy 3.11 and Acts 14:1-7.
9. **Paul as a sorcerer** (*Acts of Paul* 3.16). For Paul as a sorcerer see Acts 14.11. No direct dependence on canonical Acts is necessary since the description is vague in all accounts.
10. **Paul is scourged** (*Acts of Paul* 3.21). On the scouring of Paul see Second Corinthians 11.24 and Acts 16.22-24. Again, no direct dependence on canonical Acts is necessary since the details of the story differ.
11. Paul takes off his cloak. On Paul's "cloak," see Second Timothy 4.13.
12. Thecla takes a (Nazarite?) vow (*Acts of Paul* 3.25):

'I will cut my hair and I shall follow you wherever you go.' But he said, 'Times are evil and you are beautiful. I am afraid lest another temptation come upon you worse than the first ... and Thecla said, 'Only give me the seal in Christ, and no temptation shall touch me.' And Paul said, 'Thecla, be patient; you shall receive the water.'

The vow that Thecla takes in the *Acts of Paul* strongly resembles the Nazarite vow that Paul takes in Acts 21.34, but that is not enough to establish the historicity of either vow. On the "seal in Christ," see Second Corinthians 1.22 and Ephesians 1.13, 4.30.

111 Howe, 44.

13. In Antioch Paul meets a certain Syrian, Alexander. On Alexander, see First Timothy 1.20 and Second Timothy 4.14.
14. **Paul is engaged in service for the poor** (*Acts of Paul* 3.41): "And Tryphaena sent her much clothing and gold so that she could leave many things to Paul for the service of the poor." Paul's service for the poor is a feature of both the canonical Acts and Pauline letters.

The traditions that follow are not found in all of our manuscripts, only in a single Coptic papyrus of about eighty pages from the fourth or fifth century discovered in 1894 and now at Heidelberg (abbreviated as *PHeid*).¹¹² Its testimony therefore must be regarded as doubtful.

15. Paul travels in Myra (*Acts of Paul* 4). Compare Acts 27.5.
16. Paul travels in Sidon (*Acts of Paul* 5). Compare Acts 27.3.
17. Paul travels in Tyre (*Acts of Paul* 6). Compare Acts 21.3.
18. Paul travels in Ephesus (*Acts of Paul* 7).
19. Paul stays with Priscilla and Aquila (Appendix). This tradition is only preserved in an unpublished Coptic papyrus (not *PHeid*).¹¹³
20. Paul and the angel of the Lord speak in tongues together (Appendix). Compare with First Corinthians 14.18 and Acts 19.6.
21. Paul gives his testimony and a brief account of his conversion:

Men <and> brethren, hearken to what befell me when I was in Damascus, at the time when I persecuted the faith in God. The Spirit which fell

¹¹² Carl Schmidt, *Acta Pauli, aus der Heidelberger koptischen Papyrushandschrift Nr. 1* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1965), 3-20.

¹¹³ Schneemelcher, 263-265.

<upon me>¹¹⁴ from the Father, he it is who preached to me the Gospel of his Son, that I might live in him. Indeed, there is no life except the life which is in Christ. I entered into a great church through (?) the blessed Judas, the brother of the Lord, who from the beginning gave me the exalted love of faith. I comforted myself in grace through (?) the blessed prophet, and <applied myself to> the revelation of Jesus Christ who was begotten before <all> ages. While they preached him, I was rejoicing in the Lord, nourished by his words. But when I was able, I was found <worthy> to speak. I spoke with the brethren—Judas it was who urged me so that I became beloved of those who heard me.

This account of Paul's conversion has a few features in common with canonical Acts (Damascus Road, Paul the persecutor, etc.) but is different mostly in that Jude, who is a brother of Jesus, is instrumental in Paul's conversion. This cannot possibly be historical.

22. **The goldsmiths of Ephesus want to condemn Paul** (*Acts of Paul* 7). This tradition is attested in a single leaf Pap. Oxyrhynchus 1602 (PH).¹¹⁵ Compare Acts 19.24.
23. **Paul is scourged in Ephesus** (*ibid.*).
24. **Paul is in Philippi** (*Acts of Paul* 8).
25. **Paul is in Corinth** (*Acts of Paul* 9).
26. Paul arrives in Rome a free man. This curious tradition contradicts the testimony of Acts and therefore cannot possibly be correct. The idea that the writer of canonical Acts, Luke, fabricated his entire account of Paul's imprisonment seems to me unbelievable. The *Acts of Paul* fabricates Paul's free arrival in Rome to pave the way for Paul's further missionary activity.

114 These brackets <> indicate that the text is corrupt at these points.

115 Schneemelcher, 216.

27. Waiting for Paul as he arrives are Luke from Gaul and Titus from Dalmatia (*Acts of Paul* 10). On Titus, see Second Timothy 4.10.
28. **A young boy**, Patroclus, Caesar's cupbearer, **falls out the window while listening to Paul preaching** (*Acts of Paul* 11). No miracle takes place although the boy revives. The account has similarities to the story in Acts of Eutychus (Acts 20).
29. Nero beheads Paul. Before he dies, Paul prays to God in the Hebrew language (*Acts of Paul* 11.5, Acts 21.40; Acts 22.2; Acts 26.14). The account of Paul's death may be genuine despite legendary embellishments (like bleeding milk, rather than blood). Curiously, no mention is made in this context (as one might expect) of Paul's Roman citizenship.

Some Pauline Ideas in the Acts of Paul

Pauline theology hardly features in the *Acts of Paul*. Below is a list of a few clear Pauline themes and ideas.

The Lord's Supper, called the "Breaking of Bread as in Acts (*Acts of Paul* 3.5).

Paul preaches the resurrection and has a negative attitude to sex in marriage (*Acts of Paul* 3.5).

Demas and Hermogenes teach the resurrection has already taken place (*Acts of Paul* 3.14).

The author uses language consonant with Second Timothy 2:18. God "sent his Son" whose gospel Paul preaches (*Acts of Paul* 3.15).

Turn from idols to a living God (*Acts of Paul* 7, *Acts of Paul* 15). Compare Acts 14.15 and First Thessalonians 1.9.

Simon and Cleobius teach there is no resurrection of the flesh, but that of the spirit only (*Acts of Paul* 8). *Contra* Paul.

Some Preliminary Conclusions

The basic plot of Paul in *Acts of Paul* is that Paul is seen traveling from city to city, converting gentiles, and proclaiming the resurrection and the need for a life of sexual abstinence and other Encratite practices. The story is organized according to an itinerary of missionary visits to leading cities (Damascus—Jerusalem—Antioch—Iconium—Antioch—Myra—Sidon—Tyre—Ephesus—Philippi—Corinth—Italy—Rome). In each city, Paul encounters believers, sometimes already known to him.

The *Acts of Paul* shows Paul to be a missionary who preaches mostly on the resurrection and chastity. No mention is made of Paul as a letter writer unless one includes Three Corinthians (which I have rejected because of its clear dependence on the Corinthian Corpus). There is no discernible dependence either on the canonical Pauline Corpus or on canonical Acts. There *is* clear dependence upon Second Timothy. In addition, one can possibly trace slim dependence on Colossians. Only a few sayings found in the genuine Pauline letters occur. Conflicts of Paul with the Law and with Jews are non-existent, which suggests a time when the inclusion of the Gentiles was acceptable.

As to the portrayal of Paul, it is completely unrealistic. In drawing the personality of the Apostle, every text uses the Hellenistic divine man characteristics: the personality of Paul has only positive characteristics. All of Paul's Acts are benevolent acts and there is no realistic portrayal of him based on historical events as in the canonical Acts.¹¹⁶

3. Acts of Peter

The *Acts of Peter* was used by the author of *Acts of Paul*, the date of which is fixed by the reference to it in Tertullian's *de Baptismo* 17.¹¹⁷ Therefore, I can date *Acts of Peter* to around 190 AD. It was probably written in Rome.

Eusebius, the first to mention *Acts of Peter* concludes it is heretical (Hist. Eccl.

116 Luttikhuisen, 144.

117 Schneemelcher, 235, 283.

3.3.2). The *Decretum Gelasianum* denounces it as apocryphal. As with the other apocryphal Acts, it is a product of popular piety. The text of the *Acts of Peter* is best preserved in the so called *Actus Verellenses* named after the single Latin manuscript in which the text has come down to us.

The *Acts of Peter* presupposes the Pauline Canon in its entirety. In the first Pauline section "Paul's departure from Rome," there are clear allusions to Romans, Acts, Colossians, Philippians, Corinthians, and First Timothy. These allusions need not concern us.

Historical Traditions in Acts of Peter

There are only a handful of relevant historical traditions about Paul in *Acts of Peter*. The first tradition I consider is the following:

While Paul was spending some time in Rome and strengthening many in the faith, it happened that a woman by name Candida, the wife of Quartus, a prison officer, heard Paul speak ... Paul then saw a vision, the Lord saying to him, 'Paul, arise and be a physician to those who are in Spain.' So when he had related to the brethren what God had enjoined, without doubting he prepared to leave the city. But when Paul was about to leave, great lamentation arose among all the brotherhood because they believed that they would not see Paul again, so that they even rent their clothes. Besides they had in view that Paul had often contended with the Jewish teachers and had confuted them, (saying) 'It is Christ on whom your fathers laid hands. He abolished their Sabbaths and fasts and festivals and circumcisions and he abolished doctrines of men and other traditions ... and while they continued in treating him with tears, there came the sound from heaven and a great voice which said, 'Paul the servant of God is chosen for (this) service for the time of his life; but at the hands of Nero, that godless and wicked man, he shall be perfected before your eyes.' (Acts of Peter 1, Paul's Departure from Rome)

This tradition explains how Paul went to Spain and was later executed by Nero. There is also a reference to Paul's clash with the Jewish authorities, which is absent from the *Acts of Paul*. The language of hostility is borrowed from Colossians 2.8, 16, 22: "It is Christ on whom your fathers laid hands. He

abolished their Sabbaths and fasts and festivals and circumcisions and he abolished doctrines of men and other traditions."

A final tradition in *Acts of Peter* is worth mentioning:

I was once a blasphemer, but now I am blasphemed; I was once a persecutor, but now I suffer persecution from others; once an enemy of Christ, but now I pray to be his friend (*Acts of Peter* 2)

This tradition pictures Paul as a persecutor of the early Church and may be dependent upon First Timothy 1:13. Alternatively, it may come from the same body of tradition that underlies First Timothy.

4. The Apocalypse of Paul¹¹⁸

This work is much later than other apocryphal sources considered in this chapter and can be dated to the end of the fourth century.¹¹⁹ It is of interest only for a single tradition corroborating Paul's origin from Tarsus:

In the consulate of Theodosius Augustus the Younger and of Cynegius a certain respected man was living in Tarsus in the house which had once belonged to St. Paul.

My interest in this tradition is that it is the only mention (aside from canonical Acts) of Paul's origin from Tarsus.

Some Preliminary Conclusions

My presentation and analysis of Pauline traditions in Apocryphal sources above has yielded 16 traditions that can be regarded as historically probable. Most of these concern Paul's itinerary but there are also some other interesting results, such as the tradition that Paul spoke in tongues and that he was engaged in a mission for the poor in Jerusalem. Here is the list:

1. Paul is converted outside of Damascus (*Acts of Paul*).

118 Not to be confused with the "Apocalypse of Paul" discovered at Nag Hammadi.

119 Schneemelcher, 713.

2. **Paul receives the command to go to Damascus and later to Jerusalem** (*Acts of Paul*).
3. **Paul travels to Antioch** (*Acts of Paul* 2) **and Iconium** (*Acts of Paul* 3).
4. **Paul causes trouble in Iconium** (*Acts of Paul* 3).
5. **Paul contends with the Jewish teachers** (*Acts of Peter* 1.1).
6. **Paul is regarded as a sorcerer** (*Acts of Paul* 3.16, *Acts of Paul* 7).
7. **Paul engaged in service for the poor** (*Acts of Paul* 3.41).
8. **Paul stays in Ephesus** (*Acts of Paul* 7).
9. **Paul stays with Priscilla and Aquila** (Appendix).
10. **Paul speaks in tongues** (Appendix).
11. **The goldsmiths of Ephesus want to condemn Paul** (*Acts of Paul* 7).
12. **Paul is scourged** (*Acts of Paul* 3.21, *Acts of Paul* 7).
13. **Paul stays in Philippi** (*Acts of Paul* 8).
14. **Paul stays in Corinth** (*Acts of Paul* 9).
15. **A young boy falls out a window** while Paul is preaching but survives (*Acts of Paul* 11).
16. **Paul awaits trial in Rome** (*Acts of Peter* 1.1).

The most important conclusion I draw from these traditions is that half of them conform to the picture of Paul found in canonical Acts. The other half are consistent with the Paul of the letters (5, 7-10), proving that *the Apocryphal*

Acts contain genuine historical traditions about Paul.

In the next chapter, there is a distinct change in temperature. I move from a Pauline Type that is favorable to Paul to a body of writings where Paul is the subject of ridicule, abuse, and hatred. If the Paul of the apocryphal Acts is the morally perfect Greek man, the Paul of the Pseudo-Clementines is a shrewd deceiver and imposter, the moral equivalent to Simon Magus. This makes the Pseudo-Clementines invaluable for our purposes.

Chapter 4

ANTI-PAULINE POLEMIC

Can any one be made competent to teach through a vision?
(Polemic against Paul H XVII 13-19)

Anti-Paulinism¹²⁰ has been a subject of hot debate and close scrutiny at least since the publication of his famous essay in 1831 by Baur,¹²¹ in which he argued on the basis of his examination of First Corinthians that a rift existed within the early Church between Gentile Christians represented by Paul, and Jewish Christianity represented by the "Christ Party" and the "Cephas Party." Although Baur's analysis of early Christianity is now widely rejected, there is still a great deal of interest in anti-Pauline sentiments within and without the New Testament. Baur thought he could determine that the anti-Paulinism of the Pseudo-Clementines stood in continuity with the anti-Pauline party that existed in the life of Paul.¹²²

Lüdemann follows the direction set by Baur although his methods are more sophisticated.¹²³ Armed with sharpened skills of Redaction Criticism, Lüdemann traces anti-Paulinism both within and without the New Testament. The difficulty he faces is having to explain how that Anti-Paulinism exists in Hegesippus, Justin, the Elkesaites, canonical James and the Pseudo-Clementines, when Paul himself is never mentioned by name in any of these works. Lüdemann is inclined to spot anti-Paulinism wherever he encounters early Christian groups that have a strong Jewish flavor.

120 Examples of Anti Paulinism in the early Church, especially those found in Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 3.27.4, 6.38), Irenaeus (Haer. 1.26.2; 3.15.1), Epiphanius (Pan. 30.16.9) and Origin (Cels. 5.65) are too late for consideration in this work.

121 Baur: 61ff.

122 F. S. Jones, "The Pseudo-Clementines: A History of Research Part II," *The Second Century II*, no. 2 (1982): 85.

123 Gerd Lüdemann, *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology* (London: SCM, 1984), Gerd Lüdemann, *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary* (London: SCM, 1989), Gerd Lüdemann and M. Eugene Boring, *Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989).

The Pseudo-Clementines

By far the most significant writing for the consideration of anti-Pauline polemic¹²⁴ is the Pseudo-Clementines.¹²⁵ The *Pseudo-Clementines* are "a specific group of pseudonymous compositions that relate a fictitious tale of Clement's conversion to Christianity, of his travels with Peter, and of his recovery of the long-lost and dispersed members of his family. The genre of these writings is the ancient romance of recognitions; the Pseudo-Clementines are the first known example of Christian adoption *en bloc* of this literary *Gattung*."¹²⁶

The main constituents of the Pseudo-Clementines are the *Homilies* and the *Recognitions*. The literary relationship between the Recognitions (R) and Homilies (H) is extremely complex. The history of research is well documented in two standard articles by Stanley Jones.¹²⁷ The consensus is that underlying both R and H is a common lost source to us, a *Grundschrift* (G). Waitz was the first to attempt a reconstruction of G by the comparing R and

124 While abundant evidence survives for the Gentile-Christian wing of ancient Christianity, only fragmentary materials remain for the Jewish-Christian wing. The Institute for Antiquity and Christianity is involved now in a project that will provide critical editions of the relevant texts. The project is rendering crucial ancient oriental versions of the PS into modern languages for the first time and is also simultaneously producing a synoptic edition and translation of the ancient texts. I believe that these new editions will greatly enhance our understanding of Jewish-Christianity and of Paul. F. S. Jones, (The Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, accessed); available from <http://www.cgu.edu/inst/iac/jewishchristianity.html>.

125 I have used the translation of Irmscher and Strecker in Schneemelcher. Betz provides relevant parts of KII in his commentary on Galatians and adds useful commentary, Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979). The standard critical editions remain those of Bernhard Rehm, ed., *Die Pseudoklementinen II: Rekognitionem in Rufins Übersetzung*, ed. F. Paschke, 2d ed. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1965), Bernhard Rehm, ed., *Die Pseudoklementinen I: Homilien*, ed. J. Irmscher, 2d ed. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1969).

126 David Noel Freedman, *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 1st ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1992).

127 F. S. Jones, "The Pseudo-Clementines: A History of Research," *The Second Century* II, no. 1 (1982): 63-96, Jones, "History II," 1-33.

H.¹²⁸ He concluded that G originated in syncretistic and nevertheless Catholic circles in Rome between 220-230 AD. Most scholars have subsequently denied the connection with Rome.

Following Waitz, Schmidt attempted to locate and date G by a comparison with the Didascalia and concluded that G and the Didascalia derived from the same place of origin in the Transjordan (220-230 AD). He described G as a Catholic influenced by his Jewish environment. More recently, Irmscher and Strecker¹²⁹ suggested that H and R go back independently of one another to G, which in turn is made up of various sources. G probably belongs to Cole-Syria, where it may have come into existence in the middle of the third century.¹³⁰ The chief sources that underlie the Jewish-Christians elements in G can be identified as follows:

Kerygmatta Petrou (KII)

To this originally Greek source were prefixed the *Epistula Petri* and the *Contestatio* of the Pauline Source. The origin of KII is most likely Syria for two reasons. First, the use of a Canon by an author that does not include the Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse of John points to Syria as the origin.¹³¹ Second, the author seems to quote of the Pauline Epistles only Galatians and indirectly First Corinthians. The Syrian Corpus of Paul's letters begins with just these two letters. Strecker believed that KII represented a Gnosticizing Jewish Christianity that precluded any relationship to the primitive church.¹³² The Gnostic elements are felt particularly in the teaching of syzygies, which I explain shortly. The date of writing is *circa* 200 AD.

AJ II-Source

This secondary Jewish-Christian source, so named because of its affinity with

128 Jones, "History I," 11.

129 Cited by Schneemelcher, 486-489.

130 Ibid.

131 Jones, "History I," 72.

132 Ibid.: 91.

the Ἀναβαθμοὶ Ἰακώβου according to Epiphanius (Pan. 30.16.6-9), is discernible in R 1.33-44.2 and 5.4b-71. Strecker¹³³ felt that AJ II represented the work of a Jewish Christian in or near Pella after 150 AD. He sets the date of writing *circa* 200 AD.¹³⁴

Pauline Traditions in Anti-Pauline Polemic

The *Pseudo-Clementines* contain four units of Pauline tradition. Each is extremely valuable for our purposes because they present Paul through the eyes of his enemies. The first tradition is found in the *Epistula Petri*:

1.1. Peter to James, the lord and bishop of the Holy Church: peace be with you always from the Father of all through Jesus Christ ... 2.3 For some from among the Gentiles have rejected my lawful preaching and have preferred a lawless and absurd doctrine of the man who is my enemy. 4. And indeed some have attempted, whilst I am still alive, to distort my words by interpretations of many sorts, as if I taught the dissolution of the law and although I was of this opinion, did not express it openly. But that may God forbid! 5. For to do such a thing means to act contrary to the law of God which was made known by Moses and was confirmed by our Lord in its everlasting continuance.

The *Epistula Petri* finds Peter supposedly writing to James, the leader of the Jerusalem Church and urging caution in allowing both Gentiles and probationers access to his writings ("the books of my preachings"). He speaks of a *rule* that must be observed in the correct interpretation of Scripture: one God, one Law, one Hope. Then begins the anti-Pauline polemic, and although Paul himself is not named, there is little doubt that Paul is "the man who is my enemy." Several traditions stand out: Paul is Peter's enemy, Paul teaches an absurd doctrine, and Peter did not teach the dissolution of the Law—as Paul alleged.

The next traditions I consider deal with Paul's mission to the Gentiles:

133 Georg Strecker, *Das Judentum in den Pseudoklementinen*, 2d ed. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981), 35-38.

134 Schneemelcher, 488-489.

17.3. Following up this disposition it would be possible to recognize where Simon belongs, who as first and before me went to the Gentiles, and where I belong, I who came after him and followed him as the light follows the darkness, knowledge ignorance and healing sickness. 18.1. Since now, as has been said, many do not know this conformity of the syzygies with law, they do not know who this Simon, my forerunner, is. For were it known, no one would believe him. But now, as he remains unknown, confidence is wrongly placed in him. 2. Thus he who does what haters do finds love; the enemy is received as a friend; men long for him who is death as a bringer of salvation; although he is fire, he is regarded as light; although he is a cheat he obtains a hearing as a proclaimer of truth. (The Doctrine of the Pairs of Opposites or Syzygies H II)

(Then) there came as the first the one who was among those that are born of woman, and after that there appeared the one who was among the sons of men ... 3. He who follows of this order can discern by whom Simon (=Paul), who as the first came before me to the Gentiles, was sent forth, and to whom I (=Peter) belong who appeared later then he did and came in upon him as light upon darkness, as knowledge upon ignorance as healing upon sickness. (H II 16-17.1)

In the above traditions one finds what is called "the doctrine of the *syzygies*" applied to Paul and Peter. This doctrine asserted that in the creation of the world the first member of the pair was always the stronger member (heaven and earth, male and female) but in the history of human beings, the inferior members came first: Cane and Abel, Aaron and Moses, Paul and Peter, etc. Paul who was the first to bring the message to the Gentiles is thereby inferior to Peter who followed him. The apologetic is full of vitriol against Paul who, it says, is full of hatred, "the Enemy," "Death," "Fire" and a cheat. A historical gem is preserved, namely that *Paul carried the mission to Gentiles before Peter*. This tradition contradicts the testimony of canonical Acts but should be accepted as true because had it *not* been so, the doctrine of the *syzygies* would never have been applied to assert Peter's primacy over Paul. Lüdemann misses this point when he writes the following:

It is interesting that, despite the polemic against Simon/Paul, some credit for the Gentile mission is not denied him. It was

through him, so to speak, that Peter's approach to the Gentiles was first motivated.¹³⁵

The third tradition I present is a detailed theological response to Paul's message of salvation by faith in Jesus Christ:

5.1. For even the Hebrews who believe in Moses ... are not saved unless they abide by what has been said to them. 2. For their believing in Moses lies not with a decision of their own will but with God, who said to Moses: Behold, I come to thee in a pillar of cloud that the people may hear me speaking to thee and believe forever! 3. Since then it is granted to the Hebrews and to them that are called from the Gentiles to believe the teachers of truth, whilst it is left to the personal decision of each individual whether he will perform good deeds, the reward rightly falls on those who do well. 4. For neither Moses nor Jesus would have needed to come if of themselves men had been willing to perceive the way of discretion. And there is no salvation in believing in teachers and calling them lords. 6.1. Therefore is Jesus concealed from the Hebrews who have received Moses as their teacher, and Moses hidden from those who believe in Jesus. 2. For since through both one and the same teaching becomes known, God accepts those who believe in one of them. 3. But belief in a teacher has as its aim the doing of what God has ordered. 4. That that is the case our Lord himself declares, saying: I confess to thee, Father of heaven and earth, that thou hast hidden this from the wise and elder, but hast revealed it to simpletons and infants. 5. Thus has God himself hidden the teacher from some since they know beforehand what they ought to do, and has revealed him to others since they know not what they have to do. 7.1. Thus the Hebrews are not condemned because they did not know Jesus ... provided only they act according to the instructions of Moses and do not injure him whom they did not know. 2. And again the offspring of the Gentiles are not judged, who ... have not known Moses, provided only they act according to the words of Jesus and thus do not injure him whom they did not know. 3. Also it profits nothing if many describe their teachers as their lords, but do not do what it befits servants to do. 4. Therefore our Lord Jesus said to one who again and again called him Lord, but at the same time did not abide by any of his commands: Why sayest thou have Lord to me and doest

135 Lüdemann, *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary*, 190.

not what I say? For it is not speaking that can profit any one, but doing. 5. In all circumstances good works are needed; but if a man has been considered worthy to know both teachers as heralds of a single doctrine, then that man is counted as rich in God. (VIII)

I have quoted this extraordinary passage at length because it reflects a contrary perspective of someone well schooled in Pauline theology. The writer makes several salient arguments. First, good works must accompany faith if it is to be effective. Here faith is not faith in the Pauline sense of belief in Jesus as Lord, but believing *that* the message of Jesus the teacher is the truth. Moses and Jesus came to assist our understanding of truth (5.1-3). Second, faith alone cannot save: "There is no salvation in believing in teachers and calling them Lords" (5.4). Third, a person comes to believe not through any personal decision but through God's call (5.2). Good deeds on the other hand are the decision of the individual. Fourth, the message of Jesus and the message of Moses are the same message and therefore it is not important in which of these two teachers a man believes, provided the result is the same (6.2). Fifth, the reason some people do not believe in Jesus the teacher is that God has hidden Jesus from them. God hides the teacher since these people already do what they have to do. God in turn reveals the teacher to others because they do not know what they have to do (6.3-5).

The author's conclusion, mature and well reasoned, is that Jews who do not believe in Jesus cannot and must not be condemned provided they faithfully keep the Law of Moses (7.1). Likewise, Gentiles who do not know Moses are not condemned—provided they act according to the words of Jesus. The author concludes that those who know both Moses and Jesus and obey them are rich in God (7.5).

The value of this section for Pauline studies is inestimable. Although Paul himself is not named, his doctrine of justification by faith in Christ is given full voice via a cogent opponent. The passage allows one to glimpse the opinion of an opponent of Paul as he or she might have expressed

themselves.

The final tradition I consider finds Paul and Peter debating their respective "revelations of Christ":

1. When Simon heard this, he interrupted with the words: ' ... you have stated that you have learned accurately the teaching of your master because you have heard and seen him directly (*ἐναργεία*) face to face, and that it is not possible for any other to experience the like in a dream or in a vision. 2. I shall show you that this is false: He who hears something directly is by no means certain of what is said. For he must check whether, being a man, he has not been deceived as to what appears to him. On the other hand, vision creates together with the appearance the certainty that one sees something divine. Give me an answer to that.'

16.1. And Peter said, ' ... 2. We know ... that many idolaters, adulterers and other sinners have seen visions and had true dreams, and also that some have had visions that were wrought by demons. For I maintain that the eyes of mortals cannot see the incorporeal being of the Father or of the Son, because it is in enwrapped in insufferable light. 3. Therefore it is a token of the mercy of God, and not of jealousy in him, that he is invisible to men living in the flesh. For he who sees him must die. 6 ... No one is able to see the incorporeal power of the Son or even of an angel. But he who has a vision should recognize that this is the work of a wicked demon.

17.5 For to a pious, natural and pure mind the truth reveals itself; it is not acquired through a dream, but is granted to the good through discernment. 18.1. For in this way was the Son revealed to me also by the Father, wherefore I know the power of revelation; I have myself learned of this from him. For at the very time when the Lord asked how the people named him—although I had heard that others had given him another name—it rose in my heart to say, and I know not how I said it, Thou art the Son of the living God. 6. You see now how expressions of wrath have to be made through visions and dreams, but discourse with friends takes place from mouth to mouth, openly and not through riddles, missions and dreams as with an enemy.

19.1. And if our Lord appeared to you also and became known in a vision and met you as angry with an enemy, yet he has spoken only through visions and dreams or through

external revelations. But can any one be made competent to teach through a vision? 2. And if your opinion is, "That is possible", why then did our teacher spend a whole year with us who were awake? 3. How can we believe you even if he has appeared you, and how can he have appeared to you if you desire the opposite of what you have learned? 4. But if you were visited by him for the space of an hour and were instructed by him and thereby have become an Apostle, then proclaim his words, expound what he has taught, be a friend to his Apostles and do not contend with me, who am his confidant; for you have in hostility withstood me, who am a firm rock, the foundation stone of the Church. 5. If you were not an enemy, then you would not slander me and revile my preaching in order that I may not be believed when I proclaim what I have heard in my own person from the Lord, as if I were undoubtedly condemned and you were acknowledged. 6. And if you call me condemned, then you accuse God, who revealed Christ to me, and disparage him who called me blessed on account of the revelation. 7. But if you really desire to co-operate with the truth, then learn first from us what we have learned from him and, as a learner of the truth, become a fellow worker with us.' (Polemic against Paul H XVII 13-19)

The above section contains a fabricated dialogue between Peter and Paul (who is called "Simon"). Why the writer has named Paul "Simon" is unclear, although it may be because the author sees Paul as belonging within the same purview of wickedness as Simon Magus who features ubiquitously in the *Pseudo-Clementines*. The use of the name *Simon* for *Paul* may be a code for insiders who had already made the identification of Paul with extreme wickedness. The dialogue is written in a simple form, with each Apostle debating their respective revelations. Peter offers his revelation of Christ at Caesarea Philippi and then Paul his revelation outside Damascus. During the dialogue, Peter casts doubt on Paul's status as an Apostle and Paul defends himself. I list the parallels with the text of Galatians below. Clear differences rule out literary dependence.

KII: "For in this way was the Son revealed to me also by the Father" (KII 18.1).

Galatians: "(God) was pleased to reveal his Son to me, in order that I

might preach him among the Gentiles" (Gal. 1.16).

KII: "And if our Lord appeared to you also and became known in a vision and met you as angry with an enemy" (KII 19.1).

First Corinthians: "Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me" (1 Cor. 15.8). The words "as angry with an enemy" are striking and have no parallels in the Pauline Corpus.

KII: "You have in your hostility withstood me" (KII 19.4).

Galatians: "But when Cephas came to Antioch I withstood him to his face, because he stood condemned" (Gal. 2.11).

KII: "And (if) you were acknowledged ..."

Galatians: "they gave to Barnabas and me the right hand of fellowship" (Gal 2.9).

KII: "But if you really desire to co-operate with the truth, then learn first from us what we have learned from him and, as a learner of the truth, become a fellow worker with us" (KII 19.7).

Here there is no formal parallel but a hard insinuation that Paul in his lifetime refused to cooperate and learn from the Apostles and become a fellow worker with them. This is testimony to the independent nature of Paul's ministry.

These accounts are theologically and historically significant in that they add much to our picture of Paul and augment the testimony Paul gives in Galatians. The anti-Pauline polemicist does not dispute Paul's account but uses Paul's words against Paul, which suggests that Paul's account in Galatians of his relationship with Peter is an accurate representation of the facts. The narrative depicts a later stage when hostile groups had allied themselves to Paul or Peter and who were not capable of holding to the finer nuances of the original debate. It also testifies to a strong Pauline and anti-Pauline presence in Syria at the end of the second century.

Some Preliminary Conclusions

Below is a list of seven units of tradition in the Pseudo-Clementines that I regard as historically certain. They center on Paul's relationship to Peter and to the Jerusalem authority.

1. **Paul criticized Peter** for failing to teach the dissolution of the Law for fear of the Jews (Epistula Petri 2.3).
2. **Paul carried the mission to Gentiles before Peter** (HII 18.1).
3. **Paul had a vision of Jesus where Jesus appeared to him** "as angry with an enemy" and sanctioned his apostleship (H XVII 13-19). The vision lasted for the space of a single hour. This independent tradition could be no more than a rhetorical device used as a comparison: Peter's full year with Jesus as compared to Paul's one hour. Significantly, the writer understands Jesus' ministry with his disciples to have lasted only a year (H XVII 13-19).
4. **Paul withstood Peter and condemned him** (H XVII 13-19).
5. **The Apostles acknowledged Paul** (H XVII 13-19).
6. **Paul preferred to work independently of the Apostles** (H XVII 13-19).
7. **Paul taught that a person is saved through faith in Christ alone** (VIII).

These seven units of tradition provide clarity on the matter of Paul's complex relationship to the Jerusalem Church. The picture that emerges is different from that of the canonical Acts, where the relationship is presented in a way that suggests that there was little conflict between the groups. On the other hand, it avoids also the extreme position held by Baur, of two parties at odds with each other. Instead, Paul is presented as someone who stood within the

early Christian movement, as a legitimate and accepted figure, and yet as someone who acted as a pioneer, particularly in relation to the sensitive inclusion of the Gentiles. This step in the direction of including Gentiles, because of faith alone, provoked a degree of opposition from Peter, which led to a confrontation where both Apostles presented their respective positions, and where Paul, who should be considered inferior, at least in terms of status, condemned Peter. (Unless Peter was the superior in status, the matter of Paul "condemning him" would not be explicable.)

The most significant conclusion I draw from these historical traditions is that they corroborate with chilling accuracy Paul's account in *Galatians*, showing the book to be an intra-communal schism. The debate with Peter over the Gentiles lingered in the memory of the Church and later became a paradigm for the struggle of Jewish and Christian communities living in the second and later centuries. The attempt to diminish Paul's significance in these writings, by belittling his "revelation" of Christ, reveals a later stage when the battle is no longer only over issues, but *ad hominem*. Paul seems to have won the confrontation with Peter; he humiliated him, and paid for this in the long term. The incident alienated him from Peter and possibly from "the men of repute."

In the next chapter, I turn to the Gnostic Paul who embraced Peter and Paul in a mesmerizing vision of faith.

Chapter 5

THE Gnostic PAUL

By whose leave are you diverting my waters, Valentinus?
(Tert. Praescr. 37)

A wide-ranging investigation of the Gnostic Paul and of the history of Gnostic interpretation of Paul is beyond the scope of this thesis. I am therefore deeply indebted to the work of Pagels who has offered the most comprehensive analysis of Paul as interpreted by the Valentinian Gnostics of the second century.¹³⁶ Although she focuses mostly on the exegesis of Paul's letters by the Gnostics, she also inadvertently discerns historical traditions along the way.

Finding Paul among the Gnostics is a task fraught with obstacles for the following reasons:

First, the Valentinian Gnostics sharply differed among themselves, a fact which the Heresiologists used to their own advantage. In reconstructing a Gnostic view one can never be certain if it is representative or *misrepresentative* of Valentinian Gnostic thought.

Second, the source material is late and incomplete. Many Gnostic sources cannot be dated with certainty before the third century. The source problem is exacerbated in that it often involves reconstructing Gnostic opinions through the prism of works written by anti-Gnostics.

136 Elaine H. Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline letters* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975).

Third, *Nag Hammadi* codices are sparse in their historical information on Paul. They are less interested in Paul's life than they are in Paul's secret esoteric teaching.

Fourth, Gnostic texts contain few traditions of Paul that cannot be found within the New Testament, unlike independent traditions found in apocryphal writings and in the Apostolic Fathers.

Fifth, the discoveries at Nag Hammadi have revealed discrepancies between the views of the Gnostics as claimed by the Heresiologists and the view of the Gnostics in Gnostic works: "there exist only five cases of clear agreements. Of these, three certainly and one possibly are with Irenaeus."¹³⁷

Finally, although Pagels makes a heroic attempt to rescue the Gnostic exegesis of Paul from (in her mind) the politically motivated apologists like Tertullian and Irenaeus, the resultant Paul is unlike the Critical Paul and fails to fulfill (as I shall show) one of the criteria employed in this work in the evaluation of sources, namely, the bracketing of believability.

A note of caution: One must be careful not to confuse Paul's influence on the Gnostics with their faithful representation of him.

Secret Pauline Traditions

The Naassenes and Valentinians revered Paul as a Gnostic initiate. They believed that Theudas, who in turn was a disciple of Paul, instructed Valentinus. So writes Clement of Alexandria, "Likewise they allege that Valentinus was a hearer of Theudas. And he was the pupil of Paul" (Strom. 7.17). Ptolemy, another disciple of Valentinus, tells of a secret tradition of the savior received through Paul.¹³⁸

137 M.A. Donovan, "Irenaeus in Recent Scholarship," *The Second Century* 4, no. 4 (1984): 226-227.

138 Ptolemy makes frequent use of the Pauline Corpus: "Likewise, the Apostle Paul makes it clear" (Flor. 5.15), "His disciples made these teachings

For the Gnostics, this esoteric oral tradition transmitted via Paul was of greater importance than the Pauline text. With regard to First Corinthians 2.6-8, Valentinian exegetes argued that Paul authorized the secret traditions passed on orally. The Apostle knows that "truth cannot be communicated by means of written documents."¹³⁹ For this reason, no person can properly read the letters of Paul without having received this secret oral tradition.¹⁴⁰ The Valentinians claimed that most Christians made the mistake of reading the Scriptures literally. They themselves, through their initiation into Gnosis, read Paul's letters on a symbolic or pneumatic level. Only this kind of reading yields the truth instead of its mere outer image.

Gnostic use of the Pauline Corpus

The Gnostics not only used the text of Paul differently from the Heresiologists but also disagreed with the Heresiologists as to what constituted the Pauline text. Most of them rejected the Pastorals, which were accepted by the Heresiologists.¹⁴¹ Their Canon included the following letters: Romans, First and Second Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, First Thessalonians, and Hebrews, a list that corresponds to the Chester Beatty Biblical Papyrus II. The Gnostics, like their Orthodox opponents assumed Paul wrote Ephesians, Galatians, and Hebrews.¹⁴² The chief difference lay, not in their selection of texts, but in their hermeneutic. Tertullian for instance, insists that the same Paul who wrote Galatians also wrote Titus. Since the majority of modern scholars reject the Pastorals as Pauline, Pagels sees this as a triumph for Gnostic criticism. She craftily bypasses their egregious inclusion of Hebrews as Pauline.

Finally, although all of Paul's letters are regarded as authoritative by the Gnostics, they held some of them to be of greater value than others. Their

known, and so did the Apostle Paul (Flor. 6.6).

¹³⁹ Pagels, 57.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 58.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 4-5, 115.

¹⁴² Ibid., 115.

choice of a Canon within a Canon does not accord well with modern Pauline criticism. The most highly revered books in the Gnostic Canon are Ephesians, Colossians, and Hebrews and *these are used to interpret the other letters of Paul.*

Historical Traditions in Gnostic Sources

Pagels work, as we have noted, does not primarily address historical questions but Pauline exegesis:

This investigation into the history of hermeneutics does not attempt to reconstruct a historical account of the Apostle himself, or of issues he confronted in his own communities.¹⁴³

Historical allusions are sparse but not entirely absent. They surface not surprisingly in Pagel's analysis of Gnostic exegesis of Galatians, a letter that arguably reveals more of the Apostle's history than does any other. Interpreting Galatians, the Gnostics contended that Paul and Peter proclaimed two different *Kerygma*. Paul, the pneumatic, preached to the Gentiles one kind of liberty; Peter, the psychic, preached another.¹⁴⁴ The other Apostles, including Peter and Luke (*sic*) proclaimed another Gospel, even another God,¹⁴⁵ and remained under the influence of Jewish opinions (*Iren. Haer.* 3.12.6-7, 3.12.12-15). Peter was sent to the psychics, that is, to the Jews, and Paul was sent to the Gentiles, to the pneumatics. The Gnostics saw Peter as the founder of the psychic Church.¹⁴⁶ Paul alone of the Apostles "knew the truth, since to him the mystery was revealed by Revelation."¹⁴⁷ As a result, Paul avoided going to Jerusalem after his conversion, but when he did go, he did not submit to the authority of the Jerusalem leaders.¹⁴⁸ Here Gnostic exegesis diverges from that of the Heresiologists. The latter try to harmonize Acts 15 with Galatians, and insist that Paul did yield to the

¹⁴³ Ibid., 9.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 101.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 102, 103.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 54.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 102.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 103.

authority of the Jerusalem Church.¹⁴⁹

Finally, mention must be made of the Gnostic celebration of two Eucharist services, one for the psychic Church and another for the pneumatic Church. The pneumatic Eucharist was reserved only for initiates.¹⁵⁰ This higher sacrament was known as the sacrament of *Apolytrosis*.¹⁵¹

The Nag Hammadi Library¹⁵²

The *Nag Hammadi* Library consists of thirteen leather-bound codices written in Coptic. They are invaluable as a source of Gnostic thought and date to the fourth century AD. Several of the works in the library contain important traditions about Paul.

1. The Prayer of the Apostle Paul (I,1) (Pr. Paul)

This prayer dates to the second half of the second century and contains clear allusions to the following Pauline letters: Philippians, Colossians, Corinthians, and possibly First Timothy. The writer employs the phrase "the king of ages" found in the New Testament only in First Timothy 1.17. This is significant because Pagels has argued that the Gnostics did not regard the Pastoral Letters as Pauline. There is also an alternative version of First Corinthians 2.9: "Grant what no angel eye has (seen) and no archon ear (has) heard and what has not entered into the human heart."

2. The Gospel of Truth (I,3 and XII,2) (Gos. Truth)

According to Ménard, this work shows profound Pauline influence.¹⁵³ Its theme, claims Ménard, is the reciprocal relationship of God and the elect, a typically Pauline doctrine. I found no unmistakable Pauline allusion in the

149 Ibid., 104.

150 Ibid., 74.

151 Ibid., 160.

152 James McConkey Robinson and Richard Smith, *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, 3d Rev. ed., Coptic Gnostic Library Project (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988).

153 Jacques E. Menard, *L'Evangile de verite* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), 3-8.

work.

3. *The Tripartite Tractate (I,5) (Tri. Trac.)*

This extremely complex work dates to the middle third century. I found it unintelligible even in translation. Pauline themes can be found throughout but they have been so integrated into the author's intricate Gnostic vision that they are barely discernible. The clearest unambiguous Pauline allusion is found in Part III.16 Redemption of the Calling:

For the end will receive a unitary existence just as the beginning is unitary, where there is no male nor female, nor slave nor free, nor circumcision and uncircumcision, neither angel nor man, but Christ is all in all.¹⁵⁴

4. *The Gospel of Thomas (II,2) (Gos. Thom.)*

This Gospel can be dated to the second century although it contains traditions that are much earlier. The place of writing is probably Edessa. Koester thinks an early version of the Gospel was composed as a sayings Gospel as early as 50 AD, probably in the area Syria/Palestine.¹⁵⁵ The original Gospel was written in Greek and contains some important traditions. The first asserts the position of James in Jerusalem, a testimony confirmed by Acts and by Paul in First Corinthians:

The disciples said to Jesus, "We know that you will depart from us. Who is to be our leader?" Jesus said to them, "Wherever you are, you are to go to James the righteous, for whose sake heaven and earth came into being." (Gos. Thom. 12)

The next tradition of interest is the following saying attributed to Jesus:

Jesus said, "I shall give you what no eye has seen and what no ear has heard and what no hand has touched and what has never occurred to the human mind." (Gos. Thom. 17)

This saying, found also in First Corinthians 2:9, is not a Pauline saying but a

154 Robinson and Smith, *Nag Hammadi*, 101.

155 Koester, *Introduction*, 2d ed., 156.

saying of Jesus that Paul inherited from the tradition. Robinson supports this view.¹⁵⁶ The saying is also found in the Prayer of the Apostle Paul, the Dialogue of the Savior 57 and in the Apostolic Fathers, First Clement 34.8 and the Martyrdom of Polycarp 2.3.

The next group of sayings also contains Pauline ideas:

Jesus said to them, "When you make the two one, and when you make the inside like the outside and the outside like the inside, and the above like the below, and when you make the male and the female one and the same, so that the male not be male nor the female female; and when you fashion eyes in place of an eye, and a hand in place of a hand, and a foot in place of a foot, and a likeness in place of a likeness; then you will enter (the kingdom). (Gos. Thom. 22)

His disciples said to him, "Is circumcision beneficial or not?" He said to them, "If it were beneficial, their father would beget them already circumcised from their mother. Rather, the true circumcision in spirit has become completely profitable (Gos. Thom. 53)

The above units contain startling allusions to Pauline ideas, such as the breaking down of the distinctions between male and female and spiritual circumcision, although other Gnostic motifs seem un-Pauline. Unlike the canonical Paul, the Gospel of Thomas is anti-Jewish and anti-Pharisaic:

His disciples said to him, 'Who are you that you should say these things to us?' (Jesus said to them,) 'You do not realize who I am from what I say to you, but you have become like the Jews.' (Gos. Thom. 43)

Jesus said, 'Woe to the Pharisees, for they are like a dog sleeping in the manger of oxen, for neither does he eat nor does he let the oxen eat.' (Gos. Thom 103).

5. The Gospel of Philip (II,3) (Gos. Phil.)

This Gospel dates to the second half of the third century and is a beautiful and varied catechetical work that contains numerous Pauline allusions and citations. The first is as follows:

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 47-48.

Christ came to ransom some, to save others, to redeem others. He ransomed those who were strangers and made them his own. And he set his own apart, those whom he gave as a pledge according to his plan. (Gos. Phil. 53)

This seems to be a citation of First Timothy 2.6,14 and Ephesians 1.14. If correct, it would be another example of a Gnostic citation of a Pastoral letter (*contra* Pagels).

Other Pauline allusions and parallels include:

One single name is not uttered in the world, the name which the father gave to the Son; it is the name above all names: the name of the father. (Gos. Phil. 54)

(It is) to those who ... to unclothe themselves who are not naked. Flesh (and blood shall) not inherit the kingdom (of God)." (Gos. Phil. 56)

It is necessary to rise in this flesh, since everything exists in it. (Gos. Phil. 57)

Jesus came to crucify the world. (Gos. Phil. 63)

Love builds up. (Gos. Phil. 77)

God's farming likewise has four elements: faith, hope, love, and knowledge. (Gos. Phil. 79)

Grant¹⁵⁷ also suggests allusions to Ephesians, Thessalonians, Colossians and Hebrews, although these were not clear to me.

6. *The Hypostasis of the Archons* (II,4) (*Hyp. Arch.*)

This work was probably written in the third century in Egypt. In it, Paul is referred to as the "The Great Apostle." One finds citations only of the deuteropauline Epistles (Col. 1.13, Eph. 6.12), which has lead Koester to regard the deuteropauline elements as secondary.¹⁵⁸

157 Robert M. Grant, "The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Philip," *Vigiliae Christianae* 15 (1961): 129-140.

158 Koester, *Introduction*, 2d ed., 218.

7. *The Exegesis on the Soul (II,6) (Exeg. Soul)*

This work was probably written in the third century in Alexandria. Relevant Pauline citations include Acts 15.20, 29; 2.25; 1 Thess. 4.3; 1 Cor. 5.9-10; 6.18; 11.1; 2 Cor. 7.1; Eph. 5.23; 6.12.

8. *The Dialogue of the Savior (III,5) (Dial. Sav.)*

In its present form Dial. Sav. can be dated to the second century although it contains a source that is likely to go back to the end of the first century. It also contains the "eye has not seen" tradition:

The (Lord) said, "(You have) asked me about a saying ...
which eye has not seen, (nor) have I heard it except from
you." (Dial. Sav. 57)

The final editor of this work, which is believed to have undergone several stages of composition, sets the dialogue in the context of baptismal initiation, which has Pauline echoes. Compare the Dialogue of the Savior 120, 2-124, 22 with Ephesians 2.1-6 and Colossians 3.1-4.

9. *The Apocalypse of Paul (V,2) (Apoc. Paul)*

The Apocalypse of Paul, written in the second century, depends on Galatians 1.11-17, 2.1-2 and Second Corinthians 12.2-4. One of the traditions verifies Paul's journey to Jerusalem:

The little child spoke, saying, "I know who you are, Paul. You are he who was blessed from his mother's womb. For I have (come) to you that you may (go up to Jerusalem) to your fellow (Apostles. And) for this reason (you were called. And) I am the (Spirit who accompanies) you. (Apoc. Paul 18)

Note in the next units how Paul's authority is established and how the twelve Apostles are made to welcome Paul:

Now it is to the twelve Apostles that you shall go, for they are elect spirits, and they will greet you." He raised his eyes and saw them greeting him. Then the Holy (Spirit) who was speaking with (him) caught him up on high to the third heaven, and he passed beyond to the fourth heaven. (Apoc.

Paul 19)

Then he went up to the sixth heaven. And I saw my fellow Apostles going with me, and the Holy Spirit was leading me before them. (Apoc. Paul 22)

And I saw the twelve Apostles. They greeted me, and we went up to the ninth heaven. (Apoc. Paul 24)

10. *The Interpretation of Knowledge (XI,1).*

This homily shows how Gnostic writers addressed ecclesiastical concerns like division and jealousy in a Gnostic congregation. The author is steeped in the Pauline letters and creatively uses Paul's metaphor of the body of Christ and its members (Rom. 12, 1 Cor. 12) and Christ as their head of the body (Eph. 4). Other probable texts include Colossians and Philippians.¹⁵⁹

11. *The Treatise on the Resurrection (I,4) (Treat. Res.)*

The central teaching of the *Treatise on the Resurrection* (written in the late second century) is that "already you (the Elect) have the resurrection" (49, 15-16). Such a teaching is similar to that of Hymenaeus and Philetus denounced in Second Timothy 2:18: "that the resurrection is past already." Two traditions interest me here. The first shows Paul as *the* Apostle:¹⁶⁰

The savior swallowed up a death—(of this) you are not reckoned as being ignorant—for he put aside a world which is perishing. He transformed (himself) into an imperishable Aeon and raised himself up, having swallowed the visible by the invisible, and gave us the way of our immortality. Then, indeed as the Apostle said, "we suffered with him, and we arose with him, and we went to heaven with him. (Treat. Res. 45)

The language is comparable to Second Timothy 2:11: "The saying is sure: If we have died with him, we will also live with him."

A second tradition of note reads:

159 Robinson and Smith, *Nag Hammadi*, 472.

160 This itself is not unique, being found in the Apocryphal writings, in the Apostolic Fathers and in Marcion.

Therefore, do not think in part, O Rheginos, nor live in conformity with this flesh for the sake of unanimity, but flee from the divisions and the fetters, and already you have the resurrection. For if he who will die knows about himself that he will die—even if he spends many years in this life, he is brought to this—why not consider yourself as risen and (already) brought to this? (Treat. Res. 49)

Once again, this parallels Second Timothy 2.18: "(They) have swerved from the truth by claiming that the resurrection has already taken place. They are upsetting the faith of some."

Some Preliminary Conclusions

The traditions cited above *could* be valuable for the study of Paul, but how does one know if they are or not? The difficulty is in deciding whether these citations and allusions to the Pauline Corpus depend on the Pauline Corpus. What follows is a list of numbered units of tradition that I have collated and that I regard as historically probable:

1. **A disciple of Paul, Theudas, received oral tradition from Paul** (Clem. Strom. 7.17) I accept this as a reliable historical tradition. Although the Gnostics made much of secret traditions transmitted through notable figures like Peter, James and Paul, the tradition that Paul had a disciple named Theudas may well be true because Clement who cites the tradition does not refute it, he only denies it.
2. **Peter was sent to the Jews, Paul to the Gentiles.** This Gnostic picture of the early Christian mission is supported by the testimony of Paul, but contradicts Acts. In this regard, the Gnostics show themselves to be more critical than their Orthodox opponents. Like modern critics, the Gnostics refused to interpret Paul's letter to the Galatians vis-à-vis the account in the book of Acts. Like modern critical scholars, the Gnostics interpreted Paul, so it would seem, exclusively from the Pauline text and secret esoteric traditions.
3. **Paul went to Jerusalem.** This is a significant independent tradition

for a journey of Paul to Jerusalem.

4. **Paul did not submit to the authority of the Jerusalem leaders** (Apoc. Paul 18).
5. **James was leader of the Jerusalem Church** (Gos. Thom. 12, 1-2 Apoc. Jas.)

The Gnostics revered Paul as an Apostle; some revered him as *the* Apostle. *Gnostic use of the Pauline Texts* reveals depth and nuance. All the letters that go under the name of Paul, including the book of Hebrews, are utilized in Gnostic works with the exception of Titus. First and Second Timothy feature but modestly (Pr. Paul 53, Treat. Res. 45) and sometimes as a point of departure (Treat. Res. 48).

Despite the claim to work with secret oral traditions, Gnostic exegetes make extensive use of the Pauline text and demonstrate a deeper theological affinity for the substance of Paul's thinking than the Apocryphal writings. The use of doubtful letters like Ephesians and Colossians *as a norm* for exegesis challenges modern critics to reconsider their own rejection of these letters.

Some of the Pauline sayings paralleled in writers like the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of Philip suggest a philosophical background for several key aspects of Pauline theology. These need not lead to the conclusion that Paul was a full-size Gnostic, but they suggest that Gnostic motifs permeated Pauline theology and lay as seeds waiting for hard rains.

Some "Pauline" sayings are paralleled in Gnostic contexts. For instance, Paul's repudiation of the benefits of circumcision (Gos. Thom. 53) and the eschatological vision of neither male nor female (Gos. Thom. 53, Tri. Trac.). This suggests that Paul's relationship to Gnosticism was not antithetical but reciprocal. More importantly, *it reveals the presence of Jesus' traditions in Paul's letters.*

An unusual feature of Gnostic exegesis is the complete lack of interest in historical criticism. The Gnostic aim is to interpret the letters of Paul pneumatically, and therefore the original Pauline context, regarded as the provenance of psychic, recedes into oblivion. Finally, we may note that the Gnostics treated the book of Acts and the Gospel of Luke with great reserve.

In the next chapter, we move into the territory of the Apostolic Fathers. For those schooled in Orthodoxy, it is a welcome breath of fresh air.

Chapter 6

THE APOSTOLIC PAUL

And so we, having been called through his will in Christ Jesus, are not justified through ourselves or through our own wisdom or understanding or piety or works which we have done in holiness of heart, but through faith, by which the almighty God has justified all who have existed from the beginning; to whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen. (1 Clem 32.4)

For this section, I am indebted to the edition of the Apostolic Fathers by Lightfoot.¹⁶¹ I have made use of Lightfoot's text and translation and have consulted its recent revision by Holmes.¹⁶² Where I have cited the text directly, I have used Holmes' translation since it is more modern than Lightfoot's, although not as colorful.

The collection of writings known as the *Apostolic Fathers* has undergone intense scrutiny in recent times. The criterion that once united these works was their presumed connection with the Apostles or at least their presumed antiquity relative to other noncanonical writings of the early Church. Modern views about authorship, dating, and historical setting have robbed the criterion of antiquity of some of its significance.¹⁶³

The move, spearheaded for the most part by scholars like Koester is towards an integrated understanding of these works in relation to canonical and noncanonical literature. Koester has perfected a trend in this direction that was set by his eminent mentor, Bultmann with the publication of his *Theology of the New Testament* (1951).

161 Joseph Barber Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2d ed. (London and New York: Macmillan and co., 1885).

162 Michael William Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, Updated ed. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1999). I have also consulted Andreas ed. Lindemann, *Die Apostolischen Väter : Griechisch-deutsche Parallelausgabe* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1992).

163 David Noel Freedman, *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. electronic ed (New York: Doubleday).

What speaks for the Apostolic Fathers is their pastoral character and that with regard to content and style they are closely related to the writings of the New Testament. For the Orthodox mind they capture the spirit and substance of New Testament writers better than Gnostic or apocryphal writings. Another important feature is their eschatological character. The second coming of Christ is still regarded as imminent, which is strong testimony for their early dating. This is even the case for 2 Clement, which scholars date toward the latter part of the second century.

Those who come to the literature of this period with a deep-seated respect for the authority of ecclesiastical tradition *may be disinclined to exercise the radical criticism of someone like Koester*. Take First Clement as an example. According to the testimony of Irenaeus and Eusebius, Clement was the third successor of Peter at Rome (Ir. Haer. 3.3.3, Eus. Hist.Eccl. 3.15.34). Tertullian states that Clement received his consecration at the hands of Peter himself, a tradition confirmed by Epiphanius. To dismiss such a weight of external evidence (*four independent attestations*) seems an indication of prejudice. Also, even if the writers are not directly connected to the Apostles, that does not serve to disqualify the traditions they preserve since reliable traditions are often preserved in unreliable sources.

Paul's relationship to the apostolic tradition that followed him is one of the most difficult problems of early Christian history. The tendency is to assert that there exists a wide chasm that cannot be bridged, with Paul firmly ensconced on the *one side and the Apostolic Fathers on the other*. Schneemelcher for instance observes that Paul's influence on ecclesiastical theology before Irenaeus remains slight. He says that while Ignatius reveres Paul as an *Apostle and martyr*, his letters betray little or no influence of Paul's theology. Schneemelcher thinks Ignatius may not have even read or known Paul's letters.¹⁶⁴ Lindemann who argues for several Pauline citations and

164 Cited in Pagels, 161.

allusions has taken a more sane approach.¹⁶⁵

As I read them, four of the Apostolic Fathers show interest in and dependence on the letters of Paul: Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp of Smyrna, and the Epistle of Barnabas. Unambiguous mention of Paul and his letters is absent from the Martyrdom of Polycarp and the Shepherd of Hermes. The suggestion that the Epistle of Barnabas was written by the Barnabas mentioned in Paul's letters can safely be dismissed since the epistle shows no signs of familiarity with Paul. For the same reasons, the "Shepherd" of Hermas cannot possibly be the New Testament prophet referred to by Paul in Romans 16.14. I will not consider either the spurious Martyrdom of Polycarp except to note the following biblical citations: Acts 21.14, Mart. Pol. 7.1, 1 Cor 2.9, Mart. Pol. 2.3, Phil. 2.4, and Mart. Pol. 1.2. Finally, despite Flusser's¹⁶⁶ belief that he can reconstruct the argument of the anti-Pauline party at the first Jerusalem council from the Didache, I have not taken the Didache as a source for information on Paul as I regard Flusser's argument as too speculative.

Schweitzer demonstrated his skill as an interpreter of Paul when he observed that Ignatius and Polycarp are dominated in a much higher degree by Paul's thought. They live in his Epistles. Schweitzer believed, however, that Ignatius and Polycarp take over from Paul only the general formula of his mysticism and not its real content: "Historical theology has hitherto been helpless in the face of this enigma. It could not attain to any clearness about the relation of Ignatius to Paul, because it was still in the dark as regards Paul himself."¹⁶⁷

165 Andreas Lindemann, "Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers," in *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*, ed. W.S. Babcock (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990), 29-36.

166 D. Flusser, "Paul's Jewish-Christian Opponents in the Didache," in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. J.A. Draper (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 210.

167 Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, 2d ed. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1953), 340-341. The same point has been made by Thomas Torrance, *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1948), 50, 52, 63, 67, 72, 80.

Below is a list of Pauline phrases gathered by Schweitzer, which show the dependence of Ignatius (in particular) and Polycarp on Paul. In comparison with the Apocryphal Paul, where citations of the Pauline Corpus are almost non-existent, these Fathers show direct familiarity with the language of Paul the letter writer:

Numerous places: "In Christ Jesus."

Ign. Eph. 5.2: "You can do all things in Jesus Christ."

Eph. 5.3: "Continue in Jesus Christ."

Eph. 5.1: "To be found in Jesus Christ."

Magn. 10.2: "To be salted in him."

Magn. 10.2: "You bear Jesus Christ in you."

Trall. 13.2: "Farewell, in Jesus Christ."

Rom. 1.1: "In bonds in Jesus Christ."

Rom 2.2: "To sing praise to the father in Jesus Christ."

Phld. 5.1: "Bound in Christ."

Phld 10.1: "The compassion which you feel in Jesus Christ."

Phld 10.2: "Happy in Jesus Christ."

Phld 11.2: "Farewell in Jesus Christ."

Pol. Phil. 1.1: "Made joyful in our Lord Jesus Christ."

Pol. Phil.14.1: "Farewell, in the Lord Jesus Christ."

1. The Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians (1 Clem.)

The majority of scholars place 1 Clement towards the end of the first century. Koester proposes 96-97 AD.¹⁶⁸ Herron (70 AD) and Wilhelm-Hooijbergh (69 AD) have proposed dissenting dates.¹⁶⁹ The place of writing is Rome. Clement not only cites Paul's letters and uses Pauline phrases, but also shows familiarity with Pauline ideas on justification. Below are two examples:

¹⁶⁸ Koester, *Introduction*, 2d ed., 293.

¹⁶⁹ Cited in Holmes, 24.

All, therefore, were glorified and magnified, not through themselves or their own works or the righteous actions, which they did, but through his will. (1 Clem. 32.3)

And so we, having been called through his will in Christ Jesus, are not justified through ourselves or through our own wisdom or understanding or piety or works which we have done in holiness of heart, but through faith, by which the almighty God has justified all who have existed from the beginning; to whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen. (1 Clem 32:4)

Pauline Citations and Allusions in Clement

The citations adduced here and elsewhere in this chapter are based on my own reading of the texts in question and therefore may not conform to the results of others. Apart from Pauline citations I also note other books that hold interest for my study, such as Hebrews and Peter.

Rom. 1.32, 1 Clem. 35.6.

1 Cor. 1:26, 1 Clem. 54.1.

1 Cor. 2.9, 1 Clem. 34.8.

1 Cor 15.23, 1 Clem. 37.3.

1 Cor. 12, 1 Clem. 37.5.

Eph. 4.4-7, 1 Clem. 46.6.

Phil. 2.1, 1 Clem. 54.1 (uncertain).

Phil. 4.15, 1 Clem. 47.1.

Tit. 3.1, 1 Clem. 2.7.

Hebrews (General allusions), 1 Clem. 9-10.

Hebrews 1, 1 Clem. 36.

Heb. 11.37, 1 Clem. 17.1.

1 Pet. 4.8, 1 Clem. 49.5

Historical Pauline Traditions in Clement

Below are cited the most important Pauline traditions in Clement. The first is a well-known passage:

Let us set before our eyes the good Apostles ... Because of jealousy and strife Paul by his example pointed out the way to the prize for patient endurance. After that he had been seven times in chains, had been driven into exile, had been stoned, and had preached in the East and in the West, he won the genuine glory for his faith, having taught righteousness to the whole world and having reached the farthest limits of the West. Finally, when he had given his testimony before the rulers, he thus departed from the world and went to the holy place, having become an outstanding example of patient endurance. (1 Clem 5.3)

This tradition suggests a visit to Spain, another trial and martyrdom.¹⁷⁰ An unusual feature is that "in neither case does he (Clement) try to establish a special relationship of the events to the Roman Church."¹⁷¹ The implication is that Paul and Peter could not have been martyred there or Clement did not know where they were martyred, only that they were martyred.

The second tradition reads as follows:

Take up the epistle of the blessed Paul the Apostle. What did he first write to you "in the beginning of the gospel?" Truly he wrote to you in the Spirit about himself and Cephas and Apollos, because even then you had split into factions. (1 Clem 47.1)

This tradition shows firstly that Clement knew of the existence of a letter which Paul had written to the Corinthians and that they had it at their disposal to read. He is also aware that the letter contained Paul's warnings against schism and that Paul made mention in his letter of Apollos and Cephas. Clement may be citing the letter from memory.

Here follows the third tradition:

Love unites us with God; "love covers a multitude of sins"; love endures all things, is patient in all things. There is nothing coarse, nothing arrogant in love. Love knows nothing of

170 In this regard, see Otto Friedrich August Meinardus, *St. Paul's Last Journey in the Footsteps of the Saints*. (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Caratzas Bros, 1979).

171 Koester, *Introduction*, 2d ed., 294.

schisms, leads no rebellions, love does everything in harmony.
In love all the elect of God were made perfect; without love
nothing is pleasing to God. (1 Clem 49)

Here there is strong familiarity with First Corinthians 13. Note also the citation of First Peter 4.8.

2. The Epistles of Ignatius (Ign.)

The date of these epistles is fixed at *circa* 110-117 AD.¹⁷² The place of writing is Smyrna and Alexandria Troas.

Pauline Citations and Allusions in Ignatius

I disagree strongly with Schoedel who writes, "Certain usage by Ignatius of Paul can be established only for First Corinthians."¹⁷³ This radical skepticism is entirely without foundation. My reading of Ignatius revealed the following unambiguous Pauline allusions:¹⁷⁴

172 Ibid., 284.

173 William R. Schoedel, Ignatius, and Helmut Koester, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 9.

174 See in this regard Rudolf Bultmann, "Ignatius and Paul," in *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann* (London: Collins, 1960), 316-328. In this brief but weighty article Bultmann argued that Ignatius is the only Christian writer after Paul and John to have "understood the Christian faith as an *existentiell* attitude." To be sure certain Pauline themes have disappeared, such as justification by faith (which occurs only twice in Ignatius); the Pauline concept of sin; the contrast between "Law" and "Grace" and Paul's history of salvation perspective. The thought that dominates Ignatius is the longing for life. Nothing is said of the Pauline notion of two aeons, and little is said of the Parousia. Ignatius does, nonetheless, grasp with Paul and John, that through Christ "the faithful have for the first time partaken of real existence." Through Christ, men now stand under a new power so that the future salvation is already present. "Flesh", as in Paul, is seen as a sphere and not merely as sensuality, a sphere that man can allow to become a power over him. Ignatius differs from Paul in that he develops the idea so that it becomes also a sphere brought into community with the spirit: "those who are carnal cannot do spiritual things, nor can those were spiritual do carnal things ... Moreover, even those things which you do carnally are, in fact, spiritual, for you do everything in Jesus Christ." This concept of the flesh is intriguing for Bultmann, since for Ignatius the flesh is the sphere of death. What is un-Pauline, according to Bultmann, about the theology of Ignatius is that

1 Cor. 1.20, Ign. Eph. 18.1.
 1 Cor. 2.6, Ign. Eph. 19.1.
 1 Cor. 4.1, Ign. Trall. 2.3.
 1 Cor. 4.4, Ign. Rom. 5.1.
 1 Cor. 2.14-16, Ign. Eph. 8.2.
 1 Cor. 6.7, Ign. Eph. 10.3.
 1 Cor. 6.9-10, Ign. Eph. 16.1.
 1 Cor. 6.9, Ign. Phil. 3.3.
 1 Cor. 9.27, Ign. Trall. 12.3.
 1 Cor. 15.8, Ign. Rom. 9.2.
 Gal. 1.1, Ign. Phil. 7.2.
 Gal. 6.14, Ign. Rom. 7.2.
 Eph. 5.25, 29, Ign. Pol. 5.1.
 Phil. 2.17, Ign. Rom. 2.2.
 Col. 1.23, Ign. Eph. 10.2.

Historical Pauline Traditions in Ignatius

The following tradition is an important witness to Paul's martyrdom:

I know who I am and to whom I am writing. I am a convict, you have received mercy; I am in danger, you are secure. You are the highway of those who are being killed for God's sake; you are fellow initiates of Paul, who was sanctified, who was approved, who is deservedly blessed—may I be found in his footsteps when I reach God!—who in every letter remembers you in Christ Jesus. (Ign. Eph. 12)

Note the following: Paul's historical connection to the Ephesian Church, Paul's martyrdom (the image of following in Paul's footsteps), and the fact that Paul wrote several letters, all of which, Ignatius claims, mention the

Martyrdom is a kind of guarantee, "a work that gives him security."

Ephesian Church.¹⁷⁵ Compare also this account of Martyrdom with that of First Clement 5. Both Clement and Ignatius refer to Paul's martyrdom but are vague, alluding only to the *fact* of martyrdom, not to the nature or place.

The next traditions speak of the Apostles, Paul and Peter:

May I always share in these chains, in order that I might be found in the company of the Christians of Ephesus who have always been in agreement with the Apostles, by the power of Jesus Christ. (Ign. Eph. 11.2)

I do not give you orders like Peter and Paul: they were Apostles. (Ign. Rom. 4.3)

The latter tradition is important in that it establishes a connection of Paul and Peter to Rome. Ignatius writes at a time when the Church viewed these Apostles as a *single* authority in ecclesiastical matters. (See Ign. Smyrn. 8.1, Ign. Magn. 13.1, Ign. Trall. 7.1, Ign. Rom. 4.3, Ign. Phld. 9. 1.) This is remarkable considering the early dating of these letters.¹⁷⁶

A Collection of Pauline Phrases and Themes in Ignatius

Below is a collection of Pauline phrases and themes in Ignatius:

Imitators of God—Ign. Eph. 1.1, Ign. Eph. 10.3.

The carnal vs. the spiritual—Ign. Eph. 8.2.

Being found in Christ—Ign. Eph. 11.1.

Christians as the temple of God—Ign. Eph. 15.3, Ign. Phld. 7.2.

Jesus Christ the New Man—Ign. Eph. 3.3.

"Heavenly things"—Ign. Trall. 5.1.

The readers are mere "babes in Christ"—Ign. Trall. 5.1.

"I do not want to please men but God"—Ign. Rom. 2.1.

"I want to gain Christ"—Ign. Rom. 5.3.

175 This claim is sheer hyperbole. See Schoedel, Ignatius, and Koester, 73.

176 Schoedel sees more here than I do. He sees a reference to the tradition that Paul and Peter were *martyred* together in Rome. Ibid., 176.

Imitator of the sufferings of God and/or Christ—Ign. Rom. 6.3.

We have the mind of God and/or Christ—Ign. Rom 8.3, Ign.Phld.*Preface*.

Patient endurance of Jesus Christ—Ign. Phld. 10.3.

Redeemed by the *grace of Christ*—Ign. Phld. 11.1.

Jesus our common hope—Ign. Phld. 11.2.

Endowed with every spiritual gift—Ign. Smyrn. Preface, Ign. Pol. 2.2.

Crucified with Christ—Ign. Smyrn. 1.1.

Christ the Perfect Man—Ign. Smyrn. 4.2.

The "love feast"—Ign. Smyrn. 8.2.

God's athlete—Ign. Pol. 2.3.

Chastity—Ign. Pol. 5.2.

The armor of God—Ign. Pol. 6.2.

3. Polycarp (Pol. Phil.)

The date for Polycarp is *circa* 110-120 AD. The place of writing is Smyrna.

Pauline Citations and Allusions in Polycarp

The following are the most important Pauline citations and allusions in Polycarp:

Acts 2.24, Pol. Phil. 1.2.

Acts 10.4, Pol. Phil.22.1.

Rom. 14.10,12, Pol. Phil.6.2.

1 Cor 6.2, Pol. Phil.11.2.

1 Cor 6.9, Pol. Phil.5.3.

1 Cor. 14.25, Pol. Phil.4.3.

1 Cor. 15.58, Pol. Phil.10.1.

2 Cor. 4.14, Pol. Phil.2.2.

2 Cor. 6.7, Pol. Phil.4.1.

2 Cor. 10.1, Pol. Phil.11.1.
 Gal. 1.11, Pol. Phil.2.2.
 Gal. 4.26, Pol. Phil.3.3.
 Gal. 6.7, Pol. Phil.5.1.
 Eph. 2.5, 8-9, Pol. Phil.1.3.
 Eph. 4.26, Pol. Phil.12.1.
 Eph. 5.21, Pol. Phil.10.2.
 Phil. 1.27, Pol. Phil.5.2.
 Phil. 2.16, Pol. Phil.9.2.
 Phil. 3.18, Pol. Phil.12.3.
 1 Thess. 5.22, Pol. Phil.11.1.
 2 Thess. 3.16, Pol. Phil.11.3.
 1 Tim. 3.5, Pol. Phil.11.2.
 1 Tim. 3.8-13, Pol. Phil.5.2.
 1 Tim. 6.7, Pol. Phil.4.1.
 1 Tim. 6.10, Pol. Phil. 4.1.
 2 Tim. 2.12, Pol. Phil.5.2.
 2 Tim. 4.10, Pol. Phil.9.2.
 2 Tim. 3.5-6, Pol. Phil.6.3.

Other New Testament books cited by Polycarp include Matthew, Luke, First Peter, Hebrews, First Clement, and the First Epistle of John. Metzger does not see Polycarp as citing either Acts or Second Corinthians.¹⁷⁷

In 1965, Nielsen¹⁷⁸ wrote a useful article on Polycarp's use of the Pauline Corpus. He argued that when Polycarp referred to Holy Scripture, it was not

177 Bruce Manning Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 61.

178 C.M. Nielson, "Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures," *Anglican Theological Review* 47 (1965): 206.

the Old Testament, but Paul's Letters that he had in mind. Nielsen notes the absence of Old Testament citations in Polycarp and the frequency with which Polycarp refers to Paul. He bases his argument on 12.1, where he feels that Polycarp is not citing the text from Psalm 4.5 but from Ephesians:

For I am convinced that you are all well trained in the sacred scriptures and that nothing is hidden from you (something not granted to me). Only as it is said in the Scriptures, "be angry but do not sin," and "do not let the sun set on your anger."

Concurring with the Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology Nielsen says that when Polycarp quotes Paul:

There is some tendency to exactness in the short quotations, but the general tendency is towards freedom. He compresses, conflates, omits, and alters the order to suit his own purposes.

This is not proof that he regards Paul as anything less than Scripture because he quotes the Old Testament with the same level of the inexactness.¹⁷⁹ Nielsen concludes, "By 120 AD a sacred Christian Scripture was emerging with the Pauline Corpus as its foundation."¹⁸⁰ If Nielsen is correct, then Marcion was not the first to have regarded the Pauline Canon as Scripture (an argument made in chapter 2) and Paul was considered an ecclesiastical authority by the year 120 AD.

Historical Pauline Traditions in Polycarp

The following are the three units of historical traditions in Polycarp:

For neither I nor anyone like me can keep pace with the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul, who, when he was among you in the presence of the men at that time, accurately and reliably taught the word concerning the truth. And when he was absent he wrote you letters; if you study them carefully you will be able to build yourselves up in the faith that has been given to you, "which is the mother of us all." (Pol. Phil. 3.2)

179 Ibid.: 207.

180 Ibid.: 215.

Exercise unlimited endurance ... which you saw in Paul himself and the rest of the Apostles; be assured that all these "did not run in vain" but in faith and righteousness, and that they are now in the place due them with the Lord, with whom they also suffered together. For they did not "love the present world," but him who died on our behalf. (Pol. Phil. 9.1-2)

Or do you not know that the saints will judge the world," as Paul teaches? But I have not heard of any such thing among you, in whose midst the Apostle Paul labored, and who were his letters of recommendation in the beginning. For he boasts about you in all the Churches—those alone, that is, which at that time had come to know the Lord, for we had not yet come to know him. (Pol. Phil. 11.2-3)

Of note here are the following: the high estimation of Paul as an authoritative teacher and letter writer; Paul's life as a model for endurance; Paul suffered for his faith; Paul labored among the Philippian Church; the Church to whom Polycarp is writing has copies of Paul's letters (plural) at their disposal for study purposes; and Paul taught that "The Saints will judge the world" (1 Cor. 6.2).

4. The Epistle of Diognetus

The date of the epistle is *circa* 150—225 AD.¹⁸¹ Suggested places of writing include Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria.

Nielson argues that the writer's attitude to the Old Testament represents a pre-Marcionism since it does not display any of the violent anti-Marcionite polemics of the late second century when rejection of the Old Testament was an issue. Since the letter is an unconscious rejection, it is best to date it in the early part of the first century: "An Orthodox document which ignores the Old Testament in all likelihood belongs to a time before Marcion."¹⁸² If true this would undercut the older Patrological view that within the early Church, the authority of the Old Testament was taken for granted.

181 Joseph Barber Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. J. R. Harmer, 2d ed. (London: Macmillan and co., 1898), 488.

182 C.M. Nielson, "The Epistle to Diognetus: Its Date and Relation to Marcion," *Anglican Theological Review* 52, no. 2 (1970): 80.

Pauline Ideas in Diognetus

The following Pauline ideas are found in Diognetus: Faith is the only means by which it is permitted to see God (Diogn. 8.6); God overlooked past sins to make people worthy in the present (Diogn. 9.1); the wages of unrighteousness is punishment and death (Diogn. 9.1); and finally, God gave up his son as a ransom for all (Diogn. 9.2).

Pauline Citations and Allusions in Diognetus

The following unambiguous Pauline citations and allusions can be found in Diognetus: 1 Cor. 8.1, Diogn. 12.5, 1 Peter 3.18, Diogn. 9.2. There is a single Pauline tradition:

For there is neither life without knowledge, nor sound knowledge without true life; therefore each tree stands planted near the other. Discerning the significance of this, the Apostle blamed the knowledge which is exercised apart from the truth of the commandment which leads to life and said, "knowledge puffs up, but love builds up." (Diogn.12.4)

Noteworthy is the designation of Paul simply as *the Apostle*. The writer assumes everyone knows he is talking about Paul.

Some Preliminary Conclusions

This chapter has taken on a different format from previous chapters. That is because these works come from a very early stage in the tradition, before the Pauline Canon had a time to crystallize. The citations of the Fathers and allusions to the Pauline Corpus are therefore of much greater significance than those in (for example) Gnostic sources.

Clement in his letter to the Corinthians has at least four clear citations from First Corinthians. The other letters of Paul to which he alludes are Ephesians, Philippians, and Titus. Ignatius cites from First Corinthians (ten times), Galatians (twice) Ephesians (once), Philippians (once), and Colossians (once). He nowhere alludes to First or Second Timothy, unlike his friend Polycarp who depends on them. Polycarp cites Acts (twice), Romans (once), First

Corinthians (four times), Second Corinthians (three times), Galatians (three times), Ephesians (three times), Philippians (three times), First and Second Thessalonians (twice), and First Timothy and Second Timothy at least seven times. It is strange that Romans is only ever quoted twice and there is a single citation from Colossians.

The following Pauline letter is *not* cited: Philemon. Diognetus has only one clear citation from First Corinthians although on several occasions the writer uses language consonant with Pauline theology. He affirms his discipleship with the Apostles, but his claim must be taken in the broad sense of conformity in spirit and teaching. This leads to the following important conclusion: *The Apostolic Fathers show direct dependence upon a Pauline Canon which existed by the end of the first century and which included, in order of usage, the following letters: Corinthians, the Pastorals, Philippians, Ephesians, Second Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, Thessalonians, Colossians. Of note is the early use of Titus by Clement.*

These are the traditions I deem to be historically probable:

1. **Paul was a letter writer** (1 Clem., Ign., Pol.).
2. **Paul was Martyred** (1 Clem., Pol., Ign.).
3. **Paul was seven times in chains** (Clem.).
4. **Paul was driven into exile** (Clem.).
5. **Paul was stoned** (Clem.).
6. **Paul preached in the east and the west** (Spain?) (Clem.).
7. **Paul reached the farthest bounds of the west** (Clem.).

In the Apostolic Fathers the apostleship of Paul is never in dispute. It is assumed as a fact. Reference to *the Apostle* is another way of simply saying

Paul. This implies that questions surrounding the integrity of Paul's call—if they existed—had long since been resolved. Paul is placed alongside Peter, as an equal. In addition, Jewish questions such as those discussed by Paul are no longer in existence. Judaism is now viewed as a separate religion.

The most significant conclusion I draw from this section is that contrary to popular opinion, Paul is *not* absent from the Apostolic Fathers as is sometimes alleged. His presence looms large. Clearly, details about his life are sketchy, but his spirit is keenly felt in this literature, more so than in the Schools I have discussed in previous chapters. In addition, one may note that it is those apostolic letters that show the greatest familiarity with Paul's letters that have the greatest claim to authenticity.

Chapter 7

THE LUKAN PAUL

With this chapter, I move into the Canon. Again, boundaries need to be set. I do not intend to present a chronology of Paul's life based on Luke-Acts, nor of outlining points of similarity and dissimilarity between the Lukan Paul and the canonical Paul as a means of establishing historical traditions. Nor do I wish to harmonize discrepancies or choose between them. My task is to recover historical Pauline traditions in Acts according to the criteria set out in chapter 1. How they fit into the larger Pauline scheme will be decided later.

Since the stated aim of this thesis is to recover Paul from *noncanonical* sources, some justification needs to be made for my incursion into *canonical* Acts. The reason, as stated in the introduction, has to do with the fact that Luke reveals a picture of Paul that shows no contact at all with the Pauline Corpus. For that reason, I cannot ignore Acts.

Luke tells us many things about Paul, but can he be trusted? Since the epoch making article by Baur,¹⁸³ scholars are less inclined to trust Luke when he writes about Paul. Baur disputed Luke's idea of a harmonious Church in the first century and argued for a fundamental dichotomy between early Jewish Christianity, represented by the Petrine party and Pauline Christianity, represented by the Pauline Party. The Book of Acts, Baur argued is the apologetic attempt of a Paulinist to facilitate and bring about the rapprochement and the union of the two opposing parties by representing Paul as Petrine as possible and, on the other hand, Peter as Pauline as possible.

In his famous book on Paul, Baur insisted that a choice be made between the divergent presentations of the Book of Acts and of Paul. Baur formulated his

183 Baur: 61ff.

thesis thus: For the history of the apostolic age, the Pauline Epistles take precedence over all the other New Testament writings.¹⁸⁴ On this account, Baur said that Acts must fill a secondary place.

In a consequential work by Knox, the basic methodological principle of Baur is given clear expression. Quoting Knox at length is worthwhile:

The incomparable value of the letters is such (a) that the merest hint in the letters is to be deemed worth more than the most explicit statement in Acts; (b) that a statement in Acts about Paul is to be regarded as incredible if it conflicts directly with the letters (as many statements do) and is to be seriously questioned even if a conflict is only suggested; and (c) that statements about Paul in Acts are to be accepted with confidence only if such statements are fully and explicitly confirmed by the letters. There can be no doubt that (Acts): contains true traditions of facts and episodes in Paul's life, but these traditions can never have the certitude which data obtained from the letters possess.¹⁸⁵

Noteworthy for the present discussion is (c): information about Paul peculiar to Luke. Luke tells us that Paul is called *Saul*, that he is born in Tarsus, brought to Jerusalem at an early age and educated at the feet of Gamaliel, that he is a persecutor of the Church in Judea, that he speaks Hebrew, that he is dramatically converted "on the road to Damascus," that he ventures out on three missionary journeys which take him from Antioch in Syria to regions as far West as Macedonia and Greece, that he is finally arrested on the last of three short visits to Jerusalem, that as a Roman citizen he appeals to Caesar after several hearings before local magistrates, and that he finally arrives in Rome for trial and awaits martyrdom. With the Pauline Corpus alone, one would not know *any* of the above information. Some of the information is highly questionable:

First, if Paul underwent thorough rabbinic training and studied under

184 Cited in Kümmel, *The New Testament: the History of the Investigation of its Problems*, 135.

185 John Knox and Douglas R. A. Hare, *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, Rev. ed. (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University 1987), xvii.

Gamaliel, why is Paul silent about this in his letters? This information may have served Paul in embarrassing confrontations with Judaizers. Luke's inconsistency about Paul's knowledge of Hebrew is humorously brought out in Acts 26.14. Though Jesus addresses Paul in Hebrew, Luke has him quote a common Greek proverb! "It is hard for you to kick against the goads" (Eur. Bacc. 794-795, Pind. Pyth. Odes 2. 94, Aesch. Ag. 1624).

Second, in Galatians 2, Paul makes it clear that he had a major role to play in the "Jerusalem conference," whereas in Acts 15, Luke puts Barnabas, Peter, and James on the center stage.

Third, Luke portrays Paul as having gone first to the Jews and only later (because of their rejection of his Gospel) to the Gentiles. Paul's letters, however, give us the impression that he had the Gentiles in mind from the start (Rom. 1.5, 14, 15; 11.13; 15.16; Gal. 1.16; 2.7, 9; 1 Tim 2.7).

Fourth, Paul denies having been in Judea before his revelation (Gal. 1.22), which is hard to reconcile with Luke's picture of him as a persecutor in Jerusalem—he would hardly then have been unknown!¹⁸⁶ From the start, Acts depicts Paul as an active and aggressive persecutor of *The Way*. We first meet Paul as a witness and accomplice in the death of Stephen (Acts 8) and this characterization is repeated throughout the narrative.

Finally, the Paul of Acts does not write letters, he makes speeches. Between twenty and twenty five per cent of the words of Acts 13-28 are words put in the mouth of the Apostle in line with the current practice of historians such as Thucydides, Livy and Caesar. Such practice involved no infraction of ancient literary ethics.¹⁸⁷

186 Gal. 1.22 contradicts Acts 9.26-30; Acts 8.3, 9.1, 9.13, 9.21, 22.4, 25.4, 26.9; compare also Gal. 1.13; Phil. 3.6; 1 Cor. 15.9,10; Eph. 3.8; 1 Tim. 1.13-15.

187 John Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury 1950), 11-12.

These examples are sufficient to demonstrate that Luke is as much a theologian as he is a historian. Much of the information Luke gives on Paul seems to be wrong, either through Luke's ignorance, or because his sources were incorrect, or because he deliberately (for literary, theological and even political purposes) doctored the evidence. Luke at times presents an idealistic picture of Paul's relationship to the early Christian movement and safeguards Paul's Jewish identity and fidelity to the Law. Luke writes to soften the lines of delineation between Paul and early Christianity by placing Paul's ministry *alongside* that of Peter's and then sets out, apologetically motivated, to bring the two groups together by making Paul out to be less of a problem than he probably was. Paul becomes in Luke's hands a devout Jew who works within the authoritative context of the Jerusalem Church. Luke in short, is the first to attempt a systematic catholicization of Paul. (On Paul's relationship to Second Temple Judaism, see chapter 8.)

Despite these historical difficulties, Luke seems to base the narrative of Acts on sources that contain reliable historical traditions. Even the narrative in its final form has an air of believability. Only the most unwilling skeptic would regard the plethora of names and places, the detailed narratives, the "We" sections, as pure inventions. So the steady words of Dibelius: "This sort of information is too dull to be legend, too detailed to be fiction."¹⁸⁸

In addition, the general picture of Paul, the general Pauline Type found in Acts is congruent with that found in the letters. In my view therefore, Acts serves as a good source for the life of Paul mostly because the testimony of Acts stands independent of the Pauline Corpus. *There is no question that Acts knew of or relied on any of the letters attributed to Paul in the New Testament.* Therefore where Acts and the Pauline letters agree, that is double testimony to the veracity of a tradition. If Luke were dependent on the Pauline Corpus, or if there were any suspicion that Luke knew of the Pauline Corpus (like John,

188 Dibelius, 78.

who is dependent on the Synoptics)¹⁸⁹ one would be more inclined to doubt his testimony. Since he is *independent* and *where he agrees* with Paul's letters, Luke must be considered an excellent supplementary source for Paul's life and thought.

For this very reason, scholars have tended to evaluate Luke by using the canonical Paul as the criterion. That has led to mixed results in that they are forced to choose between Luke and Paul, with most favoring the latter. My method tries to avoid this problem. I deal with Acts on its own terms and try not to compare the traditions of Paul in Acts with Paul's letters in order to determine whether a tradition is true or false. I have tried to evaluate Luke mostly using Luke as the criterion. In the absence of other criteria, I turn to Paul.

The Text of Acts

The text of Acts has a complicated history. There are at least two textual traditions that vie for consideration. First is the Western Tradition of Texts. The Codex Beza (Codex D, a Greek and Latin Codex from the 5th century) best represents this textual tradition. It is also represented in the following: P38 and P48, the Old Latin, the Harclean Apparatus, and the Middle Egyptian. The complicated questions surrounding the Western tradition need not concern us here. It is enough to note that the Western text cannot always be ruled out for several reasons.

First, it is the oldest of the textual traditions. Irenaeus, who is the first author from antiquity to cite Acts,¹⁹⁰ does so from the Western text.¹⁹¹

Second, the Western text is found in key ecclesiastical figures, heretical and Orthodox, including, Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, Marcion, Tatian, and

189 *Contra* C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1963).

190 Haenchen regards Justin Martyr as the first to mention Acts.

191 E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, trans. R. McL Wilson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 52-59.

Irenaeus. Even if one prefers the Old Uncial to the Western text, the latter represents an independent historical tradition.

Third, at times western editors display a more accurate knowledge of the story than even the original.

Finally, one may also note that the existence of the Western tradition demonstrates the freedom with which ancient copyists felt that they could amend and expand the text. That may indicate that copyists did not regard the work as canonical.¹⁹²

The second textual tradition for Acts is the Alexandrian Text. This tradition is principally represented in Codex B (Vaticanus), Sinaiticus, Codex A, Miniscules 81 and 1175, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Papyri P45 and P74. It is also the tradition regarded by the majority of experts as the most consonant with the original work.

The Date of Acts

The first unambiguous mention of Acts is Irenaeus who uses it as a principle source in his refutation of Valentinian Gnostics. The *terminus ad quem* is the middle-end of the second century (180-200 AD). This is confirmed by the mention of Acts in the Muratorian Canon, which can be dated around the same time. Although Acts is also mentioned in all the other canonical lists of the New Testament its place is sometimes last or near last. This is the case in the Canon approved by the "Apostolic Canons," the Cheltenham Canon where Acts is placed after the Pauline Epistles (fourth century), and by the Catalogue inserted into *Codex Claromontanus*. Acts is here placed fourth last after Revelation. Oddly, Tertullian refers infrequently to Acts, which may have something to do with the fact that Marcion rejected it.

The most forceful argument for an early dating is the omission by Luke of

192 C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 29.

Paul's execution. This non-event forced as considerable a scholar as Harnack to argue that Acts must have been written before Paul's death.¹⁹³ The words of Dibelius are also hard to resist:

Does not the ending of Acts, which has always been felt to be problematical when seen in conjunction with these hearings, become actually mysterious? Why does the author suddenly discontinue his story, after describing these proceedings with such thoroughness? And why, in the scenes in which Paul is being examined, does Luke prelude his account of the trial with such detail, if he is not going to describe the trial itself (and announce the verdict)?¹⁹⁴

Surprisingly, Dibelius fails to answer his own penetrating questions.

I take the *terminus a quo* for the writing of Acts then to be the death of Paul at the hands of Nero: 66 or 67 AD.

Sources for Acts

Recovering the sources that underlie Acts is a difficult task since Luke's sources are disguised by his literary style. Haenchen writes that Luke subjects his sources to stylistic revision "which renders their reconstruction impossible from his text alone."¹⁹⁵ Haenchen reflects the opinion of Dibelius:

We must consider as hopeless every attempt to divide entirely into different sources the text of Acts as a whole, apart from editorial interpolations.¹⁹⁶

Indeed Dibelius claimed that although Luke and Acts were by the same hand, they were written for two different audiences. Whereas Luke stuck closely to his sources for his Gospel, the writing of Acts permitted him far greater

193 Adolf von Harnack, William Douglas Morrison, and John Richard Wilkinson, *Luke the Physician: The Author of the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. Adolf von Harnack, New Testament Studies; 1 (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1908), 25-120.

194 Dibelius, 103-104.

195 Haenchen, 81.

196 Dibelius, 2-3.

freedom.¹⁹⁷ Dibelius detected only a single source, an "Itinerary." For the rest Luke used current stories and accounts that he had discovered.¹⁹⁸ For Dibelius, no sources underlie the first half of Acts.

Despite this skepticism, I think Luke employed sources and that these can be recovered. I am led in this direction for the following reasons. First, Luke used written sources for his Gospel: Q and Mark (Luke 1.1-5). Although Dibelius is correct to assert that the nature of the two works differs in a way that renders their composition different, I do not think that Luke who showed himself faithful in his use of sources in the composition of his Gospel would suddenly depart from that practice in composing his account of early Christian history. In my view, the two works differ because in each instance the nature of the sources is different. Second, critical analysis of Acts reveals several sources.

Lüdemann has proposed the following sources for Acts: Itinerary supplemented by individual episodes (Acts 15.40-21.36); Account of Paul's trial in Caesarea Philippi before Festus; Written Traditions from Hellenist groups (Acts 6-8, 11, 13-14); Peter Source (Acts 3,5,12; Acts 1-5); Independent oral traditions; and the "We" passages.¹⁹⁹

More recently, Fitzmyer²⁰⁰ makes the following proposals, which I provisionally accept, although my own analysis of the text has led me to disagree with Fitzmyer on occasion.

Fitzmyer acknowledges that the activities in Acts center on three different agents in three geographical areas. On this basis, he reconstructs the following four sources:

197 Ibid., 103.

198 Ibid., 126-127.

199 Lüdemann, *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary*, 22.

200 Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 1st ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 85-88.

First the Jerusalem (Caesarea, Palestine) Source (Acts 1.6-2.40; 3.1-4.31; 4.36-5.11; 5.17-42; 8.5-40; 9.32-11.18; 12.1-23). Second, the Antioch (Hellenist) Source (Acts 6.1-6; 6.8-8.4; 11.19-30; 15.3-33). Third, the Pauline Source (Acts 9.1-30; 13.3-14.28; 15.35-28.31). Finally, the "We" Passages (Acts 16.10-17; 20.5-15; 21.1-18; 27.1-28.16).

Using the above source scheme, I have combed the text of Acts²⁰¹ for historical Pauline traditions, the most important of which appear below. In *Appendix B*, I give a complete list of the traditions, as well as detailed justification for my choices. The reader must turn there to see why I regard certain traditions as authentic and why I have excluded others. I have put the analysis in *Appendix B* for fear that it may distract the reader if included at this point. What follows below then are the more important Pauline traditions critically extracted from Acts. I present the traditions according to the three sources proposed by Fitzmyer (Antiochene, Pauline and "We"). To my knowledge, no one has yet provided such a detailed analysis of these Pauline traditions in the context of their respective sources.

A note of caution is in order. The source scheme that Fitzmyer uses is reasonable but also speculative. However, even if it is shown to be incorrect, that does not damage my presentation, since the source of a tradition does not *on its own* determine its authenticity.

Pauline Traditions in the Antiochene Source

The Antiochene Source says that Paul is first called "Saul" (Acts 8.58, 8.1), that he persecutes Judean Christians (Acts 8.3) and that he is complicit in Stephen's death (Acts 7.58-8.1). After his "conversion" Saul becomes Paul and spends a year in Antioch (Acts 11.25).

The Antiochene Source also provides details of Paul's ministry. Paul provides relief for Judean Christians with the help of Barnabas. The same Barnabas

201 I have used Kurt Aland, *The Greek New Testament*, 3d ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1983).

leads a visit to Jerusalem with Paul to discuss the mission to the Gentiles (Acts 15.3-5). At that meeting, Saul and Barnabas are welcomed by the Apostles and elders (Acts 15.4) where they relate their Gospel among the Gentiles (Acts 15.12). James, the leader in Jerusalem, reaches a resolution about the Law and its relation to Gentile converts. Two delegates, Judas and Silas, are chosen to accompany Saul and Barnabas to Antioch (Acts 15.22-23) where they are to read a letter containing the resolutions that have been made (Acts 15.23-29).

Of the units of tradition found in the Antiochene Source, most have a high degree of probability making this a very accurate Source.

Pauline Traditions in the Pauline Source

The Pauline Source begins with Saul's "conversion" (Acts 9). Saul sees Jesus (Acts 9.8-9), is baptized by Ananias (Acts 9.18), and preaches unsuccessfully in the synagogues of Damascus (Acts 9.20-22). The Jews plot to kill him but he escapes in a basket (Acts 9.23) and goes to Jerusalem, where the disciples are afraid to receive him (Acts 9.26). It is Barnabas who introduces him to the Apostles (Acts 9.27-28). While in Jerusalem, he escapes a plot on his life by the Hellenists (Acts 9.28).

One of the more important traditions in this source is that Antioch is named as the base of operations for Paul and Barnabas, who are both identified as "Apostles" (Acts 14.4). This is significant since Luke avoids this word in relation to Paul. The source also highlights the opposition and persecution Paul and his colleagues face on their travels (Acts 16.18-24, Acts 17.5-6, Acts 19.23-34), and it emphasizes Paul's role as a worker of miracles (e.g., Acts 16.18, Acts 19.11-12).

Paul is portrayed in the Pauline Source as more devoutly Jewish than in Luke's other sources and is identified as a Pharisee (Acts 23.6). The Source contains incidents that embarrass the Paul of the letters, such as the Nazarite vow that Paul takes at Cenchreae (Acts 18.19) and the Jewish vow Paul takes

in Jerusalem (Acts 21.26). Finally, the source details Paul's arrest and presentation for trial in Rome (Acts 23-28).

The Pauline Source is the most detailed source that Luke uses for his reconstruction of Paul's mission among Gentiles. It is not as reliable a source as the Antiochene Source. There is no Pauline theology other than that Paul preached, "Jesus, hope and the resurrection."

Pauline Traditions in the "We" Passages

Among the more important traditions recorded in the "We" Source are that Paul baptizes Lydia (Acts 16.14-15) and that he goes to Jerusalem where he stays with an "early disciple" Mnason of Cyprus (Acts 21.16). While in Jerusalem, Paul is welcomed and meets James with elders present (Acts 21.10-12). He is later delivered to the Augustan Cohort Julius and sent to Rome (Acts 27.1). On the way to Rome, Paul is shipwrecked (Acts 27.13-20) and escapes to Malta (Acts 27.44). Finally, Paul comes to Rome and is placed under house arrest (Acts 28.16).

Much of the material in the "We" Source is unremarkable, which makes it certain that Luke is not its author and that the possibility of invention is low. People do not generally invent unremarkable stories about their heroes. In this regard, I cite the observation by Praeder:

It seems that Luke is unconcerned to offer even the simplest evidence in support of the eyewitness authority of the first person plural participants: he refrains from naming and numbering them and never explains their relationship to Paul and other third person participants. In the little that he says about the first person plural participants he is silent about their status as eyewitnesses and the supposed special significance of their eyewitness experiences. Instead, he portrays them as relatively colorless travelers.²⁰²

202 S.M. Praeder, "The Problem of the First Person Narrative in Acts," *Novum Testamentum* 29, no. 3 (1987): 198.

Some Preliminary Conclusions

The three Lukan sources above converge at crucial points. They agree that Paul worked within the purview of the Jerusalem Church, recognized its authority, and had direct contact with it. When in Jerusalem, Paul sought the Church and its elders and took whatever steps were deemed necessary by the Church. In the Antiochene Source, Paul and Barnabas go to Jerusalem to resolve questions regarding Gentile converts. They abide by decisions reached by the Council. In the Pauline Source, Paul visits Jerusalem twice, even subjecting himself to Nazarite vows. In the "We" Source, Paul stays with Mnason of Cyprus in Jerusalem and finally meets up with James and the other elders. If Luke's sources are correct, then Baur's impression of a dichotomy in early Christianity is plainly wrong, which is unfortunate since its damage on New Testament scholarship has been incalculable.

None of the three sources used by Luke, nor even Lukan Redaction²⁰³ reveals any direct knowledge of Paul's letters. Nor do they even reveal the fact that Paul wrote letters, nor the existence of a Pauline Canon. They reveal Paul's contact with communities to whom Paul wrote letters, but they know nothing of the letters themselves. In addition, the entire struggle for the correct Canon of Paul, which is characteristic of Marcion, the Fathers, and the Gnostics, is entirely absent. The only reasonable explanation for this is that Luke was writing at a time when Paul's letters had not yet begun to circulate and when they had not yet achieved any special status. Acts must then come from a very early stage in the tradition: the stage before groups had to scramble for Paul's letters to resolve their conflicts.

None of the three sources knows that Paul dies in Rome. Paul's end is only reflected in Lukan Redactions (see *Appendix B*). That forces us to posit an early date for the writing of our two main sources. Since the Pauline Source and the "We" Source know of Paul's Roman imprisonment, the *terminus a quo*

203 For a list of Lukan Redactions, see *Appendix B*.

for them is 61-63 AD. Since they do not know of Paul's execution, the *terminus ad quem* is 67 AD. However late we date the work in its final form, we cannot escape the conclusion that several of its sources are early, making them strong contenders in the fight for Paul.

Chapter 8

THE MODERN PAUL

In this chapter, I examine the shape of modern Pauline studies by means of a critical dialogue with several of its best exponents.

A discussion that centers on Paul's relationship to Second Temple Judaism dominates critical Pauline studies today. Pre-World War II Pauline scholarship saw Paul's theology as an answer to the supposedly corrupt and legalistic religious system of Judaism. Paul's theology was viewed, in this scheme of things, as a sincere attempt to correct legalistic abuses endemic to Judaism at the time. This solution, offered by the "History of Religions School" was not new. A great deal of Christian literature after Paul adopted it. But when taken to its extreme, it often resulted in the unwarranted demonization of the Jewish people and anti-Semitism.

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

Consequently, during the last forty years there has been a dramatic shift (some call it a revolution)²⁰⁴ in the direction of Pauline studies, led by such scholars as W. D. Davies, H. J. Schoeps, K. Stendahl, L. Gaston, J. G. Gager, E. P.

204 Mary Ann Getty, "Paul and the Salvation of Israel: A Perspective on Romans 9-11," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 456.

Sanders, J. C. Beker, J.D.G. Dunn, A. F. Segal and D. Boyarin²⁰⁵ - to name but a few. Despite their differences, they all share a common goal. *They wish to remove Paul from the clutches of his theological interpreters (notably Augustine and Luther) and relocate him within the context of a new interpretation of Second Temple Judaism.* Their motivation is principally to sever the connection between Paul and anti-Semitism. Since Paul is considered a principal player in the matter, it is thought that a fresh examination will yield positive results, which could lead to a new interpretation of Judeo-Christian history, with brighter implications for future Jewish-Christian relations. It would be unwise to deny the political factors that have motivated the "New Look at Paul."

Krister Stendahl

Stendahl²⁰⁶ believes that the West has read Paul incorrectly by hailing him as a hero of the introspective conscience. When Paul speaks of justification by faith, Stendahl insists that Paul does not have in mind Luther's concern, "How can I find a gracious God?" but, "How can the Gentiles become full members of the people of God?" Justification for Paul, as far as Stendahl is concerned, is not a *Jewish* problem. Stendahl holds that asking the wrong questions has led to the wrong answers and emphases, especially regarding the

205 Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California 1997). This is a masterpiece in Pauline studies. Boyarin is a Talmudic scholar whose non-Christian approach to a well-worn discipline is refreshing and necessary. He locates the heart of Pauline theology in a platonic dualism of spirit and flesh, where flesh, though necessary and not evil, is regarded as less significant and inferior to spirit. The most challenging sections of the book are those that deal with Paul's attitude to sexuality and a penetrating critique of scholars like Kasemann and Hamerton-Kelly. I was shocked to discover that Kasemann, one of the great Paulinists of our time, used to speak pejoratively about "the Jew in every one of us", the "Jew" here representing perverse self-righteousness (209-219). The twentieth century has witnessed some outstanding contributions by Jewish scholars to Pauline research. In particular: Richard L. Rubenstein, *My Brother Paul* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), Hans Joachim Schoeps, *Paul: the Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History* (Philadelphia: Westminster 1961).

205 Krister Stendahl, *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles, and Other Essays* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 7ff.

206 Stendahl, 7ff.

doctrine of justification, which holds a disproportionate place of emphasis in Pauline interpretation. In order for his thesis to work, Stendahl minimises those passages which seem to indicate that Paul is wrestling with "a damning conscience," for example, Romans 7, while he gives central place to passages like Romans 9-11.²⁰⁷

E.P. Sanders

Stendahl's concerns are given comprehensive treatment in the beautiful work, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* by Sanders. In it and in a follow up book of essays, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (1983), Sanders attacks the view of Rabbinic Judaism as a legalistic religion based on works righteousness.²⁰⁸ He feels that this false picture has come about because of the unfortunate and enormous respective influences of scholars like Weber, Schurer, and Bousset on New Testament scholarship rather than from a critical examination of Jewish texts. Sanders (unlike Stendahl) characterises Paul's thinking as un-Jewish. (This separates him from most, if not all of the New Looks that followed him.) He accepts that such a thing as normative Judaism existed in the time of Paul, in the sense of a substratum of essential belief, *covenantal nomism*, but Paul does not conform to it. This does not mean that Paul rejected Judaism because he believed it to be a religion based on works righteousness, but because of his

207 Ibid., 7.

208 Dunn, another representative scholar of the New Look, likewise believes that Paul is not rejecting "legalism" or "works-righteousness." Paul objects not to Judaism *per se* but to one Type of Judaism based on another Type. Dunn's position is a modification of Sanders'. He likewise reduces the conflict by denying the grounds upon which the conflict is based. A conflict presupposes a common basis on which to fight and a common point of departure. Dunn has given a common basis as "covenantal nomism" (a phrase he dislikes but uses indiscriminately and inconsistently), but fails to explain what the point of departure is meant to be. James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox 1990), 242-259. Dunn's struggle stems his bid to de-Lutheranize Paul as Albert Schweitzer had done at the turn of the century. Schweitzer almost met with success, but no sooner had he initiated a new direction when Bultmann ingeniously foiled him and established Luther's grip on Paul. So says E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, 1st American ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 131.

exclusive soteriology. Since for Paul salvation is only by Christ, the following of any other path is wrong. Below are now familiar quotes:

Doing the Law, in short is wrong only because it is not faith.

What is wrong with the Law is that it is not Christ.

In short, this is what Paul finds wrong in Judaism: it is not Christianity.

On the assumption that a religion should be understood on the basis of its own self-presentations we must say that Judaism of before 70 kept grace and works in the right perspective, did not trivialize commandments of God, and was not especially marked by hypocrisy. The surviving Jewish literature is as free of these characteristics as any I have ever read.²⁰⁹

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

First, is it not strange that Paul, whose theology is described as un-Jewish by Sanders, should find himself so preoccupied with Jewish matters?

Second, Sanders does not fully allow for the possibility (he only recognises it in a footnote on page 4) that the Judaism which Paul attacked could have existed, even if it cannot be independently recovered from the sources.

Third, even if the literature of the Second Temple period is not particularly marked by legalism, this is not *per se* proof that the religion is not legalistic. There is often a discrepancy between the ideal of a religion expressed in its literature and its "demonic distortion under the tragic ambiguities of human existence."²¹⁰

Fourth, Sanders has not fully explored the reasons for the traditional

209 Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, 550. 551, 447.

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

interpretation of Paul. Few ancient Christian writers view Judaism in any other way. The modern way exemplified by Sanders and company hardly features. Does the continued existence of the Christian religion depend on a supersessionist mentality?

Fifth, Sanders minimises Paul's angry remarks about the Law and relegates the central theme of "righteousness by faith" to an inferior position in the overall cast of Paul's thought.

Sixth, what Sanders has not done is to take into account a substantial body of writings which testify to another picture of Palestinian Judaism before 70 AD. Consideration must be made of early Christian literature for a proper perspective.

Alan Segal

Alan Segal ("a believing Jew and a twentieth century humanist")²¹¹ offers a perspective consonant with Sanders', but he has another emphasis and different hermeneutic tool. For Segal, Paul's *conversion* serves as a decisive model for understanding the Apostle's life and thought. Against the trend to downplay the significance of Paul's conversion, Segal believes that Paul's personal experience after conversion is what most affected both his theoretical thinking about the new basis for Christian community and the value of Torah in it: "Paul has revalued his life on the basis of his conversion."²¹²

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

211 Alan F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: the Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale University 1990), 281.

212 Ibid., 126.

go the whole way and convert:

God-fearer is the term used to refer to those Gentiles with varying degrees of commitment to Judaism, all of whom have been attracted to the *synagogue* but who were unwilling as yet to become full proselytes.²¹³

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

Paul offered something that no other Jewish proselytiser had been able to offer - the promises of Judaism but with the peculiar responsibilities of the special laws entirely optional.²¹⁴

The crux of his argument is expressed as follows:

The vexing issue of the ritual status of the Gentiles-not their salvation or even philosophical issues of universalism or particularism or the value of work's righteousness-directly occasions Paul's meditations on Law.²¹⁵

For Segal, within certain groups of Judaism it was accepted that Gentiles could be saved without having to convert. He quotes as an example the Pharisees who believed that Gentiles could be saved by keeping the "Noachic commandments." *Salvation is not the issue. A new society is. The way in which Paul achieves ritual acceptability is through baptism which places Gentiles on the same level of ritual purity so as to engage in intimate social activities. Jews and Gentiles are free to eat together and marry each other.*²¹⁶ What is the result of Paul's social reformation within Judaism? Christianity's

213 Ibid., 93.

214 Ibid., 272.

215 Ibid., 125, 202.

216 Ibid., 194.

exclusion and confirmation of its heretical status. Paul is a Jew but an apostate one: "What Paul did not wish and what he fought against is what eventually happened: The Church became a new, third entity."²¹⁷ This is why Paul never uses the name "Christian" of his community. Paul was not converted from one religion to another, but from one variety of Judaism to another.

History after Paul judged Christianity to be different from Judaism. That fact seems undeniable today, but it is hardly so in the first century.²¹⁸

Segal's approach is provocative but he arrives at many correct conclusions in spite of flaws in his argument. He is not inclined towards a detailed exegesis of the Pauline texts, and makes unsupported generalisations such as, "nor did he (Paul) feel he had sinned in any way in his previous life."²¹⁹

Furthermore, proof for the existence of the Noachic commandments is late and cannot be found in first century Jewish sources. The existence of a category of Gentile-Jews known as "God-fearers" is vague and unsupported. More important is the criticism of Saldarini who feels that the boundaries and identities of Judaism and Christianity are not fully resolved by Segal.²²⁰ On the one hand Paul is a Jew who converts from one Jewish sect to another sect within Judaism. From another point of view Christianity is a new religion, "analytically complete in its own terms."²²¹ Paul converts to Gentile Christianity.²²²

The following remark further obfuscates the matter: "Paul was a Jew who did not have to convert to become a Christian."²²³ What does Segal mean? That

217 Ibid., 263, 284.

218 Ibid., xiv.

219 Ibid., 268.

220 A. J. Saldarini, "Review of Alan Segal's Paul the Convert - The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54 (1992): 598, 590.

221 Segal, 182.

222 Ibid., 206.

223 Ibid., 147, 214.

Paul could have converted to Jewish Christianity and did not have to convert to its Gentile version?

Theoretically, he could have just slid over as an adherent by claiming Judaism was fulfilled by the Messiah's arrival.²²⁴

This Gentile version remains in some sense a kind of Judaism because it is constituted by "God-fearers." Yet Segal contradicts himself because he suggests that Jewish Christianity was Judaism, not Christianity, whereas Gentile Christianity was truly Christianity. How then could Paul have become a Christian, failing conversion? Furthermore, Paul's letters give no indication that his conversion consisted in the transference from one community (Jewish) to another community (Gentile).

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

(People) completely misunderstand the program of Paul the Apostle, wrongly concluding that Paul's difficulty with Judaism was intellectual and theological—for instance, interpreting Paul as opposing Judaism because it practised self-salvation and volition.²²⁵

Segal thinks then that Paul's dissatisfaction depended on his conversion experience and his post conversion experience in the community. Yet can we believe that Paul failed to realize the reason for his conversion? Did he happen to take a Kierkegaardian plunge, only to discover subsequently and under group pressure, that he had made the right decision? If Paul was content in Pharisaism, why did he leave it behind? Surely, Paul's is not *sententia ex eventu*. Segal concedes the point, "One thing is clear from his language: Paul

224 Ibid., 147.

225 Ibid., 283, 169, 180, 255, 281.

is no longer a Pharisee."²²⁶

John G. Gager

The final voice of the New Look that I examine is that of Gager, Professor of Religion at Princeton University. Gager's work *Reinventing Paul* came to me highly recommended by Crossan²²⁷ and it has been enthusiastically received in several quarters. I find the work well written but filled with high minded generalizations and one sentence dismissals. Gager's argument is that the dominant view of Paul across nearly two thousand years is both bad, in that it has proved harmful, and wrong, in that it can no longer be defended historically.²²⁸ Gager summarily dismisses every interpretation of Paul held within the history of the Church,²²⁹ dismissing the likes of Augustine and Luther. (Gager is heavily influenced by Stendahl's work which was critical of both.) Ancient critics are dismissed, as are modern critics with the exception of Jewish interpreters whom Gager believes "are far more sensitive than Christians to the Jewish elements in Paul's thinking."²³⁰

For Gager, Paul was not opposed to Judaism because he was a Christian (a view held by Sanders) since *Paul never became a Christian* and since *there were no Christians in those times* (Gager quoting Pinchas Lapide).²³¹

According to Gager, Paul only knew two categories of human beings, Jews and Gentiles. To import the category of *Christian* is to violate Paul's thought world and impose an alien concept. Also when Paul speaks negatively about the law, Gager thinks, he is not talking about the law *as it relates to Israel*, but only *as it relates to Gentiles*.²³² Ironically, Gager adopts the position held by

226 Ibid., 17.

227 Crossan made the recommendation in an email to me.

228 John G. Gager, *Reinventing Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University 2000), viii.

229 Like Schoeps: "the whole history of the interpretation of Paul ... is a single chain of misunderstandings." Schoeps, 175.

230 Gager, *Reinventing Paul*, iv.

231 Ibid., 24.

232 Ibid., 44.

Marcion, and says, as a way of explaining Paul's dual standards (one for Jews and another for Gentiles), that Paul proposed *two plots* of salvation, one for Jews (that does not include Jesus as the Messiah) and a different one for Gentiles (that does).²³³ Paul's enemies, according to Gager were not necessarily Jewish, but critics within the movement. His overall conclusion is that Paul does not repudiate the Law of Moses or reject Israel as the people of God: "The law remains in effect for all who are circumcised."²³⁴

It is difficult to assess a work such as this which makes so many sweeping generalisations, particularly when the sacred beliefs of Christianity are treated with such disregard. Should one accept that Jesus was not the founder of Christianity, that Paul was not a Christian, that no Christian has ever understood Paul correctly, that only Jews understand Paul, that Paul never opposed the Law for Jews, that Paul saw two ways of salvation (one without Christ and one with Christ) and that the first person to have understood Paul correctly was the Lutheran scholar Stendahl, whose little work of some 113 pages captured what no other mind in Christian history has been able to capture? Is Gager gaga?

Some Preliminary Conclusions

I am not convinced by the efforts of these scholars to reinvent Paul although I applaud their attempt to deal with the tragic problem of anti-Semitism. Their vision depends on two simple beliefs, both of which are difficult to sustain in the light of a critical reading of the New Testament: *Paul was a devout Jew with strong ties to Judaism*, and *Paul's point of departure from Judaism was not a radical one*.

Much is assumed and what seems to stand in the face of the evidence is brushed aside and hidden beneath the foliage in the hope that few will have the audacity to look there. The words of Stephen Neill made some thirty years

233 Ibid., 59.

234 Ibid., 146.

ago about Jesus are equally applicable to Paul:

The danger for the liberal lies always in his tendency to domesticate Jesus Christ, to make him out to be less dangerous than he really is, to rob him of his mystery, and to offer solutions of the gospel problems which are no real solutions.²³⁵

I summarize the logic of the "New Look at Paul" as follows: Second Temple Judaism was not a legalistic religion. Therefore, Paul's protest against the Law could not have been based on Paul's rejection of the legitimacy of Jewish cultic practice. Therefore, Paul was the devout Jew he claimed to be. Therefore, Pauline Christianity was really a form of Judaism. Therefore, Paul shares no guilt in the history of anti-Semitism.

The motivation of Sanders and ensemble is laudable since they wish to protect Judaism from Christian anti-Semitism, but there are better ways to achieve this than to paint Paul as they do, in dull watercolors. Overall, what goes in the name of the New Look is, in my view, mostly a step backwards. It is Paul gained through strained exegesis and largely through the exigencies of the current theological climate. Since Judaism in the time of Paul is no longer considered corrupt and since the majority of Christian scholars would not readily concede that Paul is corrupt (or his protest against Judaism is invalid), the result has been to imply that neither is corrupt. Consequently, the Pauline paradox has not been resolved and Paul's point of departure from Judaism obscured.

These scholars have not given sufficient cognizance to the interior logic of Pauline Theology, to Paul's angry remarks against the Law and Circumcision, and to the fact that one so ostensibly devout and committed to Jewish matters could have espoused a Christology that is un-Jewish, the belief in a divine Crucified-Savior. Indeed, these works rarely address Paul's Christology. The boundaries and identities of Judaism and Christianity are not fully resolved

235 Stephen Neill and Tom Wright, *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1986*, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University 1988), 46.

and the question of Christian origins clouded. Furthermore, instead of unraveling the problem of anti-Semitism, the new view has tended to ignore Paul's involvement by failing to admit that a problem exists, for if Paul's prestige as a devout Jew is safeguarded, he cannot be accused of anti-Semitism. The blame falls on those who later followed and championed Paul.

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

Chapter 9

THE ANCIENT PAUL

I now set about presenting all of the units of tradition isolated in the previous chapters, cataloguing them around themes in the life of Paul. Although the reader will not find argumentation in this chapter, (I draw my conclusions in chapter 10) this is truly the culmination of my research. Below the reader will find a list of historically probable Pauline traditions that have been established from sources not written by Paul. I have grouped the traditions according to their number of independent attestations and sorted them by their probability (considering other criteria as well besides the number of independent attestations). I have not ordered the traditions chronologically or sequentially. Therefore, for example, the tradition of Paul's death (82) is followed by the tradition that he goes to Spain (83). That is because tradition 82 has more attestations than tradition 83. Traditions with a greater degree of historical probability gravitate to the top of a list, as do earlier traditions. Despite this ordering, I regard all the traditions listed below as historically probable.

Paul's Life before His Conversion

1. Saul persecutes Christians before his conversion (Antiochene Source, Pauline Source, and Acts of Peter).
2. Saul hails from Tarsus (Antiochene Source, Pauline Source, and Apocalypse of Paul).
3. Paul plays a role in Stephen's death (Antiochene Source).
4. Paul is a Pharisee (Pauline Source).

Paul's Conversion

5. Saul receives a divine commission (Acts of Paul, Gnostic, and Pauline Source).

6. Saul is converted outside the road to Damascus (Acts of Paul, Pauline Source).
7. Paul has a vision of Jesus where Jesus appears to him "angry as with an enemy" (Pauline Source, Pseudo-Clementines).
8. Ananias baptizes Saul (Pauline Source).
9. Paul preaches in the synagogues of Damascus (Pauline Source).

Paul's relationship with the Jerusalem Church

10. Paul comes to Jerusalem after his conversion (Antiochene Source, Pauline Source, Acts of Paul, Gnostic, Pseudo-Clementines).
11. The Apostles in Jerusalem receive and acknowledge Paul (Pseudo-Clementines, Gnostic, Antiochene Source, "We", Pauline Source).
12. James is leader in Jerusalem (Antiochene Source, Pauline Source, and Gnostic).
13. Barnabas introduces Paul to the Apostles (Antiochene Source, Pauline Source).
14. Paul condemns Peter over his position on the Law (Gnostic, Pseudo-Clementines).
15. Paul works independently of the Jerusalem Church (Gnostic, Pseudo-Clementines).
16. A second visit to Jerusalem leads to Paul's arrest (Pauline Source, "We").
17. Paul did not submit to the authority of the Jerusalem leaders (Gnostic).
18. Paul is instructed in Jesus Tradition (Gospel of Thomas, The Gospel according to the Hebrews).

19. Paul and Barnabas present their Gospel to the Apostles (Antiochene Source).
20. A resolution is reached by James (Antiochene Source).
21. Paul delivers to the Churches the resolution of the conference (Pauline Source).
22. Paul takes a Nazarite vow at Cenchrae (Pauline Source).
23. Paul stays with Mnason ("We").

Paul's Itinerary

24. Paul makes at least two visits to Jerusalem (Pseudo-Clementines, Gnostic, Antiochene Source, "We", Pauline Source).
25. Paul is in Antioch (Antiochene Source, Acts of Paul, and Pauline Source).
26. Paul is in Philippi (Acts of Paul, Pauline Source, "We").
27. Paul is in Damascus (Acts of Paul, Pauline Source).
28. Paul spends a long time in Corinth (Acts of Paul, Pauline Source).
29. Paul is in Iconium (Acts of Paul, Pauline Source).
30. Paul spends a long time in Ephesus (Acts of Paul, Pauline Source).
31. Paul is in Macedonia (Pauline Source, "We").
32. Paul is in Tarsus (Pauline Source).
33. Paul is in Beroea (Pauline Source).
34. Paul preaches in Athens (Pauline Source).

35. Paul spends a year in Antioch (Antiochene Source).

36. Paul is in Psidian Antioch (Pauline Source).

Fellow Travelers and Colleagues

37. Paul makes numerous travels with Barnabas (Antiochene Source, Pauline Source).

38. Paul stays with Priscilla and Aquila (Pauline Source, Acts of Paul).

39. Demas and Hermogenes are fellow Travelers (Acts of Paul).

40. John deserts (Pauline Source).

41. Paul and Barnabas split over John Mark (Pauline Source).

42. Paul meets Timothy in Lystra (Pauline Source).

43. Paul circumcises Timothy (Pauline Source).

44. Paul instructs Theudas (Gnostic).

Paul's Missions

45. Paul is based in Antioch with Barnabas (Pauline Source, Antiochene Source, and Acts of Paul).

46. Peter is sent to Jews, Paul to Gentiles (Gnostic, Pauline Source, Pseudo-Clementines)

47. Paul is engaged in a service for poor in Jerusalem (Antiochene Source, Acts of Paul.).

48. Paul spends a long time in Corinth (Pauline Source, Acts of Paul).

49. Paul spends a long time in Ephesus (Pauline Source, Acts of Paul).

50. Paul exorcizes a slave girl at Philippi ("We", Pauline Source).
51. Paul preaches in the halls of Tyrannus for two years (Pauline Source).
52. A young boy falls out of the window with Paul preaching (Acts of Paul, Pauline Source).
53. Paul carried the Mission to the Gentiles before Peter (Pseudo-Clementines).
54. Greeks regard Paul and Barnabas to be gods (Pauline Source).
55. Paul causes trouble in Iconium (Acts of Paul).
56. Lydia is converted and baptized ("We").
57. Paul preaches in the east and the west (Clement).
58. Paul reaches the farthest bounds of the west (Clement).

Opposition, Suffering and Persecution

59. Paul is arrested and jailed several times (Clement, Pauline Source, Acts of Paul, "We").
60. Citizens of Damascus try to kill Paul. He escapes in a basket (Acts of Paul, Pauline Source).
61. Paul is scourged (Acts of Paul, Pauline Source).
62. Paul is stoned (Clement, Pauline Source).
63. Paul is regarded was a sorcerer (Acts of Paul, Pauline Source).
64. Paul contends with Jewish leaders (Pauline Source, Acts of Peter).
65. Goldsmiths in Ephesus want to kill Paul (Acts of Paul, Pauline Source).

- 66. Paul escapes a plot by the Hellenists (Pauline Source).
- 67. Paul causes several riots (Pauline Source).
- 68. Paul is imprisoned at Philippi (Pauline Source).
- 69. Paul causes trouble in Iconium (Acts of Paul).
- 70. Paul is arrested in Corinth (Pauline Source).
- 71. A crowd attacks Jason's house in Thessalonica (Pauline Source).
- 72. Paul is arrested and beaten in Jerusalem (Pauline Source).
- 73. Paul is delivered to the Augustan Cohort Julius and sails for Rome (Pauline Source).
- 74. Paul is shipwrecked ("We").
- 75. All escape to Malta (Pauline Source).

Curriculum Vitae

- 76. Paul is an Apostle (Pauline Source, Gnostic, Pseudo-Clementines., Ignatius, Clement, Diognetus, Polycarp, and Acts of Paul).
- 77. Paul wrote letters to churches he founded (Clement Ignatius, Polycarp, Gnostics, 3 Corinthians).
- 78. Paul was called "Saul" before his conversion (Antiochene Source, Pauline Source).
- 79. Paul was a tentmaker (Pauline Source).
- 80. Paul speaks in tongues (Acts of Paul).

Arrest and Death

81. Paul is arrested and awaits trial in Rome (Acts of Peter, Pauline Source, "We", Acts of Paul).
82. Paul is martyred (Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Acts of Paul, Acts of Peter).
83. Paul goes to Spain (Acts of Peter, Clement).
84. Nero beheads Paul (Acts of Paul, Acts of Peter).
85. Paul is brought before Felix the Governor at Caesarea (Pauline Source).
86. Paul is guarded in Herod's Praetorium (Pauline Source).
87. Paul remains in prison for two years (Pauline Source).
88. Porcius Festus succeeds Felix (Pauline Source).
89. Paul appears before Festus and appeals to Caesar (Pauline Source).
90. Festus thinks Paul is mad (Pauline Source).

As the reader can see above, the non-Pauline sources utilized in this study have yielded a great deal of vital information about Paul, which corroborates the testimony of the Critical Paul, but which also stretches, challenges and tests it.

In the final chapter, I weigh the Ancient Paul against the Modern Paul. I show that modern scholars are right about Paul, but also wrong, notably in the hermeneutic they employ in relation to Paul.

Chapter 10

THE FUTURE PAUL

Over the past nine chapters, I have journeyed through the Paul of the early Church. What began as a somewhat modest journey has proven fruitful. The sources have yielded 90 traditions that are historically probable. Whereas these traditions are not all beyond doubt, most contain a historical nucleus. A picture has begun to emerge about the Apostle Paul that supplements and challenges the picture known in the letters. A picture has also emerged of the struggles of the early Church and of the quest for authority and identity.

I now intend to highlight several key areas of Pauline studies that are challenged by these results. I began by asking whether the modern Paul can survive an external critique. This now remains to be seen.

The Ancient Paul challenges the paradigm of modern critical studies that interprets Paul as a devout Jew faithful to Torah.

Striking in the traditions contained in chapter 9 is the absence of reference to Paul's devout Jewish past. With the exception of tradition 4, which alleges Paul was a Pharisee (a claim made by Paul himself in Philippians) no School asserts Paul's Jewish roots or allegiance. (I am not making an argument here, but merely an observation. I prefer not to make arguments from silence.) The reason for this may be that by the time these works were written, the Jewish debate was over. Conversely, it may be that the early Church perceived Paul as the champion of a new religion. Marcion, whom I have shown to be pro-Jewish, rejected the Old Testament *for Christians* because he believed that that was Paul's position. Marcion claimed Paul as his Patron, which is strange if Paul's attitude towards Judaism was as favorable as modern critics suggest. The anti-Pauline polemic of the Pseudo-Clementines is also unintelligible if Paul held the positions that Gager, for instance, suggests he did. In the Pseudo-Clementines, Paul is depicted as an enemy of the Law and Moses.

Again, if Paul's position was the opposite, why all the fuss?

No ancient writer then, with the exception of Luke, interprets Paul within the context of Second Temple Judaism. The only traditions that allude to Paul's devotion to Judaism (4, 9, 22, and 43) come from Acts. I don't think that this fact alone should cause one to doubt that Paul was a devout Jew at one time, and that he even remained a devout Jew throughout his life, but the traditions certainly pose a question for modern scholars who treat Paul as if he was thoroughly committed to the Torah.

Missing too in the traditions cited above is reference to Paul's parents (a Jew is one born of a Jewish mother)²³⁶ to his upbringing, to Gamaliel, to his education in Jerusalem, to his Roman Citizenship, and to his early life. Again, I am merely making observations.

Noteworthy is the overwhelming testimony to Paul as a *persecutor* before his conversion. Stendahl and others deny that Paul persecuted the early Church. Yet four independent attestations are hard to ignore.²³⁷ In addition, the tradition that Paul had a hand in Stephen's death comes from the Antiochene Source, which is the most reliable of Luke's sources.

Another dilemma in contemporary Pauline studies is whether Paul was *converted* or *called*. Stendahl downplays the significance of Paul's conversion, and focuses on what he calls "the greater reality of his apostolic calling."²³⁸ Paul, he says, experiences not a conversion but a call, serves the same God with a new and special calling, sees himself called in the manner of the prophets, and feels that the mystery of God's inclusion of the Gentiles into the people of

236 Talmud Mishna Kiddushin 3.12.

237 On this problem and different solutions see G. Bornkamm, *Paul* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971), 15. Bornkamm rejects the picture of Paul in Luke as a persecutor in Jerusalem. See also Haenchen, 297.

238 Stendahl, 7.

Israel has been revealed to him.²³⁹ Since Paul did not convert from one religion to another, he is at ease with his former life in Judaism.²⁴⁰ The traditions above seem to corroborate Stendhal's argument. The language of conversion does not feature, which is remarkable because by the time these writings were made, Christianity was a religion quite distinct from Judaism.

The Ancient Paul challenges the view that Paul's mission was separate from the authority of the Jerusalem Church

The traditions in chapter 9 provide clues to what is perhaps the supreme problem of early Christianity: Paul's relationship to the Jerusalem leadership. One finds a profound agreement in the traditions with Paul's testimony in Galatians, but also departure. Five independent traditions counteract Paul's claim that he did not go to Jerusalem after his conversion. The purpose of Paul's visit is clear. He went to Jerusalem to have his call and Gospel legitimized—the very thing he denies in his letter to the Galatians (11-13). The picture created by canonical Acts of the perfectly harmonious relationship between Paul and Jerusalem is shown to be only half the truth. At the same time, the simplistic division of Baur to the effect that early Christianity was partitioned into two parties is shown to be false. The Jerusalem leaders acknowledge Paul, although because of a disagreement with Peter (when?) over the matter of the Law, Paul may have later worked independently of it. The scope of division seems confined to Peter and does not include James. Most important is that the controversy is over the relationship of the Gentiles to the Law; it is not a Christological controversy.

The traditions make a startling admission about Paul's apostolic career, namely, that he took the mission to the Gentiles *before* Peter. Since Peter was a

239 See Is. 49.1.6, Jer. 1.5, Ezek 1.28, 2.1-3, Acts 9.15, Rom. 11.25, Gal. 1.12; Rom. 16.25, Gal. 1.6, Jouette M. Bassler and others, *Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 145, Johan Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), *passim*.

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

principle player in the early Christian movement, by placing Paul *before* Peter, the ancient sources in effect saddle Paul with the responsibility of the Gentile mission. Even if Paul did not initiate it, he was its principle architect, advocate, and representative.

The book of Acts implies a different scheme, that Paul went first to Jews and then, because of their rejection, to the Gentiles. It also envisages a Hellenistic Christianity that antedates Paul. There are good reasons for thinking that this scheme is incorrect. There is no evidence for a pre-Pauline Hellenistic Christianity. Hengel has argued powerfully for the view that Paul was converted within at most three to five years of the emergence of Christianity.²⁴¹ That seems in keeping with what our sources reveal. Shortly after conversion, his prominent credentials as a Pharisee propelled Paul to a senior rank within the movement (I am using the language of hierarchy to make a point). Under the direction of James and Peter, Paul along with Barnabas (who may have introduced Paul to Christianity) was given the authority to take the message to Gentiles in the form of an organized mission. Christian mission may well have been unorganized before Paul.

There is no reason to think that Paul worked on his own authority but as time evolved, it became clear that Paul's vision of the mission exceeded the bounds of what was considered proper by *some* Jews within the movement, which led to conflict. The debate was not about the inclusion of the Gentiles (no one had ever excluded them) but about the scope and condition of their inclusion. Paul's genius, lies in the judgment I believe he proposed, that Gentiles did not have to adhere to the Law to be included in the movement. At a meeting in Jerusalem, Paul argued that the Law be regarded as redundant *for Gentiles*. James ratified this resolution and instructed Paul and Barnabas to convey it to the Churches on their travels. Their missionary journeys may have been sanctioned for this very purpose. James could not have foreseen the

241 Martin Hengel, *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity*, 1st Fortress Press ed. ([Philadelphia]: Fortress, 1983).

implications of his action, which only become apparent afterwards, that if the Law is no longer necessary for Gentiles, it cannot be necessary for Jews either. When this later became a problem, some blamed Paul. In my view, Paul did not see Christianity as a new religion, *but when it became clear that that is what it had become, Paul resigned himself to it.*

All of our sources show that Paul traveled widely but when the accounts are stripped bare of redactions, they reveal little more than that Paul traveled to various places and preached the Gospel in them. It may be that in some cases Paul's travels have been reconstructed from letters he is known to have written.

The sources reveal also the complex nature of Paul's personal relationships. They reveal *a pattern of alienation*. John Mark deserted, as did Barnabas. Demas and Hermogenes are enemies of Paul. Peter too stands *condemned*. The sources also reveal that Paul was extremely unpopular outside of the movement (traditions 59-73) and that he caused much trouble. There are several arrests, trials, attempted lynchings, scourging, stoning, riots, etc. In almost all these instances, the opposition is from Greeks *not Jews*. The two reasons alleged for Paul's unpopularity (apart from the Christian claim that Paul was being persecuted for his faith) are that Paul was a Sorcerer (he performed magic and miracles, etc—see traditions 50, 54 and 80) and that he contended with the Jews on the subject of the Law. Modern critics know the second charge well enough, but give the first scant attention. In future, scholars must pay more attention to Paul the miracle worker.²⁴²

The Ancient Paul challenges those who assert Paul was disinterested in the historical Jesus

One of the outstanding finds of this study has been in the relationship of Paul to the historical Jesus (tradition 18). Scholars have regarded the absence of unambiguous reference to the teaching of Jesus in Paul's letters as an

242 Ashton's work is a courageous start, although his comparison of Paul with a Shaman seems to me to be misguided.

enigma.²⁴³ If Paul stood in continuity with the early Christian Church one would expect him to have made extensive use of the sayings of Jesus. From the Gnostic texts, especially the Gospel of Thomas and from the Gospel according to the Hebrews cited by Jerome, I have shown that Paul knows at least three sayings of the historical Jesus that one cannot find in the canonical Gospels. Paul cites the saying in the Gospel of Thomas, "What eye has not seen or ear has not heard." This saying did not originate with Paul, but has its origin in Jesus. In addition, one finds the saying of Jesus, "When you make the male and the female one and the same." Finally, there is the saying on circumcision, "Rather, the true circumcision in spirit has become completely profitable" (Gos. Thom. 53).

The startling conclusion is that there exists in Paul's writings sayings of Jesus that have derived from a Jesus tradition, albeit a Jesus tradition not identical with that contained in the Synoptic Gospels, leaving open the possibility that other sayings of Jesus exist in the Pauline text which are not clearly identified as such by Paul. If Koester is correct that an early version of the Gospel of Thomas existed *circa* 50 AD, it is probable that Paul had contact with this Gospel or at least with the tradition that led to its formation. The provenance (Syria/Palestine) is consonant with what we know of Paul's activities. One should also keep in mind that Paul belongs to the earliest stage in the Christian movement, before it had a chance to form a body of sayings and stories of Jesus.

The Ancient Paul challenges the modern critical rejection of the Pastoral Letters, Ephesians, and Colossians as non-Pauline

Of the various Schools that championed Paul, all of them, with one

243 See John W. Fraser, "Paul's Knowledge of Jesus: II Corinthians V.16 Once More," *New Testament Studies* 17 (1970-1971). I do not agree with those who believe Paul left behind the historical figure of Jesus. As I see it, this figure had not yet been formed. Here I disagree with van den Heever and Scheffler, 92, 121.

exception, know of Paul the letter writer. Only canonical Acts makes no mention directly or indirectly (through citations and allusions to the Pauline Corpus) of Paul the letter writer. I argued earlier that this could only be explained if one assumes that Luke is writing at a time when the Pauline Corpus had not yet been collated or when these letters were not yet considered authoritative. In addition, even though the Apostolic Fathers know that Paul wrote letters and make some use of those letters, they do not hold up Paul's letter writing as a matter of great importance (with the possible exception of Polycarp). Aside from Three Corinthians, Paul as a letter writer is not known in the Apocryphal writings.

The inescapable conclusion is that at some point, someone (Marcion?) collected Paul's letters and that that collection later changed the way in which these groups related to and perceived Paul. In this regard, Marcion is once again the pristine modern critic. For moderns, Paul's greatness lies in his letters (not even the Gnostics who used Paul's letters extensively believed this). For the ancients (Marcion aside), Paul's greatness lay in his apostleship, call, mission and death.

What of the limits of the Pauline canon? Are modern scholars correct in asserting that only seven of the letters attributed to Paul in the New Testament were written by Paul? Marcion's canon, as I have shown, did not contain the Pastorals. Pagels asserts that the Gnostics rejected the Pastorals too, but I have demonstrated their use in early Gnostic sources. The Apostolic Fathers make frequent mention of the Pastorals and they represent a view of Paul that is close to the spirit of Paul's letters. Polycarp makes extensive use of Timothy, but even Clement, the earliest of the writers, has an unmistakable allusion to Titus. In terms of the order of usage, the Pastorals are second only to Corinthians in the Apostolic Fathers. The letters that preoccupy modern critics, *Thessalonians*, *Galatians*, and *Romans* gravitate to the bottom of the list. There are only two citations from *Romans*! The Apocryphal Acts also use the Pastorals, and I have shown that they contain at

least 16 reliable historical Pauline traditions. These facts *taken together* lead me to conclude that *the modern critical assessment of the Pastorals needs to be reassessed*. I have no doubt that many will balk at this suggestion (I balk at it myself) and if it seems ludicrous, I would remind the reader that just over a hundred years ago, van Manen argued²⁴⁴ with the same degree of confidence that marks the modern position, that Paul could not have written Romans, Galatians, First Corinthians and Second Corinthians!

If a case can be made for the Pastorals, an even greater case exists for Ephesians and Colossians since *all* ancient Schools who saw Paul as their champion, regarded Colossians and especially Ephesians as Pauline, including the great critic himself, Marcion. The shape of Pauline theology changes when these letters are included in the canon of the Critical Paul. Paul's struggle with the Law is balanced by other emphases, notably Christology and Ecclesiology.

The Ancient Paul challenges the commonly held belief that Paul's ministry ended at Rome

There can be no doubt that *someone* executed Paul for his faith, although the triple testimony to Paul's martyrdom in the Apostolic Fathers lacks details of the event: "he thus departed from the world" (Clement), he was "killed for God's sake" (Ign.) and he "suffered with the Lord." The Fathers only allude to the fact of Paul's Martyrdom, but know nothing of when, where, or how it happened. This is very strange if Nero executed Paul. Canonical Acts knows nothing of it either. Only the Apocryphal Acts offer details and one should treat their witness with skepticism. Koester proposes that Paul was probably martyred in Philippi, a tradition confirmed in the Pastorals and in Three Corinthians as well.²⁴⁵

The testimony that Paul went to Spain therefore deserves greater attention since two (quite different) independent witnesses support it.

244 W. C. van Manen, *Marcions Brief van Paulus aan de Galatiërs*, Theologisch tijdschrift, vol. 21 (Leiden: 1887), 528-533.

245 Koester, *Introduction*, 2d ed., 302-303.

The Ancient Paul challenges the modern hermeneutical key to Paul

A corollary to the point established previously, that many ancient Schools were disinterested in Paul the letter writer is the observation that the theology of Paul is absent from the presentations of Paul in these writings and cannot possible be reconstructed. Certain notable Pauline themes surface: the resurrection of the body, "God sent his Son", "turn from idols to a living God," "the wages of sin is death," but aside from Ignatius, most of the sources show no knowledge of or interest in Paul's theology. Marcion stands alone in this regard.

Luke, who could well lay claim to being the greatest Pauline devotee before Marcion is completely disinterested in Pauline theology. Is this because he had no access to it? More likely, Luke was disinterested in Paul's theology as a key to interpreting Paul. I find traces of Pauline theology—salvation by Grace, the resurrection of the dead—but nothing more significant.

The same can be said of Paul in the Apocryphal writings where the legendary concerns of the writers displace Paul's theology. Many of the Gnostic writings provide a mirror for Pauline theology but they were written at a much later stage and even then, the Gnostics were no fundamentalists. Paul's letters are interpreted *alongside* other esoteric traditions.

Paradoxically, the two Schools that show familiarity with the spirit of Paul's theology do so without showing reliance upon a Pauline Corpus, namely, the Apostolic Fathers and the Pseudo-Clementines, which leads to the following astonishing conclusion: had the Pauline Corpus not survived, one would not know anything about Pauline theology.

What does this have to say about the modern approach? I would like to draw an audacious conclusion: *Pauline theology is not necessary as an interpretive key for Paul.* Not only is it possible but fruitful to interpret Paul outside the context of his own theology and his own thoughts. The Schools of Paul, with one

exception, embraced Paul and appealed to his authority, but they were not slaves of Paul. The only one that fills that description is Marcion and his Pauline model collapsed *as will ours* if scholars persist with a strictly theological approach to the Pauline text. The Church Fathers realized in their wisdom that as important as Paul is, he could not be the Church's only authority, which is what happens when an unequal emphasis falls on his thinking. To balance this danger, the early Church, beginning with Luke and the Pastorals, and then Ignatius, and then Tertullian and Irenaeus, thoroughly *catholicized* Paul.

One of the more perceptive works on Paul in recent times is by Ashton²⁴⁶ who proposes an analogical comparison between the career of Paul and the career of a Shaman. At first, the work seems bizarre, but as Ashton unfolds his argument, it becomes compelling. He treats Paul's life in three sections, each corresponding to one of the three periods of the typical career of a Shaman. The most important contribution of the book is not the comparison drawn between Paul and the Shaman, but the freshness of Ashton's interpretive approach. Instead of going about his business by scrutinizing Paul's letters, he proposes an alternative key, Paul's *religion*. He writes the following:

If our primary concern is with Paul's religion, we should focus our attention not upon his published thoughts but upon the much less accessible *experiences* that underlie them.²⁴⁷

So authoritative has it (the theological interpretation of Paul) become that most of us accept it unquestioningly as the key, and indeed the only possible key, to understanding. We look at Paul's life through his own eyes and read it on his own terms. My intention ... is to find an alternative key by probing beneath the standard reading in search for a religious explanation of Paul's life and letters.²⁴⁸

246 John Ashton, *The Religion of Paul the Apostle* (New Haven; London: Yale University 2000).

247 Ibid.

248 Ibid.

Ashton is correct in asserting that today a *theological* approach dominates Pauline studies. Perhaps *theological* is the wrong word. *Atomic* is better. To be fair, the *theological* approach, as exemplified by the Fathers like Ignatius and Tertullian, does not resemble the modern approach of Pauline scholars in either its methods or conclusions. The *Atomic* approach to biblical texts was characteristic of the Arians and it is characteristic today of many scholars, *liberal, and conservative alike*. I owe the description "atomic" to Hanson,²⁴⁹ who describes the Arian hermeneutic as the tendency to interpret the Bible as if each verse or each set of verses was capable of giving direct information of Christian doctrine apart from its context, not only its immediate context, but apart from its broader theological context. Hanson writes, "The very reverence with which they honored the Bible as a sacred book, stood in their way of understanding it."²⁵⁰ In contrast to the Arians, the Pro-Nicenes realized that in their struggle to formulate dogma, they could not possibly confine their arguments to the words of Scripture, because the debate was about the meaning of the Bible. Any attempt to answer the problem in purely scriptural terms inevitably leaves still unanswered the question, "What does the Bible mean?" Hanson concludes by blaming the failure of the Arians on the fact that they were unable to get beyond the exclusive attention that they paid to the words of Scripture.

Pauline scholars should take note. Exclusive devotion to the Pauline letters creates a distorted vision of Paul and of Christian theology.²⁵¹ The early Church in all its various forms accepted Paul's letters as Scripture, but they

249 R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: the Arian Controversy 318-381* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988).

250 Ibid., 849.

251 The most significant works on Paul in the past hundred years are those that have provided an alternative hermeneutical key. For instance, Schweitzer's *Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* sought to interpret Paul, not along mystical lines (as the title of the great work suggests), but through the prism of Jewish apocalyptic. More recently, the work of the Sanders, which was an earthquake in Pauline studies, saw Sanders comparing Paul's religion with that of Palestinian Judaism. The strength of Sanders' book is that he spent more time analyzing Palestinian Judaism than he did Paul's letters and theology.

also realized that truth is not only about words, but also about the person, and never only in one person.

Appendix A

COMPLETE LIST OF PAULINE CITATIONS FROM THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS

Below is my list of Pauline citations from the Apostolic Fathers. Some citations, not from the Pauline Corpus, are included for their interest to Pauline studies.

Acts 2.24, Pol. Phil. 1.2.
Acts 10.42, Pol. Phil. 2.1, 2 Clem. 1.
Acts 21.14, Mart. Pol. 7.1.
Rom. 1.32, 1 Clem. 35.6.
Rom. 14.10,12, Pol. Phil. 6.2.
1 Cor. 1.20, Ign. Eph. 18.1.
1 Cor. 1.26, 1 Clem. 54.1.
1 Cor. 2.6, Ign. Eph. 19.1.
1 Cor. 2.9, 1 Clem. 34.8, Mart. Pol. 2.3.
1 Cor. 2.14-16, Ign. Eph. 8.2.
1 Cor. 4.1, Ign. Trall. 2.3.
1 Cor. 4.4, Ign. Rom. 5.1.
1 Cor 6.2, Pol. Phil. 11.2.
1 Cor. 6.7, Ign. Eph. 10.3.
1 Cor. 6.9, Ign. Phil. 3.3, 2 Clem. 11.7, 14.5, Pol. Phil. 5.3, Ign. Eph. 16.1.
1 Cor. 8.1, Diogn. 12.5.
1 Cor. 9.27, Ign. Trall. 12.3.
1 Cor. 12, 1 Clem. 37.5.
1 Cor. 14.25, Pol. Phil. 4.3.
1 Cor. 15.8, Ign. Rom. 9.2.
1 Cor 15.23, 1 Clem. 37.3.
1 Cor. 15.58, Pol. Phil. 10.1.
2 Cor. 4.14, Pol. Phil. 2.2.
2 Cor. 6.7, Pol. Phil. 4.1.
2 Cor. 10.1, Pol. Phil. 11.1.
Gal. 1.1, Pol. Phil. 12.2.
Gal. 4.26, Pol. Phil. 3.3.

Gal. 6.7, Pol. Phil. 5.1.
 Eph. 2.5, 8-9, Pol. Phil. 1.3.
 Eph. 4.4-7, Clem. 46.6.
 Eph. 4.18, 2 Clem. 19.2.
 Eph. 4.26, Pol. Phil. 12.1.
 Eph. 5.21, Pol. Phil. 10.2.
 Eph. 5.25, 29, Ign. Pol. 5.1.
 Phil. 1.27, Pol. Phil. 5.2.
 Phil. 2.1, 1 Clem. 54.1—uncertain.
 Phil. 2.4, Mart. Pol. 1.2.
 Phil. 2.16, Pol. Phil. 9.2.
 Phil. 2.17, Ign. Rom. 2.2.
 Phil. 3.18, Pol. Phil. 12.3.
 Phil. 4.15, 1 Clem. 47.1.
 Col. 1.23, Ign. Eph. 10.1.
 1 Thess. 5.22, Pol. Phil. 11.1.
 2 Thess. 3.16, Pol. Phil. 11.3.
 1 Tim. 1.17, 2 Clem. 20.5.
 1 Tim. 3.5, Pol. Phil. 11.2.
 1 Tim. 3.8-13, Pol. Phil. 5.2.
 1 Tim. 6.7, Pol. Phil. 4.1.
 1 Tim. 6.10, Pol. Phil. 4.1.
 2 Tim. 2.12, Pol. Phil. 5.2.
 2 Tim. 4.10, Pol. Phil. 9.2.
 2 Tim. 3.5-6, Pol. Phil. 6.3.
 Tit. 3.1, 1 Clem. 2.7.
 Hebrews (General allusions), 1 Clem. 9-10.
 Heb. 1, 1 Clem. 36.
 Heb. 11.37, 1 Clem. 17.1.
 1 Pet. 3.18, Diogn. 9.2.
 1 Pet. 4.8, 2 Clem. 16.4, 1 Clem. 49.5.

Appendix B

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE HISTORICAL PAULINE TRADITIONS IN CANONICAL ACTS

In this Appendix, the reader will find detailed justification for and analysis of the Pauline traditions presented in chapter 7. Each Lukan Source is treated separately, and each tradition appears in its natural Lukan sequence as a unit. I have critically evaluated the historical probability of each unit according to the criteria of chapter one. Those traditions that appear below in **bold print** I hold to be historically probable. Traditions not in bold I regard as historically improbable. Units that have no explanatory criteria attached are so apparently probable or improbable that they need no explanation.

Here again are some of the main criteria I have used in selecting traditions:

Bracketing of Believability.

Criterion of Embarrassment.

Sequitur ("It follows").

Features of Legend.

Comparison with the Genuine Letters of Paul.

Non liquet.

Ideological Criticism.

There are several traditions below that could be true but there is no way of knowing for certain. In such cases, I have chosen *not* to regard the tradition as authentic, according to the criterion of *non liquet*.

List of Pauline Traditions in the Antiochene Source

1. **Paul was first called Saul** (Acts 8.58, 8.1). This I accept because it is attested in at least two independent traditions, the Pauline Source and the Apocalypse of Paul.
2. **The young Saul is complicit in Stephen's death** (Acts 7.58-8.1). This I accept because it is hardly something Luke would have invented of Paul (criterion of embarrassment).
3. **Saul persecuted Judean Christians** (Acts 8.3). This I accept because it is attested in two independent traditions, the Antiochene Source and the Pauline Source, and it is hardly something Luke would have invented about Paul.
4. Barnabas goes to Tarsus to find Saul and brings him to Antioch. This I reject. It seems unbelievable to me that Barnabas would have gone

all the way to Tarsus to fetch Paul. Paul's letters also make no mention of this.

5. **Saul spends a year in Antioch** (Acts 11.25). This I accept because it is attested in two independent traditions: the Antiochene Source and the Pauline Source.
6. **Relief for Judean Christians at the hand of Barnabas and Saul** (Acts 11.27-30). This I accept because it is also attested in Paul's letters (1 Cor. 16.15, 2 Cor. 8.4, 9.1-13, Rom 15.31).
7. **Saul and Barnabas go to Jerusalem for a meeting to discuss the mission to Gentiles** (Acts 15.3-5). This I accept because it is confirmed in Galatians 2.
8. **Saul and Barnabas are welcomed by the Church, Apostles, and elders** (Acts 15.4). This I accept because it is attested in two independent traditions, the Antiochene Source and the "We" Source. It also follows (*Sequitur*).
9. **Saul and Barnabas relate their message among the Gentiles** (Acts 15.12). *Sequitur*.
10. **Resolution reached by James** (Acts 15.18-20, 15.28-29). *Sequitur*.
11. **The delegates Judas and Silas are chosen to accompany Saul and Barnabas to Antioch** (Acts 15.22-23). *Sequitur*.
12. **Saul, Barnabas, and delegates return to Antioch and read a letter containing the resolutions** (Acts 15.23-29). This I accept because it is attested in two independent traditions, the Antiochene Source and Pauline Source. *Sequitur*.

List of Pauline Traditions in the Pauline Source (Pauline Source)

1. Saul seeks out the High Priest for letters to Damascus synagogues (Acts 9.1). I reject this since the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin did not extend to Damascus.²⁵²
2. **Near Damascus, Saul has a religious conversion** (Acts 9.3-8). I accept this tradition as it is confirmed in the Apocryphal Acts. With Dibelius, I reject three separate sources for the three accounts of

252 Lüdemann, *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary*, 106.

Paul's conversion in Acts.²⁵³

3. **Saul sees Jesus** and is blinded for three days (Acts 9.8-9). The second part of this unit is legend.
4. **Saul hails from Tarsus** (Acts 9.1). Few have questioned that Paul came from Tarsus (with the exception of Koester²⁵⁴) and yet Paul does not refer in his letters to Tarsus as his place of birth. The only allusion is Galatians 1.21 where Paul speaks of his travels and not of his upbringing. Even here, the reference is to Cilicia of which Tarsus was capital and not to Tarsus proper. Overall, there are a handful of references in Acts: Acts 9.11, 9.30, 11.25, 21.39, 22.3, of which three associate Tarsus directly with Paul's birthplace. Acts 9.30 and 11.25 refer, like Galatians 1.21, to travels and not to a place of origin, although these passages do imply that Paul was engaged in missionary activities at home. However, the mention of Tarsus in the Apocalypse of Paul places the burden of proof on those who deny Tarsus as Paul's place of birth.

Strabo says that Tarsus surpassed Athens and Alexandria as a center of culture and learning (Strabo 14.5.13; also Dio Chrysostom, Or. 33.34). It was a city with important Jewish connections. According to Ramsay, Antiochus Epiphanes provided the occasion for introducing many new colonists into Tarsus, many of whom were Jews. They were given citizenship rights as a body and were enrolled in a civic "tribe" of their own.²⁵⁵ If true, it would make Paul a citizen of Tarsus and not merely a descendant. Tarsus also played an important role in Roman politics from the end of the Republic to the beginning of the Augustine Principate. In 67 BC, Pompey made Tarsus capital of Cilicia during his expulsion of pirates from the Mediterranean. Cicero resided as Proconsul in the city between 51-50 and was noted for his lenient rule. In 47 BC, Julius Caesar met with representatives of the province and the city assumed the title Iuliopolis. Six years later Mark Anthony rewarded the city for siding with him against Cassius in the civil war and it was exempted from paying taxes. It was then that the famous meeting of Anthony and Cleopatra took place when she came to Tarsus sailing up the Cydnus adorned as Aphrodite. Finally, mention may be made of Roman Citizenship being bestowed by Augustus on a large number of the citizens in Tarsus because of their positive attitude to Rome in the period before the Principate.

5. **Saul persecuted Judean Christians** (Acts 9.13). This may well be

253 Dibelius, 117.

254 Koester, Introduction, 2d ed., 106-107.

255 William Mitchell Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen*, 7th ed. (London: 1903), 32.

true despite Paul's plea that he was unknown to the Churches in Judea (Gal. 1.22).

6. **Saul is baptized by Ananias** (Acts 9.18). The Ananias tradition has three core features. First, the existence of a disciple named Ananias who lived in Damascus. Second, Paul stayed with him and recovered from his Damascus experience. Third, he baptized Paul. All three are certain because why would anyone have wanted to link Paul to an obscure figure named Ananias?²⁵⁶
7. **Saul preaches in the synagogues of Damascus** (Acts 9.20-22). *Sequitur.*
8. **The Jews plot to kill Saul but he escapes via a basket** (Acts 9.23). This incident, related by Paul in Second Corinthians 11.33 is too bizarre to have been invented.
9. **Saul goes to Jerusalem but the disciples are afraid to receive him** (Acts 9.26). I accept this because of its believability—*contra* Lüdemann who regards Acts 9.26-30 as Lukan redaction.²⁵⁷
10. **Barnabas introduces Saul to the Apostles** (Acts 9.27-28). This is attested in three sources, the Antiochene Source, the Pauline Source, and Galatians 2.1.
11. **Saul escapes a plot by the Hellenists** (Acts 9.28). Why would Luke invent a controversy with the Hellenists?
12. **Saul goes to Tarsus** (Acts 9.30).
13. **Saul is associated with the Church at Antioch and Barnabas** (Acts 13.1). This is attested in two sources: the Antiochene Source and Pauline Source. Compare Galatians 2.1,11. The list of prophets and teachers at Antioch (Acts 13.1-2) must be historical.²⁵⁸ Again, why would someone have invented it?
14. Mission 1: Saul and Barnabas go to Cyprus (Acts 13). *Non liquet.*
15. **Saul and Barnabas assisted by John** (Acts 13.5). *Sequitur.*
16. Saul blinds Elymas the magician (Acts 13.6-12). I reject this as it

256 Lüdemann, *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary*, 106-113.

257 Ibid., 111.

258 Koester, *Introduction*, 2d ed., 323.

contains features of legend.

17. Sergius Paulus is converted (Acts 13.6-12). One cannot rule out the possibility that Sergius was converted but more likely, Luke constructs the conversion to show that prominent people embrace Christianity. *Non liquet.*
18. At Perga, **John deserts** for Jerusalem (Acts 13.14). This is a major embarrassment for Paul.
19. **Paul and Barnabas go to Psidian Antioch** (Acts 13.15). The journeys to Antioch and Iconium and Lystra are found in Second Timothy 3.11 and in the Acts of Paul.
20. Paul and company enter a Synagogue, Paul preaches, people convert, others resist, they are forced to flee (Acts 13.16b-51). I reject this unit. That Paul encountered opposition on his missions is certain. That it occurred in every city and followed the same pattern seems improbable. The formula, "Enter synagogue, Paul preaches, conversions, resistance, forced to flee" belongs to the ignoble pattern of anti-Semitism in Acts.
21. Paul and Barnabas decide to take the message from now on to Gentiles (Acts 13.46-8). This contradicts Acts 18.6.
22. **Paul and Barnabas go to Iconium** (Acts 13.51). *Sequitur.*
23. **Paul and Barnabas perform signs and wonders** (Acts 14.3). That Paul worked miracles is confirmed in the Apocryphal Acts and in Paul's letters.
24. **Paul and Barnabas are called "Apostles"** (Acts 14.4). Luke only here refers to Paul as an Apostle. The tradition must come from Luke's source.²⁵⁹ I agree with de Boer that although essentially denied the honored title "Apostle," Paul is very much an Apostle like figure in Acts.²⁶⁰
25. **Resistance from Jews and Gentiles, forced to flee** (Acts 14.6).
26. Paul and Barnabas flee to Lystra (Acts 14.6). *Non Liquet.*
27. Paul heals a cripple (Acts 14.8-10). This is legend.

²⁵⁹ Ibid.

²⁶⁰ M.C. de Boer, "Images of Paul in the Post-Pauline Period," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42, no. 42 (1980): 366.

28. **The Greeks regard Paul and Barnabas to be gods** (Acts 14.11-13). This is undoubtedly true. It is both believable and embarrassing. The early Church with its strong monotheistic belief would hardly have invented a tradition where its leaders are identified with gods.
29. **Paul tells the Greeks to turn from idols to a Living God** (Acts 14.15). This is a well-known Pauline exhortation (1 Thess. 1.9).
30. **Paul is stoned** (Acts 14.19). This is confirmed in Second Corinthians 11.25.
31. **Paul and Barnabas appoint elders in Derbe, Lystra, and Iconium** (Acts 14.23). *Sequitur.*
32. **Paul and Barnabas return to Antioch** (Acts 14.24-28). *Sequitur.*
33. **Paul and Barnabas spend time in Antioch** (Acts 14.28). *Sequitur.*
34. **Paul and Barnabas split over John Mark** (Acts 15.36-39). This is both believable and embarrassing.
35. **Paul circumcises Timothy** (Acts 16.3). This is unbelievable and therefore true.
36. **Paul delivers to the churches the resolutions of the Conference** (Acts 16.4). This appears to be the motivation for Paul's second Mission. He and Barnabas were instructed by James to convey the decisions of the Jerusalem council to the Churches.
37. Prevented from going to Asia and Bythinia (Acts 16.6-7). *Non liquet.*
38. Vision at Troas of a man pleading for Paul to come to Macedonia (Acts 16.8). I agree with Dibelius that Luke suppressed tradition in these verses to pave the way for Paul's entry into Greece.²⁶¹
39. **At Philippi, Paul exorcises a slave girl** (Acts 16.18).
40. **Paul and Silas are beaten and imprisoned** (Acts 16.18-24). This is confirmed in First Thessalonians 2.2,2.
41. An earthquake delivers them from bonds (Acts 16.26). This is legend.
42. The Philippian jailer is converted and baptized (Acts 16.25-33). This is not believable. *Non liquet.*

261 Dibelius, 176, 197.

43. Paul reveals his Roman citizenship (Acts 16.37, Acts 22.25-29). *Non-sequitur*. Why would Paul reveal his citizenship *after* being beaten?
44. **Paul and Silas are released by magistrates** (Acts 16.39). *Sequitur*.
45. **Paul and Silas come to Thessalonica** (Acts 17.1-2). *Sequitur*. This is confirmed in First Thessalonians 2.9 and Philippians 14.16.
46. **A crowd attacks Jason's house** (Acts 17.5-6). On Jason, see Romans 16.21.
47. **Paul and Silas flee to Beroea** (Acts 17.10-12). *Sequitur*.
48. Silas and Timothy remain at Beroea (Acts 17.14-15). This contradicts First Thessalonians 3.2.
49. **Paul goes to Athens and is provoked by idols** (Acts 17.16). Dibelius accepts Paul's visit to Athens as part of the Itinerary. It must have been historical since the mission to Athens was a failure.
50. **Paul argues in synagogue and market place** (Acts 17.17).
51. **Paul preaches Jesus and the Resurrection** (Acts 17.18).
52. **Paul preaches at the Areopagus** (Acts 17.22).
53. Dionysius and Damaris join Paul (Acts 17.32-34). *Non liquet*.
54. **Paul goes to Corinth** (Acts 18.1).
55. **Paul meets Aquila and Priscilla** (Acts 18.2).
56. **Claudius expels Jews from Rome** (Acts 18.2). This is confirmed by Seutonius, Claud. 25.4, "*Iudeos impulsore Chresto adsidue tumultuantes Roma expulit*." Although not a Pauline tradition, this serves to witness to this source's historical reliability. The event took place *circa* 41-54 AD.
57. **Paul is a tent maker** (Acts 18.3).
58. Paul is joined in Corinth by Silas and Timothy (Acts 18.5). *Non liquet*.
59. Paul decides to take the message from now on to Gentiles (Acts 18.6, 13.46-48). Paul's letters suggest that he had the Gentiles in mind from the start of his ministry.
60. Crispus the ruler of the synagogue is converted and baptized (Acts

18.8).

61. **Paul remains a year and six months in Corinth** (Acts 18.11).
62. **Paul brought before Tribunal during the proconsulship of Gallio** (Acts 18.12). Gallio's proconsulship (*circa* 51 AD) is confirmed in inscriptions.
63. **Paul takes a Nazarite vow at Cenchreae** (Acts 18.19). This is a major embarrassment to the Paul of the letters.
64. Paul encounters disciples of John **at Ephesus** (Acts 19.1-7).
65. **Paul works gifts and prophecies** (Acts 19.6).
66. Paul spends three months preaching in the synagogue (Acts 19.8). *Non liquet*.
67. **Paul preaches in the hall of Tyrannus for two years** (Acts 19.9).
68. **Paul works miracles** (Acts 19.11-12).
69. The seven sons of Sceva are overpowered by demons (Acts 19.13-17). Dibelius regards this as originally a non-Christian story.²⁶²
70. Book on magic are publicly burned (Acts 19.19). *Non liquet*.
71. **Demetrius the Silversmith provokes a riot** (Acts 19.23-34).
72. **Paul leaves Ephesus for Macedonia** (Acts 20.1). *Sequitur*.
73. At Troas Eutychus **falls out the window while Paul is preaching** (Acts 20.9-12). The non-devotional style points to its historicity.²⁶³
74. **Paul goes to Jerusalem and relates his ministry to the elders** (Acts 21.19).
75. **Opposition to Paul ensues** (Acts 21.21).
76. **Paul takes a vow** with four other men (Acts 21.26). This is a major embarrassment to the Paul of the letters.
77. **Jews from Asia cause a riot**. Paul is dragged from the temple and

262 Ibid., 19.

263 Ibid.

beaten (Acts 21.32). *Sequitur*.

78. **Paul is arrested** (Acts 21.34).
79. Paul speaks Hebrew (Acts 21.40). From his letters one can tell that Paul's first language is Greek. They betray no knowledge of either Hebrew or Aramaic. The style of his arguments is that of the Greek Diatribe and he only quotes from *Greek* versions of the Jewish Sacred Scriptures, mostly the LXX, even where they differ from the Hebrew text(s).²⁶⁴
80. Paul is not the Egyptian who stirred up revolt (Acts 21.38). This revolt is confirmed by Josephus Ant. 20.8.6.
81. Paul as a Roman citizen avoids scourging (Acts 22.25-29). Paul is silent about his Roman citizenship. Can Roman citizens be flogged three times? Not according to Cicero.²⁶⁵ Paul's appeal to Caesar is not proof Paul was a Roman Citizen since any free subject had the right of appeal.
82. Paul is struck on the mouth by the High Priest Ananias (Acts 23.2). The Western Text omits "Ananias."
83. **Paul is a Pharisee and a son of Pharisees** (Acts 23.6). I accept this tradition but it is not without its problems.²⁶⁶ See chapter 10.
84. **Paul preaches hope and resurrection** (Acts 23.6).
85. A plot by 40 Jews to kill Paul is averted by Paul's nephew (Acts 23.12-16). I reject this according to the criterion of *Ideological Criticism*. This reveals Luke at his most anti-Semitic. Sadly, canonical Acts flagrantly characterizes the Jews as Christ killers and persecutors of Christians, "This man you crucified and killed by the hands of those outside the Law" (Acts 2.36, 4.10). Even when Paul is faced with opposition by Greeks or Roman, the Jews have instigated it. They "hatch plots," "plan to murder," "are filled with jealousy and

264 The thesis of W. C. van Unnik: "It can safely be said, that Aramaic was Paul's earliest and principle tongue" is unacceptable. Unnik is quoted and discussed sympathetically by Martin Hengel, *The Pre-Christian Paul* (London: SCM, 1991), 22-23.

265 Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 189.

266 So also van den Heever: "Although both Paul and Josephus say that they were once Pharisees, they never again refer to Pharisaism as part of their identities." van den Heever and Scheffler, 63.

blaspheming," "stir up the Gentiles and poison their minds," etc. Luke only likes Jews when they become Christians. The Romans on the other hand are sympathetically portrayed. The Roman procurator Sergius Paulus is converted (Acts 13.7); the proconsul Gallio dismisses a complaint against Paul (Acts 18); the Asiarchs (whose task it was to promote the cult of the Emperor) are friendly to Paul (Acts 19.31); the town clerk of Ephesus defends Christians against the charge of profanation (Acts 19.35); the tribune of Jerusalem, Claudius Lysias (Acts 23); and finally, as a prisoner in Rome, the *Romanus Civis Paulus* is allowed to carry out his work unhindered.²⁶⁷

86. **Paul is taken to Felix the Governor at Caesarea** (Acts 23.24). The governorship is confirmed by Tacitus *circa* 52-60 AD (Tac. Hist. 5.9).
87. **Paul is guarded in Herod's Praetorium** (Acts 23.35). *Sequitur.*
88. Ananias comes to Caesarea to lay his case against Paul (Acts 24.1). *Non liquet.*
89. **Paul remains in prison for two years** (Acts 24.27). Bracketing of believability.
90. **Porcius Festus succeeds Felix** (Acts 24.27). This is confirmed by Josephus JW 2.14.11.
91. **Paul appears before Festus and appeals to Caesar** (Acts 25.1-11). *Sequitur.*
92. Paul presents his case to King Agrippa and Bernice (Acts 25.13, 14a-23). Agrippa and Bernice are referred to by Josephus, JW 2.9.6 but I am not convinced they would have heard Paul's case. *Non liquet.*
93. Festus thinks Paul is mad, Agrippa thinks Paul is innocent (Acts 25.13-32). The first is possible, the second unlikely. *Non liquet.*
94. On route to Rome, Paul is bitten by snake but unharmed (Acts 28.3-6). This is legend.
95. Paul rebukes the Jews (Acts 28.28). This is a Lukan redaction. (See below.)
96. **Paul arrives in Rome** and lives there for two years at his own expense (Acts 28.30). The second part of the tradition is possible but beyond proof. I therefore rejected it.

²⁶⁷ Haenchen, 103. See also Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, 15.

List of Pauline Traditions in the "We" Passages

1. **Paul resolves to go to Macedonia** (Acts 16.10).
2. Various travels. **Arrives at Philippi**.
3. **Lydia is converted and baptized** (Acts 16.14-15). That this is historical "is supported not only by the name (Lydia) but by the specific remark that she is a dealer in purple."²⁶⁸
4. **They encounter a slave girl** (Acts 16.16-17). *Sequitur*.
5. Paul is warned through the Spirit not to go to Jerusalem (Acts 21.4).
6. Paul stays with Philip the evangelist at Caesarea (Acts 21.8). This is Luke's attempt to link Paul's ministry to that of other key figures in Acts.
7. **Paul stays with an "early disciple" Mnason of Cyprus in Jerusalem** (Acts 21.16). I cannot see why anyone would have wanted to invent this.
8. **Paul is welcomed and meets James with elders present** (Acts 21.10-12). This is attested in three independent traditions, the Antiochene Source, the Pauline Source, and "We" Source.
9. Paul falls into a trance. This could be historical. *Non Liquet*.
10. **Paul delivered to the Augustan Cohort Julius and sails for Rome** (Acts 27.1).
11. **Paul is shipwrecked** (Acts 27.13-20). This is confirmed in Paul's letters. The narrative cannot be trusted in its entirety.
12. **All escape to Malta** (Acts 27.44). *Sequitur*. Warnecke has argued that the Island in question is Kefalinia, near Ithaca, known in antiquity as "Melaena."²⁶⁹ I hail from this Island!
13. At Malta, Paul heals the chief's father and others (Acts 28.7-9). This is legend.

268 Lüdemann, *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary*, 183.

269 Heinz Warnecke and Thomas Schirrmacher, *War Paulus wirklich auf Malta?*, Kirchen- und Missionsgeschichte (Hänsler: Theologie für die Gemeinde, 1992).

14. **Paul comes to Rome and is placed under house arrest** (Acts 28.16).

List of Pauline Traditions that Qualify as Lukan Redactions

Lukan redaction reveals much of Luke's concerns as a theologian. Of the Pauline material in Acts, I regard the following as the more important Lukan redactions.

1. The Church in Judea and Galilee and Samaria had peace (Acts 9.31).
2. Paul's speech at Psidian Antioch (Acts 13.42).
3. Barnabas and Paul rebut the Lycaonians (Acts 14.17).
4. Luke's Summary of the circumcision question that is debated in Antioch (Acts 15.1-2).
5. Peter's speech at the conference (Acts 15.7-11).
6. James' speech at the conference (Acts 15.13-21).
7. Town clerks' speech at Ephesus (Acts 19.35-40).
8. Paul's farewell speech to the Ephesians (Acts 20.18b-35). This is important for its clear allusions to Paul's death, "I do not account my life of any value," "If I may accomplish my course," "they will see my face no more," and "after my departure."
9. Jerusalem elders charge Paul to take the vow with four others (Acts 21.20b-25).
10. Paul speaks to the people in Jerusalem following his arrest (Acts 22.13-22).
11. Luke portrays Paul in this speech as devoutly Jewish. Paul speaks Hebrew to the crowd, claims to have been brought up at the feet of

Gamaliel, and educated in the manner of Judaism.

12. Tertullus accuses Paul before Felix and Paul responds (Acts 24.2b-21, 24.9-21). Festus lays Paul's case before the King (Acts 24.14b-21a, 24.24-27).
13. Paul's defense before Agrippa (Acts 26.1-23).
14. Paul's speech to local Jewish leaders at Rome (Acts 26.17-29).
15. Lukan conclusion (Acts 28.30).

Bibliography

- Aland, Barbara. "Marcion: Versuch einer neuen Interpretation." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 70 (1973): 420-447.
- Aland, Kurt. *The Greek New Testament*. 3d ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1983.
- Alexander, Patrick H., and Society of Biblical Literature. *The SBL Handbook of Style: for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999.
- Ashton, John. *The Religion of Paul the Apostle*. New Haven; London: Yale University 2000.
- Aymer, M.P. "Hailstorms and Fireballs: Redaction, World Creation, and Resistance in the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*." *Semeia* 79, no. 79 (1997): 45-61.
- Balás, D.L. "Marcion Revisited: A Post-Harnack Perspective." In *Texts and Testament: Critical Essays on the Bible and Early Church Fathers*, ed. W. E. March. San Antonio: Trinity University 1980.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Bassler, Jouette M., David M. Hay, E. Elizabeth Johnson, and J. Paul Sampley. *Pauline Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Baur, Ferdinand Christian. "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christentums in der alten Kirche, der Apostel in Rom." *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* (1831).

Beker, Johan Christiaan. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Blackman, E. C. *Marcion and His Influence*. London: SPCK, 1944.

Bornkamm, G. *Paul*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971.

Boughton, L.C. "From Pious Legend to Feminist fantasy: Distinguishing Hagiographical License from Apostolic Practice in the Acts of Paul/ Acts of Thecla." *Journal of Religion* 71, no. 3 (1991): 362-383.

Boyarín, Daniel. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California 1997.

Brown, Raymond Edward. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

Bultmann, Rudolf. "Ignatius and Paul." In *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann*, 316-329. London: Collins, 1960.

Campanhausen, Hans. *The Formation of the Christian Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.

Clabeaux, J. J. "A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus Attested by Marcion." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series* 21 (1989): 40-46, 52.

_____. "Marcion." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 4. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

- Comninos, PCR. "Was Paul Saul?: The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Second Temple Judaism." University of the Witwatersrand, 1997.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Crossan, John Dominic. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Dahl, N. A. "The Origin of the Earliest Prologues to the Pauline Letters." *Semeia* 12, no. 233-277 (1978).
- de Boer, M.C. "Images of Paul in the Post-Pauline Period." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42, no. 42 (1980): 359-80.
- Dibelius, Martin. *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. London: SCM, 1956.
- Dittenburger, W. *Orientis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae*. Leipzig, 1903.
- Dodd, C. H. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1963.
- Donovan, M.A. "Irenaeus in Recent Scholarship." *The Second Century* 4, no. 4 (1984): 219-241.
- Drijvers, H. J. W. "Marcionism in Syria: Principles, Problems, Polemics." *The Second Century* 6, no. 6 (1987): 153-172.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox 1990.

Efroymsen, D. P. "Tertullian's Anti-Jewish Rhetoric: Guilt by Association." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 36, no. 1 (1980): 25-37.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. 2d ed. New York: Oxford University 2000.

Elliott, J. K., and M. R. James. *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*. Oxford: Clarendon 1993.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 1st ed. New York: Doubleday, 1998.

Flusser, D. "Paul's Jewish-Christian Opponents in the Didache." In *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. J.A. Draper. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.

Fraser, John W. "Paul's Knowledge of Jesus: II Corinthians V.16 Once More." *New Testament Studies* 17 (1970-1971): 293-313.

Freedman, David Noel. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 1st ed. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

The Anchor Bible Dictionary. electronic ed. Doubleday, New York.

Frend, W. H. C. "Marcion." *Expository Times* 80, no. 11 (1969): 330.

Gager, John G. "Marcion and Philosophy." *Vigiliae Christianae* 26, no. 1 (1972).

_____. *Reinventing Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University 2000.

Getty, Mary Ann. "Paul and the Salvation of Israel: A Perspective on Romans 9-11." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 456.

Grant, Robert M. "The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Philip." *Vigiliae Christianae* 15 (1961): 129-140.

_____. "The Description of Paul in the Acts of Paul and Thecla." *Vigiliae Christianae* 36, no. 36 (1982): 1-4.

Grant, Robert McQueen. *The Letter and the Spirit*. London: SPCK, 1957.

Gunther, J. J. "Syrian Christian Dualism." *Vigiliae Christianae* 25, no. 2 (1971): 81-93.

Haenchen, E. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Translated by R. McL Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.

Hanson, R. P. C. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: the Arian Controversy 318-381*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.

Harnack, Adolf von. *The History of Dogma*. Vol. 1. Boston, 1897.

_____. *Neue Studien zu Marcion*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1923.

_____. *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*. 2d ed. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1924.

_____. *Marcion: Gospel of the Alien God*. Durham: Labyrinth, 1989.

Harnack, Adolf von, William Douglas Morrison, and John Richard Wilkinson. *Luke the Physician: The Author of the Third Gospel and the Acts of the*

Apostles New Testament Studies; 1, ed. Adolf von Harnack. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1908.

Hengel, Martin. *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity*. 1st Fortress Press ed. [Philadelphia]: Fortress, 1983.

_____. *The Pre-Christian Paul*. London: SCM, 1991.

Hennecke, Edgar, and Wilhelm Schneemelcher. *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*. 5th ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1987.

Herczeg, P. "New Testament Parallels to the Acta Pauli Documents." In *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla*, ed. J.N. Bremmer, 142-149. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.

Hoffman, R. J. *Marcion and the Restitution of Christianity*. Chico, California: Scholars, 1984.

_____. "How then Know This Troublous Teacher? Further Reflections on Marcion and His Church." *Second Century* 6, no. 3 (1987/1988): 173-191.

Holmes, Michael William. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Updated ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1999.

Hovhannessian, Vahan. *Third Corinthians: Reclaiming Paul for Christian Orthodoxy*. Vol. 18 Studies in Biblical Literature. New York: P. Lang, 2000.

Howe, E.M. "The Acts of Paul and Thecla." In *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to Professor F.F. Bruce on His 70th Birthday*, ed. D.A. Hagner, 33-49. Exeter: Paternoster, 1980.

James, M. R. *The Apocryphal New Testament Being the Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, Epistles and Apocalypses: with Other Narratives and Fragments*. Oxford: Clarendon 1969.

Jones, F. S. The Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, Accessed. Available from <http://www.cgu.edu/inst/iac/jewishchristianity.html>.

_____. "The Pseudo-Clementines: A History of Research." *The Second Century II*, no. 1 (1982): 1–33.

_____. "The Pseudo-Clementines: A History of Research Part II." *The Second Century II*, no. 2 (1982): 63–96.

Käsemann, E. "Paul and Early Catholicism." In *New Testament Questions of Today*, 236–251. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.

Knox, J. "Acts and the Pauline Letter Corpus." In *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn, 279–287. Nashville: Abingdon., 1966.

Knox, John. *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon*. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1942.

_____. *Chapters in a Life of Paul*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury 1950.

Knox, John, and Douglas R. A. Hare. *Chapters in a Life of Paul*. Rev. ed. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University 1987.

Koester, H. *Introduction to the New Testament: History and Literature of Early Christianity*. Vol. 2. 2d ed. New York: Walter De Gruyter, 2000.

Koester, Helmut. "Paul and Hellenism." In *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed. J.P. Hyatt, 187–195. London: Carey Kingsgate, 1965.

_____. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

_____. "From the Kerygma-Gospel to the Written Gospels." *New Testament Studies* 35, no. 3 (1989).

Kümmel, Werner Georg. *The New Testament: the History of the Investigation of its Problems*. 1st British ed. London: SCM, 1973.

Kümmel, Werner Georg, and Paul Feine. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Rev. ed. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon 1975.

Lightfoot, Joseph Barber. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 2d ed. London and New York,: Macmillan and co., 1885.

_____. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 2d ed., ed. J. R. Harmer. London: Macmillan and co., 1898.

Lindemann, Andreas. "Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers." In *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*, ed. W.S. Babcock, 25-45. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990.

Lindemann, Andreas ed. *Die Apostolischen Väter: Griechisch-deutsche Parallelausgabe*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1992.

Lüdemann, Gerd. *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology*. London: SCM, 1984.

_____. *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary*. London: SCM, 1989.

Lüdemann, Gerd, and M. Eugene Boring. *Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

Luttikhuizen, G. "The Apocryphal Correspondence with the Corinthians and the Acts of Paul." In *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla*, ed. J.N. Bremmer, 75-91. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.

MacDonald, Dennis Ronald. *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon*. 1st ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983.

Manen, W. C. van. *Marcions Brief van Paulus aan de Galatiërs*. Vol. 21 Theologisch tijdschrift. Leiden, 1887.

Martyn, J.L. "Paul and His Jewish-Christian Interpreters." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 42 (1988).

May, G. "Marcion in Contemporary Views: Results and Open Questions." *Second Century* 6, no. 3 (1987, 1988): 129-152.

McLaughlin, Eleanor, and Rosemary Radford Ruether. *Women of Spirit: Female Leadership in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979.

Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. 1st ed. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1991.

Meinardus, Otto Friedrich August. *St. Paul's Last Journey in the Footsteps of the Saints*. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Caratzas Bros, 1979.

Menard, Jacques E. *L'Evangile de verite*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.

Metzger, Bruce Manning. *The Canon of the New Testament: its Origin, Development, and Significance*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. *Paul: A Critical Life*. Oxford: Clarendon 1996.

Neill, Stephen, and Tom Wright. *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1986*. 2d ed. New York: Oxford University 1988.

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

_____. "The Epistle to Diognetus: Its Date and Relation to Marcion." *Anglican Theological Review* 52, no. 2 (1970): 77-91.

Pagels, Elaine H. *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline letters*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

Praeder, S.M. "The Problem of the First Person Narrative in Acts." *Novum Testamentum* 29, no. 3 (1987): 193-218.

Ramsay, William Mitchell. *The Church in the Roman Empire Before AD 170*. 2d ed. [S.l.: s.n.], 1893.

_____. *St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen*. 7th ed. London, 1903.

Rehm, Bernhard, ed. *Die Pseudoklementinen II: Rekognitionem in Rufins Übersetzung*. 2d ed., ed. F. Paschke. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1965.

_____. *Die Pseudoklementinen I: Homilien*. 2d ed., ed. J. Irmscher. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1969.

Robinson, James McConkey. *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus*. London: SCM, 1959.

Robinson, James McConkey, and Richard Smith. *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. 3d Rev. ed. Coptic Gnostic Library Project. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988.

Rordorf, W. "Die neronische Christenverfolgung im Spiegel der apocryphen Paulusakten." *New Testament Studies* 28 (1981): 365-374.

_____. "Tradition and Composition in the Acts of Thecla: The State of the Question." *Semeia* 38, no. 38 (1986): 43-52.

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

Rudolph, Kurt, and R. McL Wilson. *Gnosis: the Nature and History of An Ancient Religion*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1983.

Saldarini, A. J. "Review of Alan Segal's Paul the Convert - The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54 (1992): 588-590.

Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. 1st American ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

_____. *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Sandmel, S. "Parallelomania." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962): 1-13.

Schmidt, Carl. *Acta Pauli, aus der Heidelberger koptischen Papyrushandschrift Nr. 1*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965.

Schneemelcher, Wilhelm. *New Testament Apocrypha: Writings Relating to the Apostles; Apocalypses and Related Subjects*. Translated by R. McL Wilson. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Rev. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.

- Schoedel, William R., Ignatius, and Helmut Koester. *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim. *Paul: the Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*. Philadelphia: Westminster 1961.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. 2d ed. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1953.
- Segal, Alan F. *Paul the Convert: the Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven: Yale University 1990.
- Stendahl, Krister. *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles, and Other Essays*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Strecker, Georg. *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen*. 2d ed. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates*. New York: Macmillan, 1925.
- Tischendorf, Constantin von, Ricardus Adelbertus Lipsius, and Maximilianus Bonnet. *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*. Hildernheim: Olms, 1959.
- Torrance, Thomas. *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1948.
- Turabian, Kate. L. *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*. Chicago: University of Chicago 1993.

van den Heever, Gerhard, and Eben Scheffler. *From Jesus Christ to Christianity: Early Christian Literature in Context*. 1st ed. Pretoria: University of South Africa, 2001.

Warnecke, Heinz, and Thomas Schirrmacher. *War Paulus wirklich auf Malta?* Kirchen- und Missionsgeschichte. Hänssler: Theologie für die Gemeinde, 1992.

West, H. P. "A Primitive Version of Luke in the Composition of Matthew." *New Testament Studies* 14, no. 1 (1967): 75-95.

Westcott, B.F. *General Survey of the History of the New Testament Canon*. London, 1855, 1896.

Williams, C. S. C. "Eznik's Resume of Marcionite Doctrine." *Journal of Theological Studies* 45 (1944): 65-73.

Williams, D.S. "Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel." *JBL* 108, no. 3 (1989): 477-96.

Wilshire, L. E. "Was Canonical Luke Written in the Second Century? - A Continuing Discussion." *New Testament Studies* 20, no. 3 (1974): 246-253.

Wilson, S. G. "Marcion and the Jews." In *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity: Separation and Polemic*, 2. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University 1986.