

Criticism of the Pauline Epistles

3 sections in one volume

by

B. Bauer

Berlin, 1852

Published by Gustav Hempel
Reprint 1972 - Scientia Verlag Aalen

Machine translated by Neil Godfrey from
<https://archive.org/details/kritikderpaulini0000baue/page/n81/mode/2up> -
March 2023

Contents

First Section

The Origin of the Letter to the Galatians

Preface.....	Page 3
Introduction (1:6-10).....	" 8
The Call of the Apostle (1:11-16).....	" 13
The Apostle's Relationship with Jerusalem (1:17-2:14).....	" 15
The Theme of the Letter (2:15-21).....	" 27
Doctrinal Controversy (3:1-4:31).....	" 33
Exhortations and Conclusion (5-6).....	" 57

Second Section

Origin and Composition of the First Letter to the Corinthians

Introduction (1:1-9).....	Page 3
Factions in the Church (1:10-4:21).....	" 6
Concerning Immorality (5:1-6:20).....	" 34
Concerning Food Offered to Idols (8:7).....	" 42
Concerning Eating Meat Sacrificed to Idols (8:8-11:1).....	" 48
Concerning the Lord's Supper (11:2-34).....	" 62
Concerning Speaking in Tongues (12:1-14).....	" 66
The Resurrection (15).....	" 70
Conclusion (16).....	" 74

Third and Final Section.

The Second Letter to the Corinthians.....	Page 3
The Letter to the Romans.....	" 47
The Pastoral Letters.....	" 77
The Letters to the Thessalonians.....	" 89
The Letters to the Ephesians and Colossians.....	" 101
The Letter to the Philippians.....	" 110
Conclusion.....	" 118

Criticism of the Pauline Epistles

by

B. Bauer

First Section

The Origin of the Galatians Epistle

1850

3

Preface

We will put an end once and for all to the mistakes and unsuccessful attempts of the apologists, who started from the assumption that it is both possible and necessary to integrate the Pauline letters with their historical presuppositions into the historical course of Paul's life as reported in the Acts of the Apostles, through a correct framing of the question.

Having demonstrated the Acts of the Apostles as a work of free reflection, and moving on to the question of whether the four letters - (the letters to the Galatians, Romans, and the two Corinthians) - which have never before been suspected of inauthenticity, actually possess the character of Pauline originality so indisputably, as Dr. Baur suggests*, that it is impossible to imagine what right critical doubt could ever have against them, it is no longer conceivable to us to reconcile presuppositions of letters with the information provided by a work of historical fiction, which, to express it with caution, could also be spurious.

*) The Apostle Paul, p. 248.

If, however, these letters are proven to be spurious, then the real work of research takes the place of the chimerical efforts of theologians, which exposes and explains the contradiction between the historical presuppositions of the Acts of the Apostles and the so-called Pauline letters, thus abandoning the attempt to reconcile them and instead seeking the real historical relationship between the Pauline letters and the Acts of the Apostles.

The question properly framed is: which of these letters were written before the Acts of the Apostles, and which were written after? Which letters were known to the author of the Acts of the Apostles and served as its basis - and in which letters is there evidence of knowledge of the presuppositions of the Acts of the Apostles, and which of the authors of these letters had the historical work in mind and used it?

The overall subject of investigation is the historical sequence in which the letters and the Acts of the Apostles were written - dealing with the process of Christian consciousness that culminated in these works - as well as the relationship of these works to the Gospels.

While one of the most important sub-questions is whether the notes of the Church Fathers about the apostolic letter collection of Marcion are as reliable and indisputably secure as their accurate descriptions of the Gospel in his possession, the great and general interest of the following investigation lies in the fact that it will provide us with the knowledge of that revolution which still resonates and continues in the letters designated by the ecclesiastical canon as Pauline - and finally, it is not the least benefit of the correct framing of the question that we can search for and demonstrate the work of that Judaism, which we have demonstrated in the Acts of the Apostles - that Judaism which is the eternal opponent of original creation, self-power, equality, and pure, plastic form - that Judaism which, in the slackening of the present, finally believed to have found its true life element, now also in the letters that are supposed to originate from the first and greatest opponent of historical Judaism.

We begin with the letter to the Galatians.

While Dr. Baur*) identifies it as the document of Paul's first struggle with his Jewish-minded opponents, while according to de Wette's opinion**), "it bears so much the stamp of the spirit of the Apostle Paul that there is not even the slightest doubt against the ecclesiastical tradition that attributes it to him," while Nückert***) does not agree with Winer's judgment, who even places it above the letter to the Romans, but finds the presentation, "regarding the arrangement of the material, very excellent, the order of the topics well thought-out and highly illuminating," while he †) clearly and unmistakably recognizes the true Paul in the letter, to the extent that he considers the question of the authorship to be the easiest among all the questions that can be raised about the letter - we will rather prove that the author is a compiler who used the letter to the Romans and the two letters to the Corinthians during a journey, whose characteristics are contained in the following lines.

*) *ibid.*, pp. 257-258.

**) Introduction, p. 130.

***) in the commentary, pp. 336-337.

†) *ibid.*, p. 293.

6

Once the compiler is revealed, we will first determine the mutual relationship between the letter to the Romans and the letters to the Corinthians, and their origin.

7

As we leave these questions for the time being, such as whether the Apostle's relationship with the Galatian community could have necessitated him to assert his apostolic authority in the greeting (Chapter 1, 1-5), whether his title as an apostle must necessarily be placed next to his name ("Paul, an apostle"), whether it was really necessary to immediately state in the first sentence ("not from men nor through man") that he was not sent by men and that his commission did not come to him through human mediation, and

whether a historical hero would declare his legitimacy in this way during a dispute - we turn to the following study, which will answer these questions as unnecessary and in a completely different sense than has been done so far in the apologetic interest.

8

Introduction

(1: 6-10)

Immediately after the greeting, there is the accusation and astonishment over the Galatians' quick defection - immediately, without any preparation or transition. But why so abruptly? Did it perhaps make it "impossible for the apostle to apply art and take detours" because of the strong agitation of his mind? However, a natural introduction, connection to given information or previous negotiations is not a detour, it belongs to the absolutely necessary, not to the excess of art.

But was the defection of the Galatians a matter already negotiated between Paul and them? Did a negotiation precede that he could connect to without further ado? But then the apostle would still have to touch on this negotiation, he would have to refer to it - he could not (v. 6) simply say, "I wonder that you have turned away so soon."

The determination "so soon" does indeed tie in with a common assumption - "so soon"*) i.e., as you and I know, as already discussed and negotiated - the formula brings forth the appearance as if there had been a negotiation that the apostle could refer to from the outset - but the appearance remains hollow, the assumption on which the formula is based is not explained, the author does not justify his right to that formula - the formula is intended to point to a point that is visible to both the Galatians and the apostle - in fact, it points to nothing.

*) οὕτω ταχέως

9

As we pass by, we note that Judaism is already such a distant sphere for the author that he calls turning towards it a falling away from the true God, as he describes the Galatians (v. 6) as "called in the grace of Christ." We immediately notice how strained and unsure the explanation is that the author gives in verse 7 of the other gospel to which the Galatians have turned away, that is, how anxious the transition to the issue that concerns the author is.

"Which is not another," refers to the "other gospel" that the Galatians have fallen away from *), and should, therefore, explain the nature and origin of it, but this connecting and explanatory formula only picks out the category of the gospel in general from the striking and explanatory determination of the "other gospel" and thus says the following sentence: "Which is not another, but there are some who trouble you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ." Certainly, this at first unjustified turn is not carried through purely - it was not possible - it is crossed by the other turn that aims to explain the striking composition of the "other gospel" and wants to interpret the origin of this foreign, false gospel - that is, neither of the two turns is carried through purely - the author writes so floating, unsure, and confused, as it is impossible for someone who intervenes in personal, real relationships and has to defend his principle and his entire essence.

*) v. 6 εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, v. 7 ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο· εἰ μή

10

Furthermore, how affected and unfounded is the following hyperbole in verse 8: "But even if we or an angel" - an angel who, although higher than us, is the next higher and can be compared to us - an angel who, although has heavenly authority, is not too distant from us, as we also possess almost heavenly authority.

Therefore, "let him be accursed" who preaches to you a different gospel than we have preached to you - when did the Apostle say this to the Galatians, so that he can continue (verse 9): "As we said before and now I say again?" During a previous visit? Or since we know nothing about repeated interactions with the Galatians, during his first and for now only visit? But why does he repeat the curse after the words "and now I say again?" Was not the first pronouncement of the curse already a repetition of it, if he had laid it on any perversion of his gospel during his first visit among the Galatians? Does it not ultimately come down to the fact that he is only repeating the curse now, if he writes it again after the explicit remark "as I

say again"?

Indeed, it comes down to this frigid and helpless turn of phrase - and yet he also wants the readers to remember an earlier statement, that they should recall his anathema against the heretics - he wants to refer to an earlier statement - but then it also remains that the current repetition of the curse, and at the same time the explicit remark that he is repeating it twice now, is highly inappropriate and chilly.

11

Even if he only wrote the curse once and referred to this single instance as a repetition of an earlier expression, this reference to a previous threat and the repetition of the curse appears cold and affected.

The inappropriate and confused reference to an earlier statement and the repetition of the curse stems from the fact that the author reads in 2 Corinthians how the apostle fears that the Corinthians are susceptible to deception, and he reads there how the author warns of someone who would preach a different gospel - a different one which the Corinthians did not receive from him *) - in 1 Corinthians he reads how the apostle claims full authority for the curse and exercises it against the apostates**) - these phrases and keywords, which are naturally brought about in the Corinthian letters and defend the honor of their originality through the context in which they stand, the author of the Galatian letter has appropriated somewhat carelessly and combined them so disorderly that he cannot deny the plagiarism. While the author of the 2nd Corinthians fears that his readers are susceptible to diabolical deception, he immediately confronts the Galatians with amazement at their quick apostasy - while the former warns against anyone who might come with another gospel, the latter in verse 7 clumsily refers to the people who must be among the Galatians and distort the gospel, and then drifts off into the senseless impossibility in verse 8 that he or an angel should teach another gospel - while the former curses the real enemies of Christ, the latter hurls it at the impossible creatures of his imagination - finally, the ambiguity of meaning in which the author of the Galatian letter speaks of a repetition of his curse over the teachers of another gospel is now explained: he has already spoken of such false teachings before, namely he has the warning of the second and the curse of the first Corinthian letter before his eyes - but since he cannot completely suppress the feeling that the Galatians have not heard this warning and this curse, he makes those futile efforts to transform the repetition of an earlier

statement into the momentary repetition of an (unwritten) sentence.

*) 2 Cor 11:3-4 εὐαγγέλιον ἕτερον , ὃ οὐκ ἐδέξασθε

**) 1 Cor 16:22 εἴ τις ἦτω ἀνάθεμα.

12

We will now completely dispel any doubt about whether the author really used the Corinthian letters as a plagiarist, after noting how cold and clumsy it is when he refers to himself after the anathema and relies on the fact that he (verse 10), while he had previously sought the approval of men, now cannot possibly strive to please men. Clearly, he wants to justify himself because of the curse *) - I cannot do otherwise, he wants to say, I have the right to be so forceful - so he feels, he fears that his curse might make an adverse impression on his readers as being too harsh, too abrupt, too striking? Is he making excuses? Does he fear the judgment of men? Well, then he is still dependent on the judgment of others - he lacks the independence that he attributes to himself as a gain of his new servitude in Christ's service - he refutes his anxious claim.

*) V. 10: ἄρτι γὰρ.

13

And why does he refer to his former life? Why this affected contrast between his current independence and his previous dependence on the judgment of men?

Why? He wants to speak about his past, his conversion - he wants to show that he has stood independently from the moment of his calling.

The Interpretation of the Apostle

(1: 11-16)

With a very significant introduction, he notes in verse 11: "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man." Really? The Galatians did not know that? Have they not heard it from him before?

What an important announcement! How cold and forced this attention to a fact that must be known to a community founded by the apostle of the Gentiles.

Finally, one has also asked and pondered how the apostle suddenly comes to call the apostates whom he had previously harshly rebuked, "brethren." The answer is given by the First Epistle to the Corinthians, which the author has before him and from which he borrows the introduction in which the apostle begins his significant revelation about the last revelations of the Lord.*)

*) 1 Cor 15:1 γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν.

Gal 1:11 γνωρίζω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐηγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ

14

The frosty and awkward style of this entire introduction is also reflected in the way the supposed apostle speaks about the contrast between his former zeal for the law and his calling by the Lord. "You have heard," he says in verse 13, "of my former life in Judaism" - "heard" - it sounds like it's from other people, without Paul's involvement and communication - "heard" - like a foreign story, which, however, could not have happened to them by chance.

The communities founded by the apostle, however, must have known him and could not have heard of his story like a stranger's. His contemporaries and communities had to live in this story and its memory.

And when did "Judaism" **) stand before the communities as this closed, antiquated, and foreign world? Only when the struggle against the law was decided and Judaism became the category of the outdated and the pure antithesis to Christianity.

One more thing! Is "the revelation of Jesus Christ," through which the apostle received his gospel in verse 12, a single act - that specific event that the Acts of the Apostles reports? Initially (v. 12), it is still the general medium through which the apostle received his gospel - in the following (v. 16), it is determined by the contrast with the apostle's former Jewish way of life, but the Father is the Lord of the revelation, who reveals his Son "in" the apostle, and the revelation itself can thus unfold and extend as an internal one without specific temporal sections. However, when the apostle refers to the nets he cast into Arabia as a result of his calling and revelation, and then notes in verse 17 that he "returned" from Arabia to Damascus, the calling

does become a specific event and Damascus becomes the location of the revelation - that is, only involuntarily, only finally and through a lost keyword does the author reveal that he was familiar with the view of the apostle's conversion, according to which it was caused by a miracle and specifically at Damascus.

**) ὁ Ἰουδαϊσμός

15

The Apostle's Relationship to Jerusalem.

(1: 17 - 2: 14.)

After the Apostle has emphasized from the beginning that his gospel is his personal property, the privilege of his personal apostolic consciousness, based on a revelation he received, and that the execution of it is his specific mission, he finally comes to a detailed proof of his personal authority and special entitlement: he has had almost no contact with Jerusalem and the original apostles (C. 1, 17-24), his independence, his autonomous legitimacy, and the uniqueness of his sphere of activity is acknowledged by the original apostles themselves (C.2, 1-10), and he finally opposed Peter ruthlessly when he was openly in the wrong (C. 2, 11-14).

16

Only three years after his return to Damascus does he go to Jerusalem (Gal. 1:18-19), where he seeks out only Peter, stays with him for only fourteen days, and sees no one else but James, the brother of the Lord. But why (v. 20) the deliberate affirmation: "In what I am writing to you, before God, I do not lie"? He means that everyone knows that the apostles always had their permanent residence in Jerusalem - he believes that everyone must therefore assume that he has also seen and spoken to everyone else, unless he explicitly rejects and corrects this assumption - hence the strong oath that he borrowed from the Romans *), but unfortunately is based on an assumption that makes what he is swearing to a matter of impossibility. If he stayed in Jerusalem for fourteen days, associated with Peter and James, and the presence of the other apostles in the holy city was a given, as his oath indicates, then it was impossible for him not to have seen them.

*) Gal. 1:20 ἃ δὲ γράφω ὑμῖν, ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι.

Rom 9:1 ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι Further: 2 Cor 11:31

With the utmost care, he then describes his subsequent trip to Jerusalem as the second one. "Then," he says (Gal. 2:1), i.e. after that first trip, "I went up again" to Jerusalem, i.e. again, like the first time, "after a period of fourteen years," so that no trip to Jerusalem took place during this interim period - yes, to maintain his independence completely, so that the fact that he presented his gospel to the leaders in Jerusalem does not make him appear dependent and dependent, he declares that he went to Jerusalem "as a result" of a revelation that had been given to him.

17

Until this point, his presentation, although the eagerness of the piled-up exaggerations gives it a squinting appearance, would be at least comprehensible, but in the following sentences he confuses himself with his anxious restrictions and exposes the clumsiness of his invention.

"I presented to them," he reports in verse 2, "the gospel that I preach among the Gentiles" - to them! - "but privately to the influential" *) - "but?" - so the influential people with whom he conferred privately were different from those to whom he presented his gospel? But who could the latter be? So the expression "the influential" is only a more detailed explanation of the previous "to them"? Only a resumption of the first dative? Obviously, the author wants the latter to be assumed, but in his uncertainty and the fear of his invention, he has made a mistake and, through the inserted "but," has created the appearance of a difference, the separation of the influential from the preceding "to them."

*) Ch 2:2 ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον . . . κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν

The confusion increases. "Even Titus, who was with me, though he was a Greek, was not compelled to be circumcised" - not even Titus? The Greek? So if he was not a Greek, he could have been subject to compulsion? As if that were possible! As if a foreskin, the circumcised one, could still be forced to be circumcised!

18

The sentence is wrongly introduced, but even more unfortunately carried out. If Titus was not forced to be circumcised, was the concession at all rejected, or did he submit voluntarily? The following phrase, "but because of

the false brothers who had infiltrated," *) starts an attempt at redirection, which could only lead to the result: "He was not forced, but because of those false brothers who had infiltrated to spy out our freedom that we have in Jesus Christ," I gave in -- but the sentence introduced with "but" doesn't even have a verb, and in the concluding sentence that connects with the false brothers through the relative pronoun, the apostle affirms, according to the usual reading, on the contrary: "to whom we did not yield in submission even for a moment." **) The context, the consistent tendency that the apostle pursues in this context, his endeavor to present himself as entirely independent from the original apostles, the further reason that he gives for his behavior in the same sentence, "so that the truth of the gospel might be preserved for you" - all this certainly justifies the expectation that the apostle will affirm his firm steadfastness against the demands of the Jewish-minded ones. This should make us take a position against the authority of Irenaeus, who reads the sentence "to whom I yielded" without negation, and of Ambrose, who only notes that the Greeks have the negation, but is against it himself.

*) ν 4 διὰ δὲ τοὺς . . .

**) οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν . . .

19

However, even if we follow the common reading and read the negation, the sentence still lacks coherence and the disappointment remains that the expectation raised by the "aber" in the parenthetical clause is not satisfied. The phrase "wegen der falschen Brüder aber" ("because of the false brothers, however") was only possible if the apostle wanted to speak of a conceded point; as for the reason why he acted as he did, to preserve the gospel for the Gentiles in general, could this reason not still remain even if he gave in on this individual case? Could he not hope that by giving in momentarily, he could save the principle of freedom in general? And if he immediately continues in verse 6, "But from those who were recognized as important (what they once were makes no difference to me), God shows no favoritism" and shows how the pillar apostles had to acknowledge his authority as an apostle to the Gentiles and how he even opposed Peter once - does not this transition look exactly like it is about preventing the nightmarish consequences that could be drawn from a momentary concession?

So let the negation fall! The apostle gave in on an individual case! But did he give in because of the false brothers who had infiltrated? Because of false people who were lurking for his freedom - a freedom that did not belong to him alone and which he should have defended with all his might? Instead of fighting, he humiliated himself before malicious observers while he otherwise jealously guarded his independence, asserted it against the apostles, and even brilliantly maintained it in his rift with Peter.

20

Well then, let the negation remain! Yes, let the diversion that is initiated in the parenthetical clause by the stubborn "but" also be taken into account! Both at the same time! Titus was not forced to be circumcised, but I had him circumcised for the sake of the false brothers, although I did not give in to them for a moment in complete obedience (rather, I did not acknowledge or permit the general necessity of circumcision for all Gentile Christians).

But then he would have done rather what he expressly denies, he would have given up his principle in a moment *), and would not even have written to the Galatians about the main thing, that he had defended and asserted the general freedom of the Gentile Christians. The artificial emphasis on "forced" and "obedience" could not replace this assertion, which must not be lacking.

The sentence will never become clear, because the author felt uncertain, did not dare to carry out the preparations he had made, (he did not even allow himself a verb in the parenthetical clause about the false brothers because of his fear) and because he did not know at the end whether to let Titus' circumcision become a reality or how to secure the apostle's freedom.

*) πρὸς ὥραν

21

The sentence is a monster because the author, in his various intentions and tendencies, became confused and could not find a way out of the labyrinth of difficulties he had created for himself. It is most likely that he wrote the negation at the end of the sentence, but weighed down by the assumptions he had presented at the beginning, he was not able to secure and depict the apostle's independence in a clear and vivid manner, as he preserved his and the Gentiles' freedom in this unclear and confused collision.

The collision was flawed from the outset - to such an extent that a pure and structured resolution was impossible. Only a group of false brethren who had surreptitiously infiltrated themselves to investigate Paul's freedom had caused the collision? What nonsense! Rather, the subsequent negotiations between Paul and the pillars of the church were based on the assumption that everything in Jerusalem was under circumcision and that the gospel of circumcision prevailed!

Those false brethren had sneaked in secretly? They wanted to investigate Paul's freedom? Here, in Jewish-Christian Jerusalem, where the contrasts were clear and open as soon as Paul approached the pillars of the church? Secret hostility, lurking malice was necessary to discover Paul's freedom? Here, where there was a decided and opposing position towards the Gentile apostle and his freedom?

Impossible! The author himself refuted the assumption that created the monster of his confused sentence and thus brought this sentence to its deserved end.

The author, unable to shape his narrative, forgets himself so much that in the same moment in which the apostle explains the neutrality agreement he had concluded with the apostles under handshake, he lets him speak with irritated contempt for the latter. The opportunity for such a heated allusion to the supposed insignificance of the apostles was so unnatural, the author himself had such an unclear understanding of their historical position, that he feels compelled to keep his narrative in suspense on purpose. When he says, for example, "but concerning those who are considered important" (verse 6), he leaves it indefinite whether they themselves believed they were important,*) or whether, as in verse 9 where they are regarded by others as pillars, they were regarded as special by others. When he continues, "whatever they were makes no difference to me," he leaves it indefinite what they were in the end and in fact. But let us leave him his deliberate vagueness and his uncertainty, and take instead his involuntary "once were" as a betraying witness of his late position, on which he has inadvertently placed the apostle and on which he now lets him speak of the three pillars, Peter, James and John, as men who have long since died. Let us also take the way he initially (verse 2), before the more specific specifications follow (verses 6 and 9), designates the apostles with a lost catchword as the "apparent," **) supposed to be. He has in mind the passage from the second letter to the Corinthians where the author of the same designates the apostles as the "super-apostles," *) he initially (verse 2) attaches to the given formula, becomes more specific in verse 6, and finally dares to develop

the ironic designation of the apostles in his own way in verse 9.

*) ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι _ ὅποῖοί ποτε ἦσαν

**) v. 2 δοκοῦντες

*) 2 Cor 11:5 οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλοι "but the chief apostle"

23

The idea that the Gentiles were assigned to Paul and the Jews to the Pillar Apostles is too mechanical and even impossible, since it would have been impossible for Paul to only address the Gentiles and leave the Jews aside. The author loses himself in an equally mechanical separation, like the composer of the Acts of the Apostles, only that he separates the Gentile apostle from contact with the Jews, while the latter only sends him to the Gentiles when his gospel has been offered to the Jews in vain. The mechanism of the author of the Galatians shatters against the historical fact that the Jews and their proselytes in Asia Minor, Greece, and Rome were an essential element of the community from the beginning. This original mixture of the Jewish and Gentile elements - (only later, when the views of the New Testament documents about the genesis of Christianity have undergone complete criticism, can we come to the representation of the fermentation that arose from the penetration of those two elements and had as a consequence the formation of the Christian view) - this chemical process that put both elements in tension and produced a new form of historical consciousness from their fusion, at the same time, refutes the mechanism of the Acts of the Apostles.

24

The supposed Paul is finally in Antioch and resists Peter (v. 11) when he came there face to face "because he was in the wrong." So "because"? *) He only openly opposed him because others had already condemned his hypocrisy as wrong? He wouldn't have done it if others hadn't already passed such a strict judgment? This explanatory parenthetical clause is therefore an excessive and floating overflow of the whole thing - it is absurd since Peter's hypocrisy was an obvious fact and clearly evident to all.

*) ὅτι

The author also keeps his account floating in the statement of the motive that (v. 12) caused the Judean apostle, who initially had communion with the Gentiles in Antioch, to withdraw in fear - "some came from James" - the author dares not specify whether they were official emissaries or just people from his surroundings.

"The rest of the Jews," who (v. 13) were with Peter until then, "acted hypocritically with him" - so he was a hypocrite? The Judeans were hypocrites when they denied their better conviction for a moment out of fear of James' people? His principles, their principles were entirely free - freedom was their essence, and only the fear of James caused them to falter for a moment? Impossible! Peter had just been in agreement with Jerusalem and had concluded the division treaty that assigned the Gentiles to Paul alone and reserved the Judeans for the pillar apostles - Paul had just been standing alone against Jerusalem, and his freedom had been his personal privilege until then - Peter was one with Jerusalem and here, in the holy city, everything was unfree, and the biased view prevailed that one did not want to have anything to do with the Gentiles personally - so where does Peter's freedom and his difference from James and Jerusalem suddenly come from? The author cannot say; he has initiated the collision that is supposed to give rise to the Heidenapostel's exposition of his principle falsely and unsuccessfully.

25

The unfortunate mistake of the author leads him to become so confused that he even forgets the initial starting point when he forms the introduction of Paul's rebuke: "If you, being a Jew, live like the Gentiles and not like the Jews, why do you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?" But is Peter living like a Gentile? Is he not dependent on Jerusalem and James? What was Peter's offense? Was he trying to force the Gentiles to live like Jews? Was it not rather just about him? His wavering? His personal behavior, that he denied his better conviction for his person? And if his example had consequences for others as well, was it not just for the Jews who, also being carried away by his conduct, forgot their freedom for themselves and did not think of subjecting the Gentiles to Judaism?

The author forgets all the assumptions he has made so far, even the situation in which he has just placed the Jewish apostle Peter, only to bring about Paul's accusation, rebuke, and exposition, when he worked out this accusation. Peter's person and behavior were only a means for him to introduce the dogmatic exposition of the Gentile apostle, and as soon as he speaks, that is, as soon as the author gets to the intended topic, the exposition of Christian freedom, he has lost sight of his own, laboriously formed assumptions and even the situation that opened the mouth of the

Gentile apostle. Once the Gentile apostle is on his topic, the author does not pay attention to the fact that the long and simply general dogmatic exposition into which he lapses can no longer be considered a rebuke to Peter, and finally, he even forgets that he has given a historical account so far. He does not think to indicate a point where the historical narrative passes into purely dogmatic exposition, and in the end, he knows nothing about having to indicate at least where Paul's rebuke against Peter ends.

26

We can only note at most that the rebuke of Peter may extend at least or at most - both are the same given the indifference of the following exposition to the assumed occasion - until verse 21, and that the instruction of the Galatians who have turned away begins with the address "O foolish Galatians" in chapter 3, verse 1. However, even with this, we cannot provide this exposition with what it lacks, which is a reference to Peter, it remains what it is - a general, and moreover, very abstract and artificial dogmatic summary of the dialectic of the letter to the Romans and the laboriously cobbled together theme of the subsequent discussion.

27

The Theme of the Letter

(2: 15-21)

What is the purpose of the failed accusation against Peter that he, who lives as a Gentile, is forcing the Gentiles to live as Jews - what, therefore, is the purpose of this contemptuous reference to Judaism in the new starting point in verse 15: "We, who are Jews by nature, and not sinners from among the Gentiles," and what is the clumsy concession to the Jewish assumption that the Gentiles are sinners - the affected phrase: "and not sinners from among the Gentiles"?

What is the point of all this? It is meant to prove that the author has clumsily picked up individual keywords from the discussion in the Romans letter about the sinfulness of the Gentiles and the privileged position of the chosen people and used them incorrectly.

Why does the author add verse 16, with its clumsy participle "knowing," *) to

this "we," followed by the sentence, "that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but only through faith in Jesus Christ"?

*) εἰδότες

Through this reference to established knowledge, through this appeal to common consciousness, he wants to prove to us that on the standpoint on which he stands, the genesis of the dogma is already completed.

Of course, this is not his true intention - he does not know what he is doing and how much he is getting lost - but the fact remains: he puts the dogma, because it is already completed and finished, in front of the deduction that pretends to be still trying to obtain it.

28

He piles almost all the keywords of the dogma together in verses 16 and 17, but he leads them there awkwardly and heaps them so recklessly on top of each other that they lose their original meaning and effect.

Thus, in the parenthetical clause introduced by "knowing" that no one is justified by the works of the law, but only through faith in Jesus Christ, he even overlooks that the qualification "only" *) not only requires the contrast of the impotence of the law, but also the general intermediate link that man, in fact, obtains justification through faith alone.

Furthermore, when he finally picks up the "we" in the sentence "we also have believed in Jesus Christ," and the thought should progress, he repeats in the sentence "so that we may be justified by faith in Christ and not by works of the law" just what he had already assumed as commonly known in the parenthetical clause.

So much is he dominated by the given categories or rather keywords of the dogma, and dominated externally, that in the moment afterwards, in the added reason, "because no flesh is justified by works of the law," he only repeats what he had already said twice and still believes that he is making progress in the development and is doing as if he is offering something new.

Then, when he continues in verse 17: "But if, while seeking**) to be justified in Christ, we ourselves *) have also been found to be sinners, is Christ then a servant of sin?" it remains unclear how he arrives at this question and conclusion, which he rejects as false with a "far be it!" Does seeking righteousness in Christ expose and betray people as sinners, thus leading to the false conclusion that Christ is a servant of sin? Or does it lead to this misconception when it should prevent people from being sinners, and when

it fails to achieve its goal? Is being a sinner a consequence of striving for true righteousness, or is it something that appears despite this effort in individual cases? Is it a universal natural consequence or an exceptional phenomenon?

*) εἰ γὰρ διὰ

**) ζητοῦντες

*) καὶ αὐτοὶ

29

The author will not tell us why being found as sinners of those striving for righteousness in Christ could lead to the false conclusion that Christ is a sinner-servant, nor will he be able to indicate it to us. He would have to admit that he wanted to reproduce the objections of the Letter to the Romans: "shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" and "shall we sin because we are not under law but under grace?" But he would also have to admit that he was unable to reproduce and handle this dialectic. He would then also have to admit that he borrowed his "far be it!" from both passages of the Letter to the Romans.**)

**) Rom 6:2, 15 μὴ γένοιτο

30

He borrowed from the Romans the formula for rejecting a conclusion that would be disadvantageous for the Savior, but he did not really reject it. Indeed, the author of the Romans understood thoroughly how to reject the apparent consequences of his dialectic and he did reject them after his exclamation "God forbid!" On the other hand, when the author of the Galatians *) continues in verse 18, "For if I rebuild what I tore down, I prove myself to be a transgressor," in order to reject that conclusion, he assumes an object that was not even mentioned in the previous draft - the law! - He must also leave it unexplained why being found as a sinner for those who seek true righteousness is rebuilding the law - if he cannot explain it, why should this seemingly incompatible being found as a sinner among the believers and rebuilding the law lead to the objection he wants to refute? From the disharmony of completely foreign tones, no harmony can emerge - thoughts that lack any middle term cannot be subjected to a higher unifying

fundamental idea - one who misunderstands the dialectic of Romans from the beginning cannot reproduce the final solution.

*) Since the author does not introduce us to any real dialectic, creates nothing new, and only picks up catchphrases, he cannot motivate us to set his work in detailed opposition to the dialectic of the Romans.

When the author then continues in verse 19: "For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ", he wants to justify the unnatural supposition that preceded it: that it is impossible for the believer to present himself as a transgressor by rebuilding what has been dissolved. He wants to say, "for" the believer, but a pure connection to the previous confused sentences is impossible from the outset, and in the end, the author had to leave unexplained why rebuilding what has been dissolved would expose the believer as a transgressor and as what kind of transgressor. It is therefore no wonder that even the current sentence falls apart. Since the author's main purpose was to refute the false conclusion that Christ is a sinner, how does he come to the argument that the believer is dead to the law? Why does he separate, in the most disturbing way, the sentence "I am crucified with Christ" from the explanation of the common crucifixion with Christ? Why does he create the impression that the sentence about the believer's death to the law receives its conclusion from the purpose determination "that I might live unto God"? Why does he add the determination of the common crucifixion in such a dragging way?

31

He copied the Letter to the Romans but did not understand it. He rejects the objection whether we should continue in sin so that grace may abound, by saying that the believer has died to sin and specifically died as a companion of Christ's death (Romans 6:2-11) - he also speaks of being dead to the law - but he also knows, as the original creator, what the means of this consequential dying is - it is not the law, but the body, namely the death of the Redeemer.*) Finally, he comes to the conclusion that those who have died with Christ to sin "live to God," and those who have died through the body of Christ to the law belong to another, namely the risen Christ.***) From this order of exposition, the author of the Letter to the Galatians has created his confusion. And when he picks up the idea of new life in verse 20 in a new antithesis: "So now it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me," and then immediately varies the same thought and lets the explanation run into a

lengthy participial construction, "but now the life I live in the flesh (!) I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me," he only proves by this overfilling and awkward expansion of the exposition that he did not want to abandon the parallel that the Second Letter to the Corinthians offered to the Letter to the Romans.***)

*) Rom 7:4 ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ
Rom 6:2 ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ
Rom 6:4 συνετάφημεν αὐτῷ (χριστῷ).
Gal 2:19 διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι

**) Rom 6:11 νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ
Rom 7:4 ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέρῳ
Gal 2:19 ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω

***) 2 Cor 5:15 εἷ εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν ἵνα οἱ ζῶντες μηκέτι ἑαυτοῖς ζῶσιν ἀλλὰ τῷ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι.
Gal 2:20 ὃ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ

33

After the author has, as far as he could with the help of the keywords from the Book of Romans, completed his jumbled work of not really introducing any dialectic – what dialectic? The dialectic between sin and grace? Between law and grace? Between death and life? No! – he proceeds in verse 21 with the unsuitable transition: "I do not reject the grace of God" – (as if he had been accused of such rejection!) – and returns to the topic: "For if righteousness comes by the law, then Christ died in vain," and proceeds to explain the same.

Let us see if the explanation is more successful than the introduction of the topic.

The Dogmatic Discussion

(3: 1 - 4: 31)

The beginning is far from fortunate. It is affected when the author, in Galatians 3:1, wonders who could have bewitched the Galatians, as Jesus Christ had been "clearly portrayed" before their eyes, and overloaded when he emphasizes the clarity and vividness of the image with the dragging qualification "as if he had been crucified among you." One was enough: "before your eyes" or "among you."

With the question in verse 2, "I want to ask only this of you: did you receive the Spirit by works of the law or by hearing with faith?" he wants to throw out the threads of the exposition, i.e., to determine the keywords of the following discussion. Unfortunately, with this question, he also sets up an assumption that he must retract immediately afterward, something he himself had accomplished a moment before (verse 1). He assumes that the Galatians, who had just been accused of turning away from God and the truth, possess the Spirit. In the following verses (verse 5), he builds his argumentation on the basis of this assumption. Yet, he is compelled to retract this assumption completely immediately afterward, just as he is about to build on it, admitting in verse 3 that the Galatians "began in the Spirit but are now ending in the flesh."

34

The deadly confusion arises from the fact that he really only wants to instruct the believers in general, that he is actually speaking to the entire church, and after he has linked up with the believers' own consciousness of the Spirit, he remembers the fictitious assumption that the apostle is writing to apostates, spiritless servants of the law. He feels that he has gone astray and believes he can make everything right again by characterizing the Galatians as what they are supposed to be according to the original assumption of the letter in a couple of interjections (v. 3 and 4).

However, even in this correction, he has made a mistake. His punishing question, "Have you suffered so much for nothing?" presupposes a long series of trials, sufferings, and martyrdoms - but the first entrance of the letter (C. 1, 0) presupposes that only a short period of time had elapsed between the conversion of the Galatians and their apostasy. Moreover, to his detriment, the author, in order to become familiar with this particularity, continues quite artificially: "if only it were for nothing" - he acts as if he knows something worse for which the Galatians could have suffered for their trials - he acts as if he could continue the construction so that the Galatians' trials and martyrdoms not only were in vain but also turned out to be harmful to them - in fact, however, he has only lost his way, and the construction could not be continued in this way - it was already to the detriment of the Galatians if all their trials and sufferings were in vain.

Furthermore, in this new section, he also incorporates keywords from the Romans letter. The phrase "hearing of faith," from which the Galatians are said to have received the Spirit according to verse 2, is itself an unclear combination and only understandable for someone who remembers that according to Romans 10:17, faith comes from hearing - (according to the context of the Romans passage, from the preached word).*) When the author then picks up his argumentation from the possession of the Spirit in verse 5 and without any reason or basis - (the context of the argument even rejects this excess as a disturbing addition) - refers to the one who "supplies the Spirit" as the one who also worked miracles among the Galatians, only the passages from the Romans and 2 Corinthians letters, according to which Christ worked miracles through the apostle by the power of signs and the power of the Spirit, and the apostles worked the signs of an apostle among the Corinthians in miracles*), are to blame for this unnecessary and inappropriate overloading.

*) Rom 10:17 ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς
Gal 3:2 ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως

*) Rom 15:18-19 κατειργάσατο χριστὸς δι' ἐμοῦ . . . ἐν δυνάμει
πνεύματος θεοῦ
2 Cor 12:12 τὰ μὲν σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου κατειργάσθη ἐν ὑμῖν . . .
ἐν . . . δυνάμεσι.
Gal 3:5 ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν

God is the subject with which the author accomplishes the return to his topic - it is God who, in those two participles that represent the place of the subject, bestows the Spirit and works miracles - but what is it that this God does? The author does not say, the verb is missing, but he could not find a suitable one because he has connected the keywords "from works of the law or from hearing with faith," which originally presuppose the receiving person as the subject in the Romans letter, inconveniently enough with God as the active and giving subject. It was impossible for him to indicate in a specific verb what this God does "from works of the law or from hearing with faith" - he is well aware that the resumption of the determinations of those participles in a verb would not be enough and that old ways of power and grace of the God whom the Romans letter opposes to man in his sin,

powerlessness, and faith must follow - but to list all the revelations of this God one by one was too much for him - he would rather leave out the verb.

That it was a mistake on his part to make God the subject in this botched sentence, he proves himself when he immediately proceeds and rather aphoristically continues (v. 6), "as Abraham believed God and it was counted to him as righteousness" - that's right! The subject had to be man in the previous sentence! The disharmony of that unfortunate sentence now becomes all the greater, especially with the "as" - "as Abraham believed" - which is referred to an explanation and conclusion that is not given. This "as" *) stands therefore unsupported there since the previous sentence did not even have a verb, and the question it contained was not answered. All these verbs, especially the verbs that indicate the position of the believer, are certainly known to the author from the Romans letter - in the same letter (Romans 4:1-5) Abraham's position is also extensively developed - and what is known and familiar to him, the author believes he only needs to remind the readers of with a few keywords.

*) καθὼς

37

"Therefore, you see**)," continues the author in verse 7, "that those who are of faith are the sons of Abraham." But how are his readers supposed to see this? He has not provided anything on which his "therefore" could be based. He is completely certain of his argument and fully expects his readers to understand the conclusion and the result - and yet he has not provided a single intermediate link in the proof, nor even hinted that Abraham's offspring is universal and spiritual. He believes that because he has the proof before his eyes, he can also demand that his readers draw the final conclusion - he has in mind the argumentation in Rom. 4:11-25 and confuses his own situation and that of his readers, for whom these dogmatic arguments are familiar and commonplace, with the fictional assumption that the apostle is creating and developing these concepts and proofs. Reality undermines and confuses the fiction.

***) γινώσκετε ἄρα

38

Afterwards (V. 8-9), he only cites a few keywords from the Epistle to the

Romans to support his argument about the universality of Abraham's descendants. At least he realizes that the "therefore" in verse 7 was not justified by the preceding argument and tries to make up for it by providing the necessary information for the conclusion.

However, the following statement that those who are "of the works of the law" are under a curse is missing nothing more and nothing less than the main point that no one can keep the law - precisely the main issue that the author has difficulty understanding and which is explained in various ways in the Epistle to the Romans.

He only provides one of these explanations from the Epistle to the Romans in verse 11, and cites it as evidence that "no one is justified before God by the law." But why is this evident? Is it evident from the nature of the law? From human nature? From experience? No! Only because he can borrow a few keywords from the Epistle to the Romans*). He tries to provide his own explanation - "the righteous shall live by faith" - but this is not a proof, it is just a tautology, as both the fact that faith gives life and that the law does not justify are fundamentally the same statement and both require proof.

*) Rom 3:20 διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ
ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ
Gal 3:11 ὅτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ θεῷ

39

The author wants to prove something, but he is unable to do so and repeats his previous statements — he wants to exhaust the topic but only provides scattered quotes from the Romans letter.

Thus, in verse 12, he makes a new attempt by stating that "the law is not based on faith; on the contrary, it says, 'The person who does these things will live by them.'") However, he only hastily and disorderly copies the antithesis of the Romans letter (chapter 4, verses 4-6), in which the righteousness of faith and that of the law are actually set in opposition, and the majority, which takes the place of the law - ("the person who does them") - is not disturbed and is naturally motivated, since it belongs to the citation from Leviticus, which speaks of the commandments of the law.**)

*) ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς

**) Rom 10:5 [corrected from 5:10] Μωϋσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν
δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου, ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ

After the author (in verse 13) describes redemption as liberation from the curse of the law, without having previously shown why the law is a curse - and after he clumsily describes in verse 14 the purpose of this redemption as the transfer of Abraham's blessing to the Gentiles and the receipt of the promise of the Spirit - he suddenly, only because he has just spoken of the promise, inserts the parenthetical statement in verse 16 that the seed mentioned in the promise to Abraham could only be Christ - and finally, in verses 17 and 18, he comes to the laborious and tedious thought that the law, which only came after the promise, could not annul or overthrow the promise. He reproduces the idea of the Romans letter (chapter 4, verses 10 and 13) that the promise came to Abraham independently of circumcision and that he was justified before being circumcised.

40

The author intends to arrive at the discussion of the purpose of the law in the Book of Romans with all of this. He asks in verse 19, "Why then the law?" and answers, "It was added because of transgressions."*) However, he cannot answer the question posed by commentators whether this means to restrain or to increase transgressions. He must leave the matter in a dangerous state of ambiguity because he did not understand how to express the dialectic of the Book of Romans concerning the relationship between the law and sin. Furthermore, he even greatly erred in his expression. According to the Book of Romans, the law is an intermediate work that came before grace to make sin increase so that grace would abound.***) Its purpose is to make sin come to life and exist as sin, because "apart from the law, sin lies dead"***) (Romans 7:8). This is real dialectic truly executed by the author of the Book of Romans, and it could have been thoroughly and truly executed by him. The reason for this mistake is that the author used one phrase of the Book of Romans: "where there is no law, there is no transgression"*) (Romans 4:15) - a phrase that still holds true with the necessary caution - incorrectly and processed it into his main thesis.

*) τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη

**) Rom 5:20 παρεισήλθεν ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα

***) ἁμαρτία

*) Rom 4:15 οὐ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος, οὐδὲ παράβασις

41

The following remark about the mediator of the law (V. 19-20), which has given rise to countless explanations, but which is completely clear if one does not expect more from the author and his art of presentation than what his other performance justifies, contains a new turn and yet, despite its independence, is linked to the preceding allusion from the Romans through a participle, "ordained through angels," and this participial clause**), whose subject is "the law," is even overloaded in a cumbersome and pointless way by the mention of angels: "ordained through angels," etc.

**) διαταγῆς

The idea that angels served in the giving of the law is a notion that has forced itself untimely on the author here*) - he actually only wanted to get to the word "mediator" in order to attach a remark to it that sheds a new light on the superiority of the Gospel over the law. The following verse (20), which has caused so much trouble for interpreters: "Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one," is based on the assumption that Moses is only a mediator, and deduces from this the weakness of his position. He stands between two parties, receives and gives - he received the law (through the angels) from God, and now it depends on what man does with what he receives through him. The ultimate result therefore depends on the behavior of man, and according to the author's opinion, it can be easily calculated given the weakness of man - in other words, the law is a contract whose duration, among other things, depends on whether one of the contracting parties, man, holds and observes it. While, therefore, the mediator depends not only on one, but especially on man, God is only one, i.e. dependent only on Himself, follows only Himself and His self-consistent plan - acts purely and solely according to His plan and His (unchanging) nature - while the law has the weakness of a contract, the promise is unchangeably established since it depends only on one - God, who is one.

*) She also finds herself in Apollo. history 7, 53.

Heb. 2, 2. We shall not yet decide here on the relation of these passages to the parallel of Galatians.

42

The author, as if this new turn of thought did not occur and by its complete execution did not push back the previous reference to the Romans, immediately connects to it with the formula "so",*) as if this reference were still fresh in everyone's mind, in verse 21 and asks: "Is the law then against the promises of God?" In indicating the purpose of the law, he wants to get to the statement in the Römerbrief that God has enclosed all under disobedience, and he understands it only insofar as he has to transform the subject of his original into scripture and leave the relationship of this subject to the law indeterminate, so that it is unclear whether scripture itself is the

law or the general statement that contains the law.**)

*) οὖν

**) Rom 11:32 συνέκλεισεν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπειθείαν ἵνα
Gal 3:22 ἀλλὰ συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφὴ τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν ἵνα

43

So dependent is he, however, on his source that he also designates the proof of grace as the purpose of this inclusion of all under sin, albeit not with the same precision as the Epistle to the Romans: "For God has consigned all to disobedience, that he may have mercy on all," says the Romans, while our author says, in a more verbose and less elegant manner, "so that the promise might be given to those who believe in Jesus Christ through faith."

But before the compiler answers the question of the purpose of the law according to the guidance of the Epistle to the Romans, he inserts a sentence in verse 21 between the question and the answer that gives the appearance of his wanting to solve the matter himself: "For if a law had been given that could give life, then righteousness would indeed be by the law." The compiler, who does not create categories but also cannot handle them correctly and mixes them up wildly, has erred in this overloading. There was no mention of a law having the power to give life, and there was no reason whatsoever for the objection "For if the law had this power." The only question was whether the law now contradicts the promise. Nobody had thought about this in the immediate previous discussion, and nobody could have thought that the law possessed the power of life. Therefore, there is nowhere any reason for the author's defensive argumentation. However, one thing has long been on his mind, one thing he has not yet accomplished, despite several attempts and efforts: he has not been able to make it clear that the law carries in itself and in the dichotomy it presupposes and which forms its basic condition, the impossibility of its execution, and thus the basis of its impotence. And he has clumsily inserted this thought, which still occupies and burdens him, between his plagiarism from the Epistle to the Romans.

44

After he then describes the law as the disciplinarian leading to Christ in verses 23-26, and contrasts the life under the disciplinarian with the present sonship of believers, which he essentially exhausts in thought, he further justifies it with a new turn in verse 27, which led to nothing in the preceding discussion, with an image that completely emerges from the previous circle of thought. The phrase "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have

put on Christ" is borrowed from the Epistle to the Romans, the image of the following clause "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is no male and female" is borrowed from another passage in the same epistle, and a reference that leads him to the first Epistle to the Corinthians moves him here, where there was no question of this contrast, to expound on the idea of the abolition of all previous contrasts according to 1 Corinthians 12:13.

45

However, only in the Romans is there real coherence, and a real and significant idea is carried out when it says in chapter 6, verse 3, "Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death?" This statement from Romans is the indispensable link of a real and great exposition. On the other hand, the compiler of the Galatians has made this statement irrelevant by using another passage from Romans, which speaks of putting on Christ, for the latter part of the sentence.*)

*) Rom 6:3 ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς χριστὸν ἰησοῦν εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν

Gal 3:27 ὅσοι εἰς χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε·

Rom 13:14 ἐνδύσασθε τὸν κύριον ἰησοῦν χριστόν

Then, when the author of the First Corinthians, in the context of his exposition on the unity and inner harmony of the ecclesiastical organism, describes baptism as the binding agent of this organism, so that all, Jews and Greeks, slaves and free, form one body, as they are all infused with one spirit, this is again a coherent statement and a thoughtful link in a large and coherent exposition. However, the compiler of the Galatians could not give his plagiarism a firm foundation or support, and added more oppositions, increasing them beyond those whose abolition the First Corinthians spoke of, to include the opposition of male and female, for which there was no place here.

46

Actually, the compilation that the author provided so far should have ended with verse 28, since all the contradictions have now been overcome. But did he really give a living, structured presentation? Did the keywords and fragments belong to him, which he rather borrowed from other works? Did he really develop, draw conclusions, and prove anything? None of all this - therefore it was also impossible for him to calculate the point at which a presentation must come to its conclusion - therefore it also costs him neither effort nor overcoming to add a foreign, superfluous, trailing link to his compilation with verse 29, which he again borrows from the letter to the Romans and then copies verbatim in chapter 4, verse 7, when he gives the

presentation he now intends.

He now takes up the section of the letter to the Romans that deals with the godliness of believers in Romans 8:14-17 and receives its conclusion with the conclusion in verse 17: "And if children, then heirs." Therefore, he says in Galatians 3:29: "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." This fragmentarily thrown sentence leads him to that exposition of the letter to the Romans, and in conclusion, he copies it verbatim: "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."*)

*) Gal 4:7 εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ
Rom 8:17 εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι· κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ . . .

47

Firstly, let us try to help him by transitioning from the confusion of the previous metaphors and oppositions - being held under sin and receiving the promise, being under the guardian and becoming a child of God - to the new metaphor and opposition of the minor and major heirs in Chapter 4, verse 1. He believes that he is in the best possible context, even making the transition with the words: "but I mean"*) , thus thinking that he has just spoken about the minor heir who is under guardianship, as well as his low legal status and that his statement, that such a heir does not differ from a servant, is fully prepared - he believes that his readers have been drawn into this deduction to the extent that they are only waiting for the final culmination of it, which lies in the comparison with the servant. However, none of this is the case: there is no context about the minor heir, no deduction leading up to the final point.

*) λέγω δέ

So how can we help the compiler? By allowing him the miracle of connecting to the distant allusion contained in the earlier opposition between living under the guardian and being a child (verse 24-25), which has been pushed back far by new deductions, as if it were immediately before and as if those who live under the guardian and face the children of God are really the children and heirs who stand under guardianship during their minority.

Therefore, we will forgive him and forget with him that so far, childhood has been opposed as a gain of the subordinate standing, which preceded faith - meaning, we will allow him to do so and assume that so far the opposition has been only the difference in status between the children.

We will also forgive him that the image of the heir who, during his minority, is under guardianship, limps significantly, as God the Father is and remains alive.

Finally, however, the confusion becomes so great and the compiler reveals himself to such an extent that he can no longer be helped and his work collapses.

While in the beginning of this new deduction the heirs are assumed to be children even during their minority, they become children only at the end (verse 5-7) and receive sonship through Christ.

And when they become children and receive sonship at the end of this deduction, the contrast between minority and adulthood is no longer considered - in fact, their elevation to heirs is only described as a consequence of their elevation to the new status of children (verse 7).

In short, the conclusion of the deduction denies the beginning, knows nothing of it, and the whole thing has long since fallen apart, while the compiler still thinks he is in the best context. The confusion even rises to the point that the author, at the very moment when he describes sonship (verse 5) as a gift, describes this gift (verse 6), which he also describes in changing, unclear forms, as the necessary consequence of the fact that the recipients are children from the beginning.*)

*) V. 6 ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί

This exposition had to end so unfortunately after the compiler had forced his image of the mature and immature heir who does not differ from the servant into the clear work of the Romans (8:14-17), in which the state of servitude and sonship are opposed to each other. The dissonance with which he ended was so glaring that he ultimately had to resort to almost verbatim copying the work of the Romans, thereby having to designate the elevation of the believers to heirs as a consequence of the received sonship, and forgetting that according to his assumption, they were already children and heirs, albeit immature.

Moreover, the more literally he copied, the more he betrayed his lack of skill. When the author of the Romans says (8:15), "you have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father," it is clear and exhaustive. Our

compiler, however, who wanted to appear rich with his collected dogmatic formulas, has crammed a whole representation of the work of redemption into this exposition on the state of children and heirs, and therefore brings the keyword of sonship into the sentence (v. 5) that the Son of God redeemed those under the law "that we might receive the adoption of sons." Therefore, when he speaks of the spirit that testifies in the hearts of believers about their sonship, he must create a new formula, and thus he creates that excessively overloaded sentence (v. 6): "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father."

The rich man who gave readers of this exposition on the state of sons and heirs a whole representation of the work of redemption as an addition on top of it all had no room in the narrow space in which he had to cram this representation to even suggest how the redemption happened and what it consisted of. Or should the preceding participle (v. 4), according to which Christ came under the law*), have been the means of this redemption? Then he had neither room nor time to explain why this means was effective and expedient, why it was necessary.

*) γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον

50

After the long dogmatic argument that has kept the author occupied until now, he finally returns to a personal address to the Galatians and wonders anew about their relapse into the law (V. 8, 9)**), while just a moment ago he was assuming that he was speaking to those who have "lived under the law" (Ch 4:5), in other words, to Jews. And while he now describes their lapse into the law as a relapse, he addresses his readers as Gentiles who "did not know God and served gods that were not really gods" - in other words, he confuses two assumptions, which would not have been possible for a man who was really writing to his former pupils.

**) πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν

For how long must Judaism have fallen, finally, if its nature could be placed alongside heathenism as one of the elemental principles of the world*, due to its dependence on natural determinations!

*) V. 3 στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. V. 9 στοιχεῖα.

51

The author continues his personal discussion with the Galatians: "he fears for them (v. 11) that he may have worked in vain," just as the author of the second letter to the Corinthians fears that his readers have been led astray from simplicity in Christ.**)

**) 2 Cor 11:3 φοβοῦμαι δὲ μή πως,
Gal 4:11 φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς, μή πως

He then asks his readers in verse 12: "become like me, because I have become like you, brothers, I beg you." But he does not say in what way he has become like them. Has he become free from the ordinances? Given himself wholly to God? Impossible! He descended to them — so they should ascend to him. Should they then become like him, just as he became like them by abandoning Jewish customs and identifying with them as Gentiles? Again, impossible! The context leads to no real point of comparison — none is even hinted at, and the last point, which would hold up the apostle as an example of temporary humility, cannot be sustained precisely because the apostle is to be presented as a real, enduring ideal. The author wanted to present him as an ideal, but did not understand how to work out his intention, and did not dare to copy his original - (1 Corinthians 11:1) "Follow my example, as I follow the example of Christ" - directly. ***) The conclusion of this plea: "Brothers, I beg you, you have not done me wrong" is a disconnected babble, for which the author gives no hint of explanation and which leads him to describe the extraordinary joy with which the Galatians received the apostle during his first visit in verses 13-15.

***) 1 Cor 11:1 μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε, καθὼς ἐγὼ χριστοῦ
Gal 4:12 γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι ἐγὼ ὡς ὑμεῖς, ἀδελφοί, δέομαι ὑμῶν.
1 Cor 4:16 παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε

52

Did the author visit the Galatians more than once? The author doesn't mention a second visit that corresponds to the first one. He betrays his underlying assumption that, when he wrote the letter, the Apostle had only been to the Galatians once.*) Immediately after describing his supposed first visit (Galatians 4:14-15), he says in verse 16, "Have I now become your enemy by telling you the truth?" This means that he assumes that the change in their attitude toward him occurred between then and his first visit, which he considers to be the only one and which he doesn't mention again. The word "now" in Galatians 3:3, "Having begun by the Spirit, are you now being perfected by the flesh?" also assumes only one visit by Paul among the Galatians and implies that the change in their attitude toward him happened quickly after their conversion. The author indicates that the transformation occurred so rapidly that the Apostle himself was surprised, making it

impossible for him to have made a second visit between the Galatians' conversion, their falling away, and the writing of the letter.

*) Not το δεύτερον, which corresponds to the ο πρώτον

53

How did the author come to describe his only presence among the Galatians as the first, suggesting that there was a second one? Or did he realize his mistake? Did he hope to correct it when he said later in verse 20: "I would like to be with you now", that is, when he expressed his wish as a definite intention? Did he hope that his wish would count as an action and that his only presence among the Galatians would be counted as the first one?

*) "He says not: I would like to, not:" ἤθελον ἄν, but I wanted to, ἤθελον.

Anything was possible for him - but it is certain that this formula: "I would like to be with you now", is a copy of the formula in the Second Corinthians: "I am ready to come to you for the third time"**, and that only the dependence of the author on this letter, which speaks of a repeated presence of the apostle among the Corinthians, led him to use a formula - "the first time" - which suggests a second presence of the same person among the Galatians.

**) 2 Cor 12:14 τρίτον ἐτοίμως ἔχω ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς.
Gal 4:20 ἤθελον δὲ παρεῖναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄρτι,

Furthermore, when he characterizes that first presence among the Galatians (chapter 4, verse 13) as one in which he preached "in the weakness of the flesh," it would be impossible for him to say a clear word about what this weakness of the flesh consisted of and how it manifested itself, whether it was the same as the "temptation in the flesh" of which he speaks immediately afterwards (verse 14), and what should be understood by this temptation. He does not know, does not need to say, and leaves the closer determination to the apostle of the Corinthians, who (2 Corinthians 11:30) boasted of his weakness, whose flesh (2 Corinthians 7:5) was of no use to him in his distress, and who also suffered "in weakness, with much fear and trembling"*) among the Corinthians.

*) 1 Cor 2:3 ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ καὶ ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ πολλῶν
Gal 4:13-14 δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς πειρασμὸν μου τὸν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου

54

The author must leave it indefinite in what consisted the weakness of the flesh in which the apostle preached to the Galatians, but the definiteness that he (V. 14-15) lends to the devotion with which the latter received the apostle is so exaggerated that it betrays itself as an artificial fabrication by its vividness and artificiality. "You received me as an angel of God - as Christ Jesus" - what a chilly exaggeration! "You would have plucked out your own eyes and given them to me, if possible" - if it had been necessary, a man who had really had a personal relationship with the Galatians would have written this - in his icy exaggeration, the author confuses the simplest concepts and does not see that the possibility, if the willingness was not senseless and useless pomp, had to be firmly established.

Suddenly, the author describes the seducers before he even named and introduced them, and after only briefly mentioning "the disturber" in passing at the very beginning of the letter, "they are zealously trying to win you over, he says in verse 17 without specifying the subject, but they want to exclude you so that you will zealously seek them" - but how did he arrive at this "zealously trying to win over"? Where is the preparation for it? Nowhere. Where is the absolutely necessary contrast to the "zealously trying to win over" that is "not fair"? Nowhere, unless in the Second Corinthians, where the author "is zealous for God" for the Corinthians,*) but also really demonstrates this zeal, while the compiler of the Galatians letter even leaves it indefinite about what the false zealots want to "exclude" the Galatians from.

*) 2 Cor 11:2 ζηλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς θεοῦ ζηλω.
Gal 4:17 ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ καλῶς

55

In the uncertainty of his consciousness, the compiler can only write vaguely, he must keep the matter in suspense. "It's nice," he continues in verse 18, "to be eager to do good at all times, and not just when I'm with you" - but what is "doing good"? It is not said. Who should be eagerly doing good? The Galatians? Yes, they must be, since the author had just complained that they were eagerly following false teachings. But what is the following qualification: "not just when I'm present"? Clearly, it is supposed to make Paul the subject! He should indeed be eagerly doing good even in his absence! - how baseless! How affected!

How cumbersome is the exclamation immediately following this desire, "My children, for whom I am again in the pains of childbirth until Christ is formed in you!" - how affected is this imitation of the sentence in the first Corinthians (1 Cor. 4:15): "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you!"

When the compiler comes to that disclosure in verse 20 that he wanted to be present with them "and change his tone," he again carefully avoids specifying whether this change should be for good or for evil - nor does he give the slightest hint as to whether it should be in contrast to his previous warm relationship with the Galatians or to the language of the entire letter or to the stance of the current passage. He carefully avoids any specificity - he cannot create.

56

After these last uncertainties and vaguenesses, he comes in verse 21, without any transition, without any preparation, to the allegory of Ishmael and Isaac (verses 21-31), which forms the conclusion of his dogmatic exposition and shows the nature of both Testaments through the fate of the son of the bondwoman and the son of the free woman. The author of the Epistle to the Romans had already set Isaac as the son of the promise and the type of the true children of Abraham in contrast to other children of the patriarch (Romans 9:7-9) - our compiler has developed this idea, this time, in a meaningful way.

However, he was not able to carry out his development to the end completely pure. Just in the middle of his argumentation (verse 25), where he wants to say that Hagar, the bondwoman and mother of the servants, corresponds to the present (lower) Jerusalem, he let the subject fall by the wayside because he was led astray by the distant similarity he discovered between Hagar and an Arabic word that means "mountain," using the subject Hagar for the statement that it is Mount Sinai in Arabia*). But when he finally reaches the conclusion, "So, brothers, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free" (verse 31), he has not provided anything beforehand, at least in the allegory, from which this conclusion could arise.

*) τὸ γὰρ ἀγὰρ σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ ἀραβίᾳ, συστοιχεῖ δὲ τῇ νῦν ἱερουσαλήμ, δουλεύει δὲ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.

57

Yes, yes! Perhaps he can refer to V. 29, which states that now, as it happened in Ishmael's time, the offspring of the flesh persecutes the offspring of the spirit. No! It remains impossible because if the assumption was already established that the believers were the persecuted and suffering offspring of the spirit, the children of the promise, the children of the free, then it did not need to be inferred, and it could not and should not have been the subject of a conclusion.

Exhortations and Conclusion

(5 and 6.)

Even now, when he draws practical applications from his dogmatic exposition and returns to the purely personal relationship with the Galatians, the compiler remains a man who speaks lifelessly from a lifeless relationship, and he cannot even handle the laboriously collected keywords with ease and fluency.

Immediately the introduction to the section devoted to exhortations and practical applications (C.5,1): "Stand firm in the freedom!" is formed after the exhortation of the first Corinthians: "Stand firm in the faith".*)

*) Gal 5:1 τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ στήκετε
1 Cor 16:13 στήκετε ἐν τῇ πίστει

58

The way in which the compiler introduces the sentence (v. 2): "if you let yourselves be circumcised, Christ will be of no benefit to you," with the explicit remark "See, I, Paul, tell you," is much too intrusive - this reference to the authority of the apostle is much too anxious, and the formula "See!" has its dangerous counterpart in the unfortunate "Behold!" which follows later in chapter 6, verse 11.**)

**) Ch. 5:2 ἴδε, Ch 6:11 ἴδετε

The "I testify again to every man who receives circumcision" before the following sentence in verse 3, "that he is under obligation to keep the whole law," is so unclearly expressed that the author leaves it in doubt: is he just repeating the previous sentence and only impressing it in a different form, or is he repeating what he said during his presence in Galatia? The former would be a mistake, as Galatians 3 is not only a repetition of the thought in Galatians 2, but an expansion of it and a continuation to a new turn - the latter would only have been possible if he attributed a wonderful power of memory to the Galatians.

The following sentence, "You have been severed from Christ, you who seek to be justified by law," in verse 4, is added without any connection to verse 3. A connection can be imagined, but the author has not said anything about how he combined them - he did not dare to build the bridge since he did not

feel quite sure when he used the term of emancipation and liberation, which is used in the image for the liberation from the law in the letter to the Romans, in this inappropriate way for the separation from Christ.*)

*) Rom 7:2 After the death of the husband, "the wife is emancipated from the law of the husband". - κατήργηται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνδρός.

Gal 5:4 κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ

59

The "for" in the following sentence in verse 5: "for in the Spirit, through faith, we eagerly await the hope of righteousness" is a somewhat daring addition for the reader to form the transition point with verse 4: "we think differently, the matter is different, it must be started differently; for..." The pleonasm of the determination "we eagerly await the hope", the accumulation of the two determinations "in the Spirit, through faith", the isolated position of the determination "in the Spirit", whose opposite is not elaborated, all of this once again demonstrates that the author only picks up the keywords of an existing dogmatic view and tries in vain to handle them with the appearance of originality and ease.

In the sentence of verse 6: "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision counts for anything, but only faith working through love," the first part is taken from the book of Numbers, and the confused combination of love and faith is a faulty mixture of the keywords from the first letter to the Corinthians.

The rebuke in verse 7: "You were running well; who hindered you from obeying the truth?" is presented without any connection to the preceding text; it was not enough that the connection was "in the mind of the apostle" - it should have been brought out from the depth of this mind.

60

The disobedience to the truth is suddenly turned into an "obedience" against the deceivers - a harsh turn! And the remark that this obedience "is not from him who calls you," is a pretentious and yet not very meaningful remark.

Finally, the compiler stands again in his full nakedness. "A little leaven," he continues in verse 9, "leavens the whole lump" - literally borrowed from the first Corinthians (5:6), but transferred to a false context. There, where the Corinthians were punished for showing leniency to a criminal, the image was appropriate to draw their attention to the danger that being together with him entailed - but here, in the Galatians, where it is about deceivers and

false teachings that work with open intentionality and have the whole life, being and thinking in mind from the outset and without concealing it, here, where it is not about the hidden danger that a small, inconspicuous substance can hold - here, the warning was placed as inappropriately as possible - all the more inappropriate since, according to the previous assumption of the author, the Galatians had already been deceived, enchanted, and become disobedient to the truth.

And where does he suddenly come in verse 10 to the assurance of trust: "I have confidence in you, in the Lord, that you will not think otherwise?" He trusts and openly stated that they have fallen away? - trusted and has not long before confessed (4:20) that he had become unsure about them? So where does this trust come from? From the second Corinthians (2:3), where the author expresses his trust in his readers that his joy is theirs*), thus assuming agreement, but this assumption has not made itself impossible, while our compiler cannot even say whether this agreement of the Galatians refers to the immediately preceding short and abrupt sentences or to the entire content of his letter.

*) 2 Cor 2:3 πεποιθῶς ἐπὶ πάντας ὑμᾶς.
Gal 5:10 ἐγὼ πέποιθα εἰς ὑμᾶς

61

The unreliability of this assurance of trust is rivaled by the inner impossibility that causes the statement in verse 11, "if I am still preaching circumcision, why am I still being persecuted?" to collapse. Still preaching? So in the interest of the Lord and the church - as a teacher of the Gentiles still preaching? Did Paul ever preach circumcision in this sense? Actually, the sentence even means, "if it is really true what they accuse me of, that I still demand circumcision" - but where is a trace of this accusation to be found? The author did not even dare to make this accusation possible in his letter and to let others express it - in short, he created an absurdity and probably came to his mistake by confusing the person of Paul with the subject of the salvation of the community as a whole, and Paul's history with that of the community, which did have a time when circumcision was still preached.

Partly into this absurdity of a phrase, there also resonates the meaning: "if I still preach circumcision now that I am preaching Christ" - but even this, always only faint allusion, is untenable, as Paul, being a Jew, did not "preach" circumcision and there was no reason to assume that he was still preaching it now.

62

The conclusion in verse 11, "then the offense of the cross has ceased," could indeed be connected to the previous statement, if it were assumed that the apostle preached circumcision and suffered no persecution as a result. But the compiler did not make this assumption, nor did he develop this connection. He simply drew this conclusion out of thin air and used the keywords from the first letter to the Corinthians about the offense of the crucified Christ (1 Corinthians 1:23) and the annulment of the cross of Christ (1 Corinthians 1:17).

The following hastily expressed desire in verse 12, "I wish that those who unsettle you would even mutilate themselves," is a tasteless and affected antithesis to the destruction that they supposedly wish for the offense of the cross.

As we willingly grant the compiler his pleasure in using the word "for" with which he continues in verse 13, "for you were called to freedom, i.e. his joy that his Galatians are very different from those scoundrels who must be cut off, we only note that the subsequent limitation, "only do not *) let your freedom become an opportunity for the flesh," enters very suddenly and unprepared, and seems unnecessary for the Galatians who knew so little about Christian freedom that they preferred to be slaves to the law.

*) μόνον μὴ

63

How does the author come to fear an abuse of freedom? His possible "knowledge of the human heart or history" cannot be assumed as his guide, since this concerns these specific persons, the Galatians, context, development, motivation, and warning against a serious, imminent danger.

However, he felt so unfamiliar with the situation he wants to assume that he couldn't even find the verb for his warning, and instead, he just threw the phrase "only that freedom not be an occasion for the flesh" into the air, composed of his compilation of phrases from the Romans letter.

It was also impossible for him to describe the approach that freedom makes to its false application, the occasion that it gives to the flesh - too many phrases from the Romans letter were going through his head, and he could not motivate all of them, nor bring them together with their natural antitheses.

Indeed, the author of the Romans letter knows how to describe the occasion that sin takes from the law, to which the good and holy must serve,

correctly*) - but he is also an original creator.

*) ἀφορμὴ, Rom 7:8-12

The one who worked out the warning against the misuse of freedom in the Romans letter (14:1-15) and limited freedom through love knew what he wanted, and therefore wrote systematically. In contrast, the compiler of the Galatians letter, who jumps from one keyword to another after that abrupt and unclear warning against the misuse of freedom, cannot help anyone find their way.

64

The author of the Galatians letter connects verse 14 with the lost keyword "love" in verse 13, saying that "the whole law is fulfilled in one word, namely: You shall love your neighbor as yourself" - only in the Romans letter, which is before him, is this fulfillment of the law detailed in chapter 13, verses 8-10, and the expression "the whole law" is justified after listing the individual commandments. The author of this letter knew what he wanted, and understood how to distinguish the categories - he calls the love of the law fulfillment and says that the law and its commandments are summed up in one word: the commandment of love.*)

*) Rom 13:9 ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται

We can leave the following contrast that the compiler formed in verse 15 to the "love" of the previous verse due to its flatness, and immediately point out how he skips over the previous explanation and glorification of love with the words "But I say," and returns to the lost keyword "flesh" in verse 13 with the words "Walk by the Spirit, and you will not carry out the desire of the flesh" in verse 16.

Therefore, verses 14-15 are not just an occasional digression - (the fulfillment of the law in love and the summary of the law with all its commandments into the one commandment of neighborly love being an occasional digression!) - it only becomes such through the clumsy turn and return to a long-forgotten keyword.

65

The author intends to arrive at the contrast that is presented in Romans 7:14-23, but he does not know how to handle it and presents it incorrectly. "For the flesh desires against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh. These are opposed to each other, so that you may not do what you want."

So, the Spirit only desires against the flesh? Does the Spirit resist the flesh only in the same powerless way that the flesh resists it? Does the Pneuma, the Spirit, not go beyond the conflict and desire?

What a mistake! The Spirit, the divine life force, is always the victorious one, transcending its opposition!

The copyist made an endless mistake and made the contrast, which the author of Romans makes from the inner person and the members, from the law whose will is opposed by the indwelling sin, from the self-abandoned human spirit (the Nous) and the members and whose solution is demonstrated rather in the new, life-giving, overcoming Spirit, in the Pneuma (Romans 8:1-2), completely meaningless by making the Spirit, the infinitely triumphant Pneuma, one side of this contrast.*)

*) Gal 5:17 ταῦτα (i.e. πνεῦμα and σὰρξ) ἀντίκειται ἀλλήλοις.
Rom 7:23 βλέπω δὲ ἕτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου
ἀντιστρατευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου

66

He wants to proceed confidently with the thoughts he presents, as if he knows them thoroughly and their mutual relationship, and after just describing the opposition between the Spirit and the flesh as a mutual conflict, he continues as if he wants to develop something new, to present the relationship in a new form: "these oppose **) each other" - but as if the same thing had not been said just a moment before!

**) V 17 δὲ

He explains this opposition by saying that the Galatians "do not do what they want" - while the opposition in the Letter to the Romans is clearly shown in the fact that the willing and doing person are separated, with one wanting what the other does not do and the latter doing what the former does not want! How confused and unclear, on the other hand, is it when the compiler collapses the willing and non-doing into one?

When he continues in verse 18, "But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the law," he must betray himself that the Spirit is the divine principle of life, and therefore must also admit that he has given it a false position in the previous opposition. But how does he come to the turn of phrase: "Then you are not under the law?" Had it been previously noted that the law reigns as long as the opposition persists? Yes, in the Letter to the Romans it is not only noted but also explained in detail in chapter 7 that the law is the power of opposition, while the Spirit is the power that resolves the opposition and

thus also frees from the law - but the compiler has only picked up a keyword from this explanation.*)

*) At the end of his development, the author of Romans Ch. 8, 11 says ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοι υἱοὶ θεοῦ after previously in v. 2 he had described the spirit as the power, who are exempt from the law.

67

While the Nömerbrief (Romans) with its actions of the flesh leads to the works of the flesh,**) the Compiler in verse 19-21 uses the list of various sinners from the first Corinthian letter, "who will not inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Corinthians 6:9-10), to make a corresponding list of sins and likewise to connect the laboriously introduced remark that "those who do such things will not inherit the kingdom of God". Even the works of the flesh that seem peculiar to his list, he has taken from the situation and warnings of the Corinthian letter about strife and discord, and even the letter to the Romans must have provided him with a word for this discord.***)

***) Rom 8:13....

Gal 5:19 ἔργα τῆς σαρκός

***)) Gal 5:20 ἔρεις, ζῆλοι, ἐριθείαι, διχοστασίαι, αἰρέσεις

1 Cor 3:3 ζῆλος καὶ ἔρις καὶ διχοστασίαι,

1 Cor 11:19 αἰρέσεις

Rom 2:8 ἐριθεία

Before he writes literally from the first Corinthian letter that such "will not inherit the kingdom of God", he says to draw special attention to this saying: "of which - (i.e. of which sins) - I foretell you, as I foretold before" - but when did he foretell them? When he was with them? He means it - he knows he is repeating a sentence already uttered - but he cannot achieve that the Corinthians to whom the sentence was addressed become Galatians and that they have heard the sentence.

68

"And did he predict it? Does it require a special skill to do so? A prediction? The earlier statement - that the saying had already been written and that he had already given it to the Galatians to consider - he awkwardly weaves into the verb and turns the already established saying into a prediction.

In a very weak manner, in verse 24, after listing the fruits of the spirit, Matt notes: "Against these there is no law."

In the Epistle to the Romans, in chapter 6, verse 6, the flesh, "the old man," is crucified with Christ, and the man who is freed from sin and death rises and lives with Christ. The compiler conveys the first side of this dialectic in an extremely cumbersome sentence: "And those who are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires." The other side, on the other hand, he presents in the feeble tautology in verse 25, "If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit," and to this already laborious trailing tautology he attaches the exhortation to avoid ambition, mutual strife, and envy, which goes into detail but without any cause, without any motive.

He must be very concerned about the exhortation he now turns to in chapter 6, verse 1, since he begins it with the address "Brothers." He acts as if the reason for the importance he attaches to it lies in circumstances, relationships, and actual incidents known to him and the readers, but a real letter writer would also have referred to such incidents, would have referred to what is known to him and the readers. The appearance of familiarity that the author creates remains without reality."

69

He calls the Galatians "Pneumatikoi" *) - as if he could have previously made much ado about their spiritual nature! As if he had not only borrowed the expression from the first letter to the Corinthians and the praise that the letter to the Romans gives to its readers (8:9) that they no longer live in the flesh, but in the spirit!

*) Ch 6:1 ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοί.

He writes, "if anyone is caught in a transgression beforehand,"**) without being able to explain what this "caught in advance" is supposed to mean - he writes: "if even someone" - even then, - as if it were an exceptional case, - as if it were not only then in general, when someone is caught in a transgression, that "restoring in gentleness," which he recommends, could be the subject of discussion!

But how can he write coherently when he gathers the keywords of his work from all sides, for example the spirit of gentleness, in which one is to raise up the fallen, picked up from the first letter to the Corinthians (4:21)?

How can he write clearly when, in order to detail the behavior towards the fallen, he reaches back to the letter to the Romans and takes the category of "bearing" out of a context in which Romans 15:1 speaks of bearing the weaknesses of the feeble? Therefore, the exhortation (Galatians 6:2), "Bear one another's burdens," will never fit into the context in which the raising up of the fallen is recommended, and the determination of who bears the

burden of the offense, whether the fallen or his neighbor, will never be reconciled because the composition is misguided from the outset.

**) προλημφθῆ

70

The author calls deep bearing of each other's burdens a "supplement" to the law of Christ, while he meant to say fulfillment. *) He speaks of a "law of Christ," so that Christ becomes a positive, dogmatic legislator, while in the formulas of the letter to the Romans that he had in mind, "the law of faith," "the law of the spirit" flow into one another through the contrast against the law, which is the law of sin and death in the true sense and in this contrast is illustrated as a figurative expression brought about solely by the contrast. **)

*) Ch 6:2 καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσετε instead of πληρώσετε.

**) See the dialectic Rom. 3, 27, in νόμος πίστεως— also the dialectic Nom 8, 2, in which the νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς forming the one side to the law of works and the law of sin and death.

The author justifies his unclear recommendation of forbearance in verse 3 with the phrase: "For if anyone thinks he is something when he is nothing, he deceives himself" - but is the author only talking about the correct assessment of oneself, not about the relationship to one's neighbor? Is it appropriate to add the intermediate thought: Remember that you are no better than others - that you too may come to a point where others have to bear your burdens? Not to mention that the author knows nothing about this transition - is it permissible? Is the author talking about the mere possibility that they may come into a similar situation? No. He speaks of those who are nothing and boast - he misuses a phrase from the letter to the Corinthians that rejects the imagination of knowledge and insight, and transfers it into a foreign context. *)

*) 1 Cor 8:2εἴ δὲ τις δοκεῖ εἰδέναι τι οὐδεπὼ οὐδὲν ἐγνώκεν
Gal 6:3 εἰ γὰρ δοκεῖ τις εἶναι τι μὴδὲν ὧν

71

Enough is enough! We come to a conclusion and only need to briefly return the keywords that are also stumbling around in confusion in the following sentences (4-10) to the first letter to the Corinthians, to which they mainly belong, and to the letter to the Romans as their legal basis.

The contrast in verse 4, "Let each one examine his own work, and then he will have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another," may be unclear and confusing, but it is based on the serious assumption of possessing real advantages - but this assumption is not prepared for and is explicitly excluded in the justifying sentence in verse 5, "For each one will bear his own load," that speaks directly of everyone's own weaknesses and deficiencies. The contrast is therefore resolved, and the first letter to the Corinthians may retain its phrase: "Let each one examine himself" (1 Cor. 11:28).

The following exhortation in verse 6, which remains without any motivation, "Let him who is taught the word share in all good things with him who teaches," may remain the author's own property. (However, see 1 Cor. 9:7-13.)

The transition, however, from "do not be deceived!" to the following remark in verse 7, "Do not be mocked," must again be left to chance for the author of the first letter to the Corinthians because only where there is a need, only after a strict economy of action and thought (1 Cor. 6:9, 15, 33) is that formula in its place - but here, where no such economy preceded it, it can only feel foreign.

72

The formulas concerning the relationship between harvest and sowing (verses 8-9)*) also belong to the first letter to the Corinthians, whose author knew how to handle them better, and finally, the second letter to the Corinthians (2 Cor. 4:1) may also retain its formula: "let us not grow weary" from verse 9.**)

*) Compare 1 Corinthians 15:42, 50, but here the perishable nature of the seed is contrasted with the incorruptibility of the harvest, while the author of the letter to the Galatians has given the idea a different turn, namely that the harvest corresponds to the seed.

**) μη εκκακωμεν

However, the author's own work is the remark in verse 11, "See with what large letters I have written to you with my own hand!" - this is his own boast with his own handwriting, the ornate reference of the apostle to the fact that he had written this time by hand, as well as the special remarkable form that the letters are said to have.

But even this invention was not made from his own resources. While he deliberately and intentionally leaves it indeterminate what was remarkable

about his letters, the supposed apostle had to rely on his readers knowing about letters that Paul did not write by hand - but they had to know about such letters because is it not clear enough when the apostle notes at the end of the first letter to the Corinthians (16:21), "The greeting is in my own hand--Paul," that the letter itself was written by another hand? Whether the compiler had already read the current conclusion of the letter to the Romans, according to which another named Tertius greets as the writer of the letter, we can leave undecided here.

73

Suddenly, in verse 12-16, there is a new attack against those "who wanted to please the Galatians according to the flesh and forced them to be circumcised" - once again, the Apostle positions himself against his opponents. But why again? Has he not already defeated them? And what is the connection between this attack and the previous remark about the handwriting of his letter? The only possible connection could be that the Apostle draws his readers' attention to what he is actually doing for them, while the seducers are trying to please them for their own selfish purposes: he has written to them with his own hand and in what kind of letters! As if the condescension of his writing with his own hand could even be compared to the intellectual efforts or even intrigues of the supposed Judaizing teachers! He - he would rather make himself pleasing to the Galatians according to the flesh. He - he would be boasting about himself and would not have the right to the following assertion in verse 14: "But far be it from me to boast except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ".*)

*) Modeled after 1 Corinthians 2:2, where he means to say that he desires nothing except Jesus Christ, and him crucified: *εἰ μὴ ἰησοῦν χριστὸν καὶ τοῦτον ἐσταυρωμένον*. Gal. 6:14 *εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ*

74

The conclusion of his letter is still missing, and the author completes his work by once again attacking his opponents, immediately before the final blessing of verse 17: "From now on, let no one cause me trouble, for I bear on my body the marks of Jesus." How harsh! What a strange harshness, after the matter between him and the Galatians was supposed to be settled! How inappropriate before the blessing!

He has debated throughout the entire long letter, has debated hard enough, and now he says he bears a badge of honor that elevates him so high that he is above all debate and accountability.

What a contradiction!

Moreover, he has used the second Corinthians letter again for this outburst and confusingly paraphrased a clear passage in it, where the apostle, in his afflictions and persecutions, "always carries around in his body the death of Jesus." He left it indefinite*) what the stigmata on the apostle's body consisted of, whether they were the marks of slavery to Christ, recognizable to everyone, or the characteristic signs that make him like Christ.

*) 2 Cor 4:10 παντοτε την νεκρωσιν του κυριου ιησου εν τω σωματι περιφερουντες

Gal 6:17 τα στιγματα του κυριου ιησου εν τω σωματι μου βασταζω

Criticism of the Pauline Epistles

by

B. Bauer

Second Section

The Origin of the First Corinthians Letter

1851

3

The Introduction.

1: 1-9.

If it were really Paul who wrote to his Corinthians, he would not have addressed the church, which he could consider as his own work, with a phrase that points to a community that is personally unfamiliar to the author of the letter and refers to a long-established and independent church. "The church of God located *) in Corinth," as such, had already existed for a long time, was fully established, and had surpassed the time when it consisted of individual believers who were won and gathered.

If Paul had really been personally involved with the Corinthians, he would not have addressed his letter to "all" believers, to believers in all places - had the author of the letter been confident in his cause, he would not have formed this address to all communities outside of Corinth so vague, unclear, and uncertain that he added the Corinthians to this new and distinct class of readers with the formula: "from them and from us." The expression "from us" - ("in our place") **) - is so comprehensive that the Corinthians cannot be

excluded from it.

*) V. 2 τη εκκλησια του θεου τη ουση εν κορινθω.

**) εν παντι τοπω αυτων τε και ημων

4

The author, therefore, falls into the contradiction that he is writing a letter that is only concerned with the Corinthians and their affairs, but at the same time he addresses it to all believers in the church and with the poorly formed formula that is meant to include readers outside Corinth, he also includes the Corinthians in this new class of readers.

He knew very well that he was actually writing to all Christians, to all the churches, and that the matters he discusses in the following text are the affairs of the whole church. He wanted his readers to feel the general significance of his work from the outset, but the fear that he might deviate too far from the fictitious assumption determined him to include the Corinthians in the formula that was meant to extend beyond them.

In a detailed description, with a thanksgiving to God for such great grace, in a positive and negative statement, he praises the perfection of the Corinthians: they are rich in everything, they have no lack of any gift, they are so perfect that they only need to await the final revelation of the Lord. The testimony of Christ is unshakeably established among them, and there can be no doubt that God will keep them blameless until the day of the Lord.

They have everything that a Christian can have before the final revelation of the Lord - what a contradiction, then, with all the assumptions of the following letter - what a contradiction with the constant reprimand that the author gives them, especially with his assumption (chapter 3, verse 3) that they are still so fleshly that he has only been able to impart to them the rudiments of Christian teaching thus far! He is perfectly serious in his praise, he does not want to win them over temporarily, to secretly introduce the following criticism with flattery - he does not want to be ironic towards his readers - he rather thanks God for the flawless perfection that he has granted them.

5

In this praise at the beginning, the author does not simply let go of the criticisms that he will make later on, but rather he excludes them outright

through this all-encompassing praise.

He does not praise what is praiseworthy about the Corinthians, but this unrestricted praise was impossible if the following reproach, which relates to all aspects of Christian life and thought that the author considered essential, is to be justified.

For what the Corinthians have, the author could not thank God and at the same time reserve the right to complain and punish their shortcomings in the following text. These shortcomings would be impossible if they were already perfected in all things and only waiting for the final revelation of the Lord.

In short, the author made a mistake and was unable to maintain the unity of his assumptions. After portraying the Corinthians as the ideal of true Christians, albeit at an inopportune time, he could only make the transition to his theme and the first criticism with an awkward "but" *) "But I exhort you".

*) Verse 10. In this great dissonance, the smaller ones disappear, namely that the author connects the relative clause of verse 8, "who will keep you steadfast," whose subject is God, in contrast to the Lord, to the Lord in verse 7, and in verse 9 designates God, who would have to be the one calling, as the instrumental cause of the calling: "through whom you were called."

The Factions.

1: 10 - 4: 21.

He already knows the unity and catholicity of doctrine and wants to designate dogmatic divisions as the scourge of the church when he exhorts his Corinthians (v. 10) to "all speak the same thing" **), not to allow divisions to arise among them, and to preserve the unity of thought and opinion. But he cannot yet represent dogmatic unity in reality; it was still in the process of becoming at his time, and instead of actually describing dogmatic oppositions in the following, he can only speak of the preference for individual party leaders and lose himself in antitheses that have nothing to do with the oppositions of dogmatic interpretation.

**) το αυτο λεγειν

He wants to have very precise and authentic information about the disputes and divisions of the Corinthians, because - what a guarantee! - he received it from Chloe's household (v. 11) - how sharp and certain, then, will his descriptions be, how striking will his admonition be! - How weak and vague is his transition to the actual description in v. 12, which leaves it uncertain whether he refers to what has gone before: "Now I mean this, that..." - or whether he refers to what follows: "What I mean is..." . . . *).

*) λεγω δε τουτο, οτι . . .

7

Enough though! He is now on the topic. The Corinthians were divided - one said, "I am of Paul," another, "I am of Apollos," another, "I am of Peter," and another, "I am of Christ!"

But that is all we learn about these factions among the Corinthians. So it seems that Chloe's household was not particularly well-informed.

When Peter or any faction is mentioned that opposed Paul's name, we are entitled to expect something about the great controversy over the validity of the law - but there is no further mention of the law and its relationship to grace. Or perhaps the faction that put Peter's name at its head wanted to achieve its goal by a circuitous route? First, undermine Paul's reputation? Substitute another authority for his? Claim that one of those who heard Christ himself was the only true apostle? Expose Paul as an unauthorized intruder?

But that could only have been accomplished by immediately attacking his teachings; the dispute over the difference in doctrine could not have been avoided - it would even have had to be the beginning. However, the letter does not discuss the law and its various interpretations and evaluations.

8

Does the letter really lead to such a lively fight over the significance of Paul's personality as the statements from Chloe's household suggest? Rather, the second Corinthians letter - a letter whose origin has yet to be investigated and which at this moment exists for us as little as it did for the Corinthians when they received the first letter - defends Paul's authority only in the second letter.

Or was the apostle, when he wrote the first letter, not yet as well informed about his opponents as he was when he wrote the second? Had the people from Chloe's household not been able to tell him everything yet?

But if he once speaks of the Corinthian situation in which he mentions a faction for Peter, he should have described it as well. A matter that he touches upon must be justified and exhausted.

Or should we really admire the skill with which Dr. Baur*) allegedly applied his polemic in the second Corinthians letter (10-13) against Peter's faction, giving it "its full force", and admire the art with which he combined the exposition of both letters "into a harmonious unity"?

*) Paulus p. 324, 325

However, even if we assume the impossible, that part of the second letter was dedicated to the fight against Peter's faction in the first letter and that the second letter has the same author as the first, would not the work of the same author, instead of coming together in unity, rather fall apart? Would he not leave the readers of the first letter waiting in uncertainty for an absolutely necessary exposition before he knew that he would have a second occasion and opportunity for it?

9

However, according to Dr. Baur's view, even in the first letter, the author explicitly addresses the party of Peter - in the discussion that immediately follows the beginning of the ninth chapter.

So in this passage about the marriage of the other apostles and the pay of the clergy? In this confusion of the most diverse discussions? In this confusion of expressions, none of which are thoroughly searched?

Regarding the party of Christ, according to the author, it is supposed to be a separate one, *) not only the party of Peter, insofar as it is directly connected with Christ through its leader - a separate party that wants to be connected with Christ directly, not through its teacher - but the author does not know anything about how they thought about this direct relationship with Christ.

*) like Mr. Baur wants, *ibid.* p. 278

As Dr. Baur wants it to be, it should be a condemnable party like the others, which it would not have been if it wanted to belong to Christ alone in contrast to the other parties that had their particular leaders - but the author

does not say what made their character reprehensible.

It is supposed to be a sect, but the author does not know anything about what made them a sect - he fights against them as little as against the party of Peter.

Even the party of Paul is supposed to be a sect, reprehensible like the others - but the author has nothing more to say about them later.

10

He soon initiates a polemic against Apollos, but cannot shape it because the contrast between the wisdom of God and the wisdom of this world, in which he moves in the course of this polemic, remains highly indefinite - we will even see that when he elaborates on this contrast, he forgets Apollos with all the other nuances of the Corinthian sect as much that he presupposes worldly wisdom as a demand of the Corinthians in general, even of the Gentiles - in short, as everything else, except as the peculiar demand of a particular sect.

In the end, we would therefore have to praise the author, i.e., the real apostle, with Dr. Baur*) again for "skipping everything obvious to immediately grasp his subject at the highest and most extreme point" - i.e., for giving his readers indefinite generalities instead of real configurations and refutations - or would we have to admire his method that he "knows how to gain an absolute standpoint of contemplation in a rapid ascent over all subordinate elements, from which the subject in question can be brought into a contrast against which no further contradiction is possible due to its clearly evident evidence" - i.e., we would have to admire in the polemics of the author as their peculiar "concise, striking and compelling" power that he immediately places the assumed contrasts, occasions, and phenomena under a supreme contrast, in whose indefinite and meaningless generality they all disappear.

*) ibid p. 356

11

Or could it perhaps also be described as a particular skill of the author that he leaves it completely unspecified how the various factions he criticizes in the later sections of the letter related to them?

Rather, he forgets these factions in the course of the letter, after he had unfortunately formed them, when, in order to remind the pagans of the necessary Catholic unity, he placed the apostle among sects that he did not

yet know and - (if we disregard the faction of Peter, which the author himself does not describe) - could not know.

It was not the factional spirit of the Corinthians that pleased itself*) in multiplying sect names and establishing names that "indicated various colors and shades, but not necessarily different factions" - but the author piles up names and differences to put the apostle into a chasm similar to the division of his later time, but he was not a free enough poet to create the images of the sects of his time in real forms.

*) like Mr. Baur says, *ibid.* p. 273

After the author, in verse 13, has reproached the division of the community with the question of whether Christ is divided, and the veneration of the party leaders with the question of whether Paul has been crucified for them or whether they were baptized in Paul's name, this keyword of baptism leads him to an exclamation in which he expresses his joy and gratitude to God that he has not baptized anyone among the Corinthians. He is glad that no one can claim to have been baptized in his name.

12

But were those whom he might have baptized his creations? Was the assumption, which is now impossible and causes his joy, even possible if he baptized specifically in the name of Christ, as it would have been necessary? Could anyone, given the general assumption of the meaning and purpose of baptism, even entertain the idea that they were not baptized in the name of Christ, but in the name of the man who baptized them?

When the author used his own keyword from D. 1 in this misguided way, he certainly remembered that Paul must have also baptized. Therefore, he adds the clause immediately after his solemn statement, accompanied by thanks to God, that he had not baptized anyone, "except Crispus and Gaius". But his conscience still doesn't leave him alone, and in verse 16 he must add, "I also baptized the household of Stephanas", and his inner uncertainty finally forces him to make the evasive remark that he "did not know whether he had baptized anyone else" - that is, it forces him to render the entire excursus unnecessary and take away all reason for his joy.

Instead, in verse 17, he presents the general fact that Jesus had sent him to preach the gospel, not to baptize.

But he did baptize, didn't he? So is he only speaking in the heat of the moment when he does not count baptism as part of his mission? Perhaps - but then he is certainly speaking without calculation and falsely! Should he not express the matter strongly, not exaggerate it to present it falsely? How can exaggeration be allowed to portray a matter inaccurately and falsely?

13

And why shouldn't Paul baptize? Wasn't baptism necessary? Or should he have it done by disciples and assistants?

He had always done it himself, even through people who were nothing but his organs and means.

None of this concerns the author - nor does he care about the difficulty that is no longer relevant to him, that by not baptizing, Paul did not make the formation of a separate party impossible, as he did have his own teachings. Instead, the author rushes ahead and, with the incidental addition of "not with wisdom of words" in verse 17, he brings up the theme of his first treatise, the contrast between worldly wisdom and divine foolishness.

Rather than taking his theme from reality, he brings it about with the help of an incidental remark! Instead of preparing and naturally bringing about the various modulations of his theme through a presentation of the actual conditions in Corinth, he makes the first execution of his theme an incidental addition to a casually thrown-out determination.

This is indeed how a historical hero must write, defending his work against the jealousy and aberrations of the parties!

The author couldn't have introduced the theme more skillfully, after the news from Chloe's household alone had prompted the Apostle to write the letter.

14

If the transition to the theme is shaky, the keyword that mediates this transition is also unclear and left hanging. The wisdom of speech in which the apostle should not preach the gospel *) could only refer to the form of preaching, yet it must also be a demonstrative development that touches on the content, since the frustration of the cross is described as its consequence.

*) V. 17 ουκ εν σοφια λογου.

If this rejection of the wisdom of speech with its corrupting effects was not to be meaningless and purposeless, it had to have the opponents of the apostle in mind, who thus frustrated the cross of Christ. But why does he not really fight against them? Directly? Why does he only give them a blow in passing?

But who were these opponents? It would most likely be Apollos - so was Apollos frustrating the cross with his wisdom of speech? Why does he not destroy him? Was the blessing of the death - the salvation work in death - in danger? Why does he not fight against the danger?

But he does not even say what the danger was for the cross - he overlooks the main thing. Does he fear that the brilliance of the presentation would push the fact itself into the background? But the power of the arguments would rather benefit the fact itself! He does not even hint that it is a matter of concealment, omission, denial of the fact - he only speaks of the art of presentation - so why should the fact suffer from it?

And what is the contrast between the wisdom of speech?

15

This contrast is missing the main point. Only later in verse 21 does he speak of the foolishness of preaching, but he also does not explain what it consists of, and even places it in a contrast that has nothing to do with the wisdom of speech, which he introduced with this back-and-forth about uncertain and constantly shifting contrasts.

None of these contrasts can hold up - none of them stand on a firm foundation. After excluding the wisdom of speech in verse 47 without setting up its contrast, he suddenly introduces the contrast that the word of the cross is foolishness to the lost, but to us, the redeemed, it is the power of God in verse 48 - instead of speaking of the factions in Corinth, instead of describing and toppling their contrast to the correct understanding of salvation, he suddenly comes to a contrast in which the outsiders, the lost, stand opposed to him and the Corinthians - to us, that is, him and all believers, including the Corinthians - at the same time he is making arrangements in verse 47 to set up and justify his method in opposition to the Corinthian factions, he gets lost in a contrast in which the Corinthians, along with him and all believers, stand opposed to those who reject the word of the cross as foolishness.

Yes, at the same time he sets up this contrast between the lost and the redeemed, and while still thinking he is moving within it, he has already slipped into the new contrast between Hellenic wisdom and the foolishness of the evangelical sermon in verses 19-21. That wisdom has been refuted

and made foolish by God, it was not the means to grasp God in His wisdom - God punished it through the contrast, contradiction, mockery, irony of linking the wisdom of the world to the foolishness of the sermon.

16

But he doesn't hold onto this opposition either, he doesn't carry it through clearly and completely. The foolishness of the preaching was supposed to form a double opposition: to the wisdom of the world and to the wisdom of God; it was supposed to be the punishing and mocking refutation of worldly wisdom and at the same time the ironically inverted path that God took to himself after worldly wisdom had proven its inability to grasp him in an adequate way in the element of his wisdom; but this latter opposition recedes, and the author confines himself to the opposition that the foolishness of preaching forms with worldly wisdom, and reinforces it even more by developing it, in verses 22-23, as the natural opposition to the demands of the Jews and Greeks - the Jews and Greeks who suddenly replace the lost ones and completely suppress the thought of the Corinthian factions.

However, he does not develop the opposition - he only laboriously circles around it. At first, the Corinthians and all the redeemed stood opposite the lost ones - now, in verse 24, the called ones themselves*) stand opposite the Jews and Greeks with their inappropriate demands, but the called ones, to whom the Jews and Greeks belong in the same way - after he finally set verse 25, "For the foolishness of God is wiser than human wisdom, and the weakness of God is stronger than human strength," infinitely above all human wisdom and strength, and as he wants to derive the proof for this relationship from experience, he turns back to the Corinthians in verse 26, urging them to consider their calling and to deduce from it that God has chosen the lowly, the ignoble, and the foolish to shame and refute the wise, strong, and prominent.

*) αυτοις δε τοις κλητοις ιουδαιοις τε και ελλησιν - a floating and ineffective self and an inappropriate adoption of the given catchphrase that "the Jews and Greeks have an equal share in salvation!"

17

So a new thought, a new contrast - rather a new assumption - a given assumption - the assumption that in the election of the weak and foolish, the wisdom of God is revealed!

But an original creator would first have to prove that divine wisdom is demonstrated in this calling. For our author, however, the assumption, the proof, is given - but where? To the gospel text that the author of the Gospel

of Luke used and for whose use by the author of our letter we will provide numerous and the most convincing evidence.

But let us accept the author's appeal to a statement for which he would have had to provide proof, and let us instead receive as a gift the consequential evidence for his use of a gospel text! Let us also allow him to draw the divinely intended conclusion from the calling of the weak and the shaming of the strong, namely that in God's sight no flesh should boast, and that whoever boasts should boast in the Lord (v. 29-31). Let us allow him in v. 30 to point to God as the source of all being and of the called ones with an unmotivated, perhaps even artificial and contrived turn of phrase *) - let us also allow him there, when he calls Christ the wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption destined for believers, to establish the complete content of Christian wisdom - let us not burden him with the question of the relationship between his righteousness and the dialectically determined righteousness of the Romans letter - (for he could not answer the question anyway) - rather, let us follow him to clarify his appearance among the Corinthians, which he wants to describe as being in accordance with the nature of Christianity.

*) Artificially brought about, insofar as he could only connect it with V.28, according to which God chooses his chosen ones from the non-existent.

18

His testimony about God did not come (C. 2, 1) in lofty speech or wisdom — he believed among the Corinthians that he should know nothing except Jesus Christ and Him crucified (V. 2) — but how did he suddenly come (V. 3) to his states of weakness, fear, and trembling among them? He does not say.

Where did his weakness, fear, and trembling come from? Perhaps from feeling that his own strength was inadequate in the face of the greatness and sublimity of the subject he was preaching? Did he feel oppressed in the face of the great task? He does not say. Or did he feel fear in front of the audience he was addressing? Was he embarrassed in front of the listeners? He does not say. Did the thought of the Greek education of the Corinthians make him uncomfortable? There is no word to justify this assumption. Did the obstacles that stood in the way of his work fill him with fear? What kind of apostle would that be? Or was it the aftershocks of the fear that recent persecutions had caused him?

He does not say — he says nothing explanatory — the image of the apostle that has come down to the author and which he assumes his readers are

familiar with, contained among other things the element of suffering, and he lets the apostle refer to it without bothering to provide real motivation, or even being able to.

19

Similarly, when he now proceeds to describe the teaching of the apostle (v. 4), he fails to really describe it. First, he repeats the negation that his preaching did not come in persuasive words of human wisdom, and when he then sets up the positive contrast that it came in demonstration of the Spirit and power, he must leave it indefinite as to how this demonstration was shown, what the Spirit and power consisted of, or is everything settled with the purpose (v. 5) that it happened so that the faith of the Corinthians should not rest on human wisdom but on God's power? Impossible!

All the less so, since nothing is settled and decided, was he entitled to suddenly attribute the category of wisdom to his preaching, and to do so in the form of appealing to how he had also revealed this hidden wisdom before the Corinthians, while later (ch. 3, 1) he presents to them the circumstance that he had not yet been able to communicate to them the true, inner, spiritual core as a rebuke of their low standpoint.

The author now already comes to the idea of a special doctrine — that idea which he sets forth with prosaic precision in ch. 3, 1-2 — he speaks of a wisdom that is intended for the mature, that is, for those who, with their spiritual maturity, stand in contrast to the first beginners, the immature, against whom those who, according to ch. 3, 1 and ch. 14, 20, are still in childhood stand. However, in the Montanism, he only tentatively expresses it in the beginning and does not continue the completed differentiation towards its proper direction. Instead, he only presents the wisdom of the mature as such that remains a mystery to those outside, the rulers of this world - rulers of this world, to whom the Jews (Luke 8) belong in the same way as the Gentiles (heathens).

20

All of these contrasts of a particular wisdom that belongs only to the perfect and the immature, the spiritually mature and the spiritually immature, were given to the author by the zeitgeist. He even knows and uses the Gnostic distinction between pneumatic and psychical people and refers to the Corinthians as the carnal ones (C. 2, 14. E. 3, 1), using the buzzwords of the sects of his time and hoping to subject them to Catholicism and make them useful. However, he himself has frustrated this hope, as at the beginning of his writing, with a great deal of effort and strength, he had made the attempt

to oppose the worldly demand for wisdom with the folly of the gospel as a divinely intended antithesis. That which is characteristic of him, this antithesis of worldly wisdom and divine folly, he cannot hold onto and carry through, losing it within the community through the antithesis of male and pneumatic perfection and the fleshly weakness of childhood, and within the community itself, he brings this antithesis back into disorder through that antithesis of voluntary renunciation of divine revelation to all wisdom of this world.

How can the antithesis that should belong to the wisdom that is determined for the perfect actually form and be securely established if the simplicity of the preaching of the crucified as the highest was described before and the folly of God was placed above all the wisdom of this world? What good could all of these developments and great revelations about the knowledge and revelation of the Spirit given in the second half of the second chapter do for the Corinthians if, as the carnal ones, they are unable to understand spiritual things? Just before the author excludes the Corinthians (C. 3, 1) from the knowledge of spiritual relationships, he does indeed assume that they belong to the pneumatics. He speaks generally, including all of his readers, that is, the members of the community in his "we" from verse 7 to 12: "God has destined us for his glory, which none of the rulers of this world knew; we have received the Spirit who is from God, that we may understand what God has freely given us" (V. 12). Finally, at the end of the development (N-16), it is us, all of us, all pneumatic people, who have the Spirit of Christ, and therefore also as pneumatics, the supreme authority of the world - how can he then immediately exclude the Corinthians from this "we" and oppose himself to them as the carnal ones?

21

Let us rather ask whether he is capable of holding onto and truly following through with this new opposition, which he has arrived at in a wondrous, i.e. unmotivated, way.

(We should also note beforehand that the Spirit who searches all things, even the depths of God, is thus distinct from the depths of God that are its object, and yet remains divine Spirit and the power of revelation. This is a figure that assumes the Gnostic distinction, according to which the limit and determination lie in the Absolute itself, but in divine form, and in its divine power and essence possess the drive and ability to overcome its limitations.)

22

So the Corinthians are carnal? Uneducated children to whom he (C. 3, 1-2) could only give milk, not solid food?

What a self-deprecation, speaking with two tongues! What a diminution of the universality of the new doctrine, that he could not come forward with it openly and boldly! How unfortunate, rather, this transfer of gnostic and Montanist distinctions to the ground of Catholicism, which he nevertheless wants to occupy and maintain!

So the crucified Christ, with whom he (C. 2, 2) appeared before them and as a true Christian teacher was the only one who could appear, was milk - children's food?

What did he hide and withhold from them? He does not even hint at it - he does not know it himself.

And if they (V. 2) "still cannot" do it now, why does he write to them? Why does he go into everything he can find in the letter itself in detail? If he allows the letter to have been intended for two different races of people at the same time, it is clear that he nowhere distinguishes between two classes of readers - does he let himself be carried away into more difficult discussions only because once he did not ask whether they would not be too high for his readers? On the contrary! What he gives, he gives with careful consideration, with full intention - his intention was directed at nothing more and nothing less than a complete presentation of true Christian thinking and acting - as it were, a system of the whole, which then had to be included with a detailed description of the last things.

23

And in what have the Corinthians shown that, as fleshly people and as children, they are still unresponsive to the richness of the Pneumatikos? In their divisions (V. 3) - in their subordination to party leaders (V. 4) - thus he wanted to take up again the beginning of his writing, the news that Chloe's household had brought to him - for this he had to use the category of fleshliness and childhood in Christ. But once he has achieved this goal, and once he has come to his intended topic through the questioning remark (V. 5) about who Paul and Apollos really are, once they are no longer considered as authorities, the contrast against the childishness of the Corinthians is completely forgotten, and instead of the judging, punishing and excluding Pneumatikos, the syncretist stands there, who assigns everything that the individual factions contain as common property to the universal Church until the final judgment decides (V. 5-45).

The syncretist, the indifferentist - the Catholic stands there, who recognizes the individual faction leaders as servants of the One Lord and makes their peculiar work the common property of the Church through the reflection that they all serve and are accountable to the same Lord.

A true Paul, a shaken one who is aware of the uniqueness of his work achieved in heroic strength, will not be so indifferent to his work that he leaves it to itself as his own planting and comforts himself with the thought that someone else will come and water and nurture the plants (V. 6).

24

A true hero does not believe he acts as a wise master builder when he only lays the foundation and consoles himself that someone else will build some structure on it according to their own wishes (v.10).

Only the syncretist is capable, in the lethargy and confusion of his consciousness, of the thought that a wise master builder only lays the foundation and thereby preserves himself *) as a wise master builder. The real master builder, however, cannot even think that he has nothing more to do than just laying the foundation; he knows that he has to preserve his art in the structure, solidity, and appropriateness of the building.

*) v. 1. ὥς . . .

A real fighter, a discoverer, to whom his discovery is dear and to whom it is impossible to leave it to chance, even if he is convinced that the same is under the guidance of his God, also appreciates the weapons of details and will use them to carry out his new way in detail, to ensure his principle against the detail of the existing. A real trailblazer, who is in the multifaceted fight against tradition, does not initially relinquish his new principle to the extent that he believes he acts as a wise master builder when he leaves it at the foundation and lets others build whatever they want and however they want on it.

If the real Paul had been only a part of what he was supposed to have been according to the assumption of the letters named after him, it would have been impossible for him to speak of his work with such indifference and to make this indifference the hallmark of the wise master builder.

25

But after Paul's time, others have emerged and done their own part in the founding and development of the church - these others also matter to the late author of the letter - the syncretist wanted to bring them all to recognition. Bringing all of them to the fore as co-workers in building the church is one thing - but he had to overstep and create a skewed image when he made Paul speak of these later individuals as if they were contemporaneous co-workers, and when he allowed Paul to express the same significance and insignificance of all of them.

It was already a mistake from the beginning that he praised the mere foundation layer as a wise builder - the cornerstone is already there *), laid by someone else, and no one can lay another foundation. Only with the superstructure (v. 12) does the possibility of one's own work and the question of its worth or worthlessness begin - but if that is the case, why so much praise for the wisdom of the builder who lays the foundation?

*) V. 11. κείμενον.

Finally, the syncretist's leniency drives him so far that even in the last judgment, where he entrusts the judgment of the fitness of the buildings, he still distinguishes between the building and the builders, allowing the latter to suffer their punishment only through the burning of their work, while saving themselves "as through fire" (v.15), leaving this expression in suspense and unexplained as to whether they are purified by the fire of their work or escape through the fire of their work.

26

Very little corresponds to this syncretistic leniency in the tone of severity with which the author immediately punishes the corruption of the temple of God with the same corruption (V. 16-17) - he does not even say what this corruption of the temple consists of - he also leaves it uncertain whether each individual, "you are the temple of God", or whether the whole in all, the community as such, is the temple of God - the key words of this saying were given to him, but the saying itself is only suggested by the preceding, not motivated, not really brought about.

It was already inappropriate that in V. 16 with this severe turn of phrase, "Do you not know that you are the temple of God," he addressed the Corinthians, the believers, instead of the teachers, and the following warning (V. 18-20) not to consider oneself wise, in a context where the relationship of teachers and their teachings to each other is being discussed, even less so in their place.

He thinks he is bringing the previous discussion to a conclusion and final result and gets into a new turn, for which he uses the earlier catchwords of wisdom and foolishness. After he has explained the indifferent nature of the different teachings and subjects, spoken of the position and significance of the teachers, he considers it appropriate and timely to take up the earlier contrast of wisdom and foolishness and does so in such an inappropriate way that he warns the believers against self-deception as if he had just explained the injustice of the wisdom of this world.

This warning against worldly and human wisdom and the syncretist principle that claims all human work as its own, finally confuses him (v. 21-22), as if both were the same, as if the one who cannot boast about any human being could also have the freedom to extend his ownership right to all human work, be it Paul, Apollos, Peter, or the world, and consider it all his own. Whoever belongs to Christ alone (v. 23) has nothing to do with people anymore and no longer values human work to the extent that he considers it his own. But if the thoughts of the wise are futile (v. 20), it would even be a sin to claim ownership rights over them.

However, even if the confusion into which the previous development leads him is so destructive and has detrimental consequences for the author, it is enough for us to draw a certain conclusion from his statement, "All things are yours, whether Paul or Apollos or Peter or the world" that the author who wrote this statement stands at a point where the history of Paul, Apollos, and Peter belonged, long since concluded.

The author does not completely misinterpret the last ramifications of this development when he immediately connects the new turn, "So *) let us consider ourselves as servants of Christ and stewards of God's mysteries," as if nothing had happened in between, to the earlier statement (v. 10, 14) that individual teachers are only servants and workers of God. However, he has no right to completely ignore what happened in between and to anchor himself so confidently to the distant past. However, even if he does so, he will soon destroy his work again in the course of his progress. After he has given the criterion (v. 1-2) by which a teacher is to be judged as a steward of God - (it only depends on whether he is found faithful) - he immediately rejects it (v. 3) for himself ("for me it is a very small matter that I should be judged by you"). Why does he then present it?*) The criterion applies generally, to God and people - why does he reject it for his relationship with the Corinthians? The criterion applies universally to all teachers - why does he make an exception for himself? The concession was universal - why does he withdraw from it?

*) C. 4:1 Οὕτως.

*) εμοι δε.

He then assures that he does not even judge himself, but in the next moment (V. 4), that he is not aware of anything against himself, yet this

does not justify him, and that the Lord will judge him. But what does he have to discuss his justification with the Corinthians if he rejects their judgment altogether? And have the Corinthians already judged him? Did they want to judge him? If the Corinthian factions were of a doctrinal nature, did the Apostle's opponents have to rely on allegations of official misconduct? Finally, he outright forbids premature condemnation (V. 5), but is the judgment that he thus forbids as hasty and as an intrusion into the divine privilege, the same as the assessment that was indifferent to him before (V. 3)?

What disjointed and ultimately exaggerated turns! Instead of overthrowing the sects, he protects the work of their leaders with his syncretistic principle. Instead of dissolving the parties, he submits the judgment of their leaders to the Last Judgment. By deferring to that judgment, he believes he can secure his recognition. Finally, he believes he stands elevated by simply despising the Corinthians' judgment as an intrusion into the divine prerogative.

29

The contradictions are significant enough, but their secure solution is found in the fact that the author is not only a syncretist but also a hierarch. The hierarch will soon stand in his full greatness.

Before this, he attempts to bring the previous development to a conclusion through a summarizing turn of phrase.

"I have done this," he says, "with a special reference to myself and Apollos" (V. 6)*), but he does not say at the same time where this execution begins - whether from E. 1, 14, where he speaks of himself after the reproach against the factions, or from C. 3, 5, where he occasionally compares Apollos with himself - but an occasional comparison, in a context that deals with the teachers in general and their significance, is this the implementation of a general idea with consistent, special reference to Paul and Apollos? Or if he wants to say that although the factions extended further and other leaders could have been considered, he only spoke and acted on himself and Apollos - where does he then speak of Apollos at all? - where does he even mention his name other than in that occasional comparison (C. 3, 5) with himself and later (C. 3, 22) with himself and Peter?

*) ταυτα μετεσχηματισα.

30

However, it is clear that he means at least the exposition from 1 Cor. 3:5 onwards, as indicated by the purpose statement: for your sakes, that ye

might learn in us not to think above that which is written. The verb "think" *) was probably originally missing, which is now the common reading, he could not find a verb that was specific and general enough at the same time. But it would have been very difficult for him to find an appropriate verb for this sentence. At the end of the verse he can be more confident and say: "that ye be not puffed up one against another," but one may ask what gave him the right to say "in us" as if Apollos had agreed and given his approval, did not the Corinthians rise up against each other and did they not rather support their party leaders?

*) φρονεῖν.

In the beginning of his purpose clause, when he avoided and omitted the verb, his adventurous composition "that ye might learn in us, not to think above that which is written"**) was his way of avoiding specificity and providing the necessary generality. But if one asks which positive Scripture he had in mind with this elaborate phrase (for he must have had a positive Scripture in mind), it would be difficult, even impossible, to indicate a specific passage in the Old Testament that he had in mind. Rather, it is most likely that the late writer, from the standpoint of his readers and time, in which the writing of the heathen apostle was considered positive divine word, designated the written exposition of it as the norm for the believers - even at the risk of creating a weak tautology: "I have written this, that ye might not think above that which is written..."

**) το μη υπερ ο γεγραπτα.

31

From the confusion of this sentence, it can be seen that the author intended to indicate that with the supposed previous digression on Paul and Apollos, he had something further in mind, something general that went beyond the time of Paul. However, as little as he carried out that parallel, or could even necessarily carry it out, he failed to develop this indication of general interest and to shape it.

As the syncretistic and hierarchical interests crossed in his mind and as he made arrangements in verse 7 to punish the self-exaltation of those who resisted putting their particular treasure at the disposal of the larger whole, the church organism, he reminded the people who showed by their subordination to the party leaders that they did not claim their own creative power of the fact that they had received everything they possessed. The hierarch, who wanted to be seen as the sole mediator of all church property, took the place of the syncretist and poured his scorn on those who wanted to be something and mean something without him: "Yes, you are already

satisfied, you have become rich, you reign without us - yes, you are autonomous, you are sufficient for yourselves, you do not need us - you are the true rulers and destined to rule - aren't you? You want to rule? You would like that - yes, I wish you ruled", the hierarch concludes, driving his irony to the extreme and being sure that his wish could not come true - "then we could at least come to power with you, because without you we would never be able to do so."

32

His authority and high dignity, however, are completely secure: both are the reward for his martyrdoms, and he holds this guarantee for his high significance mockingly and ironically against the rebellious laypeople in verses 9-11 as something certainly trivial and insignificant, even something degrading.

"But God has made us apostles as the last of all and exposed us as such" (v. 9) - us apostles, that is, all apostles who form a holy choir in connection with Paul, and whose tragic fate is known to the whole world.

But what does the mention in this description of the martyr's state of verse 12, that he provides for his livelihood and works with his own hands? What is the meaning of this free renunciation of the reward from the communities - a renunciation that cannot be counted among the sufferings and is rather the well-calculated means of asserting one's own independence? It is a reminiscence that has arisen from the tradition of the behavior of the apostle to the Gentiles, but here it is least in its place.

Furthermore, what is the antithesis between the treatment the apostle receives and his behavior towards his persecutors in the same verse? "When we are cursed, we bless," etc. It does not belong in a context that deals purely and solely with the persecutions and sufferings that the apostle and his peers experience - it is again a reminiscence, taken from a foreign context, a free adaptation of the gospel commandment according to which (Luke 6:28) the curse of people should be repaid with blessing. The more inappropriate this self-praise is in the present context, the stronger it testifies that the author had already been given a gospel with that commandment of the Lord.

33

In short, the hierarchy already existed when the author wrote, and it sought after the titles of its authority against the resistance of the laity - there were already multiple Gospels, for the scripture that commanded blessing as a weapon against curse was not the original Gospel - and there was already, as

the author immediately proves, a norm of catholicity.

After portraying himself and his group (v.13) with exaggerated humility as the scum and refuse of the world, he (v.14) turns around and explains that he (v.15) is still their father, reminds them (v.16) without saying what of, and after that, following his own example, he reports to them that he sent Timothy to them for that reason - but he doesn't say why. He forgets that Timothy would have had to arrive before the letter and finally comes to the point that all these convoluted phrases were aiming for, the revelation that Timothy will remind them of the way he teaches everywhere, in every community.

What kind of a shallow teacher would he have to be if his long stay with the Corinthians wasn't long enough to acquaint them with his teachings!

However, the author is not concerned with Paul's teachings, but rather wants to refer to the one and universal, everywhere applicable norm of the Church - Timothy doesn't even need to come - he was not sent, as the author later realizes (chapter 16, verse 10), he will come later and is unnecessary, since the author himself in this letter already summarizes everything he considers to be the embodiment of catholicity.

34

He only wanted to refer to the ecclesiastical-legal ground on which the hierarchy stands invincible, and in the clumsily intertwined phrases with which he (v. 18-21) concludes this entire exposition and threatens with his imminent personal arrival, he presents himself as the all-powerful hierarch who can hold war and peace in both hands.

The hierarch will soon prove himself as a miraculous judge.

On unchastity/adultery/fornication.

5: 1 - 6: 20.

The author was well aware that, as he moved on to another chapter and wanted to link this part of the discussion to another offense of the Corinthians based on the basic assumption of the letter, he could no longer rely on the reports of Chloe's household but had to form a new transition. This time he calls the general talk of people his "source" and qualifies it by adding "in general" *): "In general, it is reported that there is immorality among you", using the following admonition as a justification and further

confirmation of the severity with which he has been addressing the Corinthians.

*) 5: 1 ὅλως.

35

The adultery he has heard of is the relationship that a member of the community has with his father's wife. However, he does not say anything about whether the offender is living with his father's wife as a husband or lover, whether his father is dead or not, whether the latter still has the woman as a wife in the latter case, or whether he is divorced from her - the talk of the people had not told him anything about it. Instead, he willingly avoids going into this detail and does not need to delve into it because he only wanted to enforce a rule that was particularly close to his heart regarding prohibited degrees of kinship, to present marriage with a stepmother as an abomination and to demonstrate his hierarchical omnipotence in the destruction of the abomination.

He sees himself presently in the Corinthian community - the entire community with his spirit gathered in the name of him who had already referred to the gathering of two or three who come together in his name as fully empowered and possessing unlimited power (Matthew 18:19-20) - and thus he speaks as a judicial chairman in pronouncing judgment on the offender, according to which the latter is to be handed over to Satan.

At that moment, he believes, the judgment takes place as he writes and the Corinthians read his letter*) - as if it were the same moment.

*) an assumption that is only unwittingly contradicted by the perfect tense: I have judged, i.e., by a perfect tense that arose from the reflection that he has already brought the matter to a decision before he comes to them himself.

36

How dangerous it would have been if the apostle had actually dared not only to immediately resort to the extreme measure and hold a supreme court based solely on the talk of the people, but also to rely on the fact that a community that did not unconditionally recognize his authority, and of which a large part was even in open rebellion against him, would immediately agree with his opinion.

However, the danger disappears for the apostle because his name only serves the hierarchical fiction.

Only the singular Paul, only an imaginary person, was able to dictate such a colossal punishment - to a real person in relation and conflict with his peers, this adventurous "consciousness of miraculous power", which the apologists*) attribute to Paul and his apostolic co-workers based on this passage, whose Pauline origin they first have to prove, is not given.

*) so also Dr. Baur, a. a. O. p. 329.

After this miraculous exertion of power, the hierarch now turns to the accusations he has against the Corinthians - admittedly at a very inconvenient time, since he had just established them as the supreme court he now has to reprimand.

Based on the context, his call to eliminate the old leaven must refer rather inappropriately to the criminal who has long been eliminated, expelled, and given over to Satan for the destruction of his flesh, while his spirit, without anyone knowing how that is possible, remains reserved for salvation on the day of the Lord.

37

If this reference to a matter that had already been resolved is inappropriate, then it is even more inappropriate that the exhortations in verses 6-7 are so general that the offender is no longer, at least not solely, to be considered. However, they also stand as a figurative elaboration on the necessity for Christians to remove the leaven of old impurity from themselves in their Easter life (v. 8) - for it is always their Easter.

Let us accept his figurative play as evidence that he wrote at a time when the Jewish Passover festival had long been Christianized and already stood as a Christian festival, which could be used as an image for the purity of Christian life in general.

Let us not demand coherence from him now when he comes to a new matter in verses 9-13 and immediately intertwines it with the previous discussion on the adulterer, although the latter had already been pushed far back by the Easter image.

He wants to correct the misunderstanding that his warning in the earlier letter against associating with fornicators had caused by reminding them of what he actually wrote. But how can he conclude this correction, which concerns a completely different subject in verse 13, with the demand: "Expel the wicked one - the wicked one who, in this determination, can only be that long-since dealt-with adulterer - from among you!"

And what a misunderstanding! If he warns against associating with fornicators, did people take it to mean that they had to leave the world? Is it possible for anyone to interpret this warning as referring to anything other than spiritual community?

38

And isn't his interpretation of a common rule of life rather false when he explains that he only meant the association with sinful brothers, i.e. members of the congregation, and he did not think of those outside? That is, isn't this interpretation of a common and self-explanatory rule of life trivial?

And really? Did he present this, inappropriately interpreted rule of life in the letter? As if a special letter from him was needed for that norm of humanity to be given, and an impossible misunderstanding of his readers for him to make a baseless interpretation of it!

If a real Paul were the author of the present letter, and he had already written a letter to the Corinthians before, and felt compelled to bring it up again, he would have done so in a more natural way.

If now a polemic against submission to pagan jurisdiction follows (c. 6, 1-6), then any thought of connection with the preceding must be abandoned. An allusion had indeed been given to the writer in the fact that mention had been made before of those outside, but the relation in which they are now and before considered is essentially different in both cases. The writer, who would like to pretend that he has command over a multitude of relations that lie in his relation to the Corinthians, is restricted and forced to set dogmas and statutes of his time side by side - or rather his real intention was only directed towards the concatenation of dogmas of his time, and the assumption that Paul writes should only give this dogmatic theory the sanctity of apostolic authority.

39

The prohibition of the pagan jurisdiction was already established as a statute when the author attempted to theoretically justify it, and he immediately juxtaposed essentially different commandments with it as proof that he did not create independently, but rather compiled given material (verse 7). The author took the punishing remark, phrased as a question, about the use of pagan jurisdiction from the same gospel text which the author of the Gospel of Luke used to borrow the isolated question in chapter 12, verse 57: "And why do you not judge for yourselves what is right?"

Incidentally, in his theoretical justification of the prohibition, the author assumes that the saints will be the judges of the world, and that they will also judge the angels (although he himself does not know exactly how this latter judgment will be carried out). Thus, verse 3, which asks whether they should not also judge earthly matters, is logically valid, but the conclusion in verse 2, whether they are not worthy of lesser legal matters, is somewhat confused and confuses two phrases: whether they are not equal to the lesser matters, and whether the lesser matters are not worthy of them.

Furthermore, while the question in verse 5, whether there is not even one wise man among them who can judge between brother and brother, is properly phrased, verse 4 is awkward and somewhat new, completely disconnected from the context, as he instructs to select the despised from the community and set them aside as unworthy.

40

Verse 6 confuses two prohibitions, that of submitting to pagan jurisdiction and that of any kind of legal dispute altogether, immediately blending them into one another — a clear indication that the material of this exposition was given to him, but he himself was not its master.

In verse 7, he believes he is correctly continuing the prohibition of legal disputes by stating that the believer should rather suffer injustice and be taken advantage of — thus he has given too narrow a meaning to the evangelical commandment, which recommends submission to secular authority in general (Luke 6:29), by turning it into a prohibition of legal disputes between brothers, i.e., between believers.

It is very weak when he accuses them in verse 8 of doing wrong in general and even more so to their brothers — taking advantage of and even oppressing them; it is very far-fetched, after this digression on pagan jurisdiction, to state in verses 9-10 that the unjust — enumerating all possible types of them at length — will not inherit the Kingdom of God; and finally, it is very affected when he reminds the Corinthians in verse 11 that some of them were also such people — as if he had any reason to speak of the past when he is only talking about the present and its flaws — as if he had the right to touch on the past when his readers, as he himself notes, have been cleansed of its filth.

41

He then leaves this reminder of the past without any further consequence, just as it was without reason, and immediately turns to a phrase (v. 12) that has no connection whatsoever with this whole section (chapters 5-6). "All

things are lawful for me, but not all things are helpful" only echoes the following discussion in chapter 8 on the consumption of pagan sacrificial meat, and perhaps also with the beginning of v. 13, in which it is stated that food is for the stomach and the stomach for food. However, with the end of this verse and of the entire sixth chapter, it has nothing more to do - the author deals with adultery from v. 13 to v. 20, for which the absurdity of "All things are lawful for me" is impossible - so impossible that it cannot have been in the supposed letter of the Corinthians, to which the author is supposed to refer according to some interpreters.

No! The author had it in his head - he brings it up here at the wrong time, drops it afterwards, after having connected it with the equally inconsequential phrase "All things are lawful for me, but I will not be dominated by anything" in v. 12.

Anyway, he now deals with adultery from v. 13-20 and demonstrates its wrongness by showing how it gives the body to the prostitute, which belongs to the Lord, and that it is a sin against one's own body, which is intended to be the temple of the Holy Spirit, and especially against the body that man has not even given to himself.

42

On Marriage.

7.

Just as the author has forgotten about Chloe's household and no longer thinks to take the occasion for his teachings from the gossip of her servants, we too shall do likewise and not burden him with the question of whether the teachings he now gives about marriage contradict specific views that were held by the factions that Chloe's household was talking about, and whether these views were related to the direction and assumptions of those factions. He himself no longer knows anything about those factions--he gives the Christian view on marriage and the casuistry of marriage legislation as it had developed in his time. Let us not demand more from him than he could give.

Since he has no longer to deal with specific abuses in this chapter, as he did in the previous section, he could not take occasion from the general talk of the people for his treatise. No! The Corinthians have written to him about marriage (7:1) and he answers them--but on what? On their questions? Does he give the slightest indication at the beginning about what their questions were? Does he really take up their questions? Does he make even one reference to specific questions later on? Is there even a hint about whether

all the points in the following treatise relate to corresponding questions, or whether he once goes into detail about his views without regard to specific questions?

43

None of all that. The assumed reason is a superficial construct and, once it is stated in verse 1, it is immediately and forever forgotten.

When the author wrote, the preference for celibacy over marriage, which was only permitted because of fornication (verse 2), was already a moral dogma. This preference was so self-evident that he did not even think of justifying it in the introduction.

Marriage, which was only allowed as a concession to the weakness of the flesh according to Christian principles, had already been regulated according to the needs of spiritual life, and the mutual obligation of the spouses to each other was temporarily lifted if they agreed to do so for the purposes of fasting and praying (verses 3-6). Then, at the end of his digression on this temporary suspension of obligation, the author gives a floating instruction in verse 5 that they should come together again so that Satan would not tempt them for their uncleanness (as if the prospect of resuming sexual activity would console them during their current abstinence!). At least this shows that he is writing in a time when the later views and language of ascetics were already emerging.

We say "at least" because what his instruction actually aims to achieve, whether it is intended to console only for the momentary renunciation, whether he wants to limit the time of renunciation as much as possible, or whether he wants to prevent the danger that the married couple might fall into sin during their fasting, he himself would not be able to say, since all these expressions did not come to his mind at once.

44

After describing marriage once again as a mere concession, as a weakness that can be permitted as a means of avoiding the worse consequences of passion, in verses 10-11 he moves on to divorce. He forbids it, tracing the prohibition back to an explicit command of the Lord (v. 10), and yet he immediately proceeds without interruption to specify what should be done if divorce has already occurred (v. 11), and at the end of this instruction he lags behind with a feeble "and" returning to the prohibition of divorce.

This is a consequential confusion! First, an absolute prohibition, then an unprejudiced acceptance of the exceptional case, which is not even

characterized as such, and finally a relapse into the assumption of the prohibition.

To put it in a reasonable way, the situation is as follows: the author knows the absolute prohibition of the original gospel, but he could not hold onto it strictly, as he wanted to give rules for real life, which often contradicted it - but he also did not yet know the casuistry that explicitly specifies the case in which the absoluteness of the prohibition should yield, as in the Gospel of Matthew.

If he then explicitly states that he has no command of the Lord for his exaltation of celibate life (v. 25), the result just obtained is confirmed: he knew neither the Gospel of Matthew nor the Gospel source from which its author (in Matthew 19:10-12) took the praise of those who have renounced marriage.

45

As for his instruction regarding mixed marriages (between Christians and non-Christians), it is firstly flawed when he concludes his command to uphold these as real, valid marriages, and his argument that the non-believing partner is sanctified by the believing partner, with the remark (v.14) that otherwise your children would be unclean - as if it were possible that all of his readers were living in mixed marriages, or as if he were only speaking to such people! His instruction is also highly incoherent: after bringing mixed marriages to the point of recognition as valid marriages through the reflection that the believing partner sanctifies the other, he nevertheless disapproves of them (v.16), rebukes the hope with which the believing partner trusts in the salvation of the unbelieving partner as presumptuous, and only reluctantly agrees to recognize such marriages in the case *) that God has destined a certain couple for a mixed marriage.

*) V. 17 εἰ μὴ

"So I ordain in all the churches," he adds, which means, to put it in plain terms, that he must conform to the common Catholic practice of allowing these mixed marriages.

"!!" - as if a man who puts yes and no side by side in his instructions for this case could be an organizer and legislator for the entire church!

What kind of legislator is he, who in a section on marriage suddenly and even in the belief that he is still in the best context, speaks about the indifference with which God looks upon the difference between circumcision and uncircumcision (v.18-19)!

"What kind of lawmaker is he who, prompted by the mere hint of indifference, speaks out against indifference regarding the difference between free and slave status (V. 20-22), advises the slave to guard his status as indifferent, commands him with a very affected and deficient phrase to use even his slavery for the case*) that he could become free (!)**) - who finally comforts the slave with the statement that he is a freedman of Christ, while the called master is a servant of Christ!"

*) V. 21 ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ

**) use! The phrase he had in mind was: Don't make use of the opportunity to become free!

As if the slave, as a freedman of Christ, were not freed from him, and the master, even though he becomes a servant of Christ through his calling, ceased to be the master of his civil slave!

What a lawgiver, furthermore, who immediately links the commandment for the slave in verse 23 to the prohibition "do not become slaves of men" - as if there were even the slightest reason to warn against the slavery of men, which here is spiritual and theoretical, after the Corinthian party strife and their subordination to party leaders have long been forgotten!

What a letter writer, finally, who, when he speaks again about the infinite superiority of the celibate life and explains the reasons why marriage is infinitely inferior to abstinence, acts and speaks***), as if he had not yet said a word about this matter, and finally gives behavioral guidelines regarding the godly conduct of widows (V. 39-40), as if he had not already fully dealt with this matter (V. 8-9)!

***) V. 25 περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθενῶν

We highlight one argument from his reasoning because it is again important for determining his relationship to the Gospels.

In the context where he presents marriage as unnecessary and superfluous due to the brevity of time remaining until the final crisis (v. 29-31), he adds a warning that those who have wives should live as if they had none, and he immediately extends this statement to everyone, advising those who weep to live as if they were not weeping, those who rejoice as if they were not

rejoicing, and those who buy as if they had no possessions.

Having wives, rejoicing, and buying are positive determinations and pleasures, which are all valid in their place when it comes to renunciation and abstaining. Crying, on the other hand, does not belong here, it is not introduced by anything in context and could not have occurred to anyone who originally creates and follows a driving interest – it has come to the author by chance, from outside, through foreign force – but from where? From those beatitudes that the author of the Gospel of Luke has taken from the same source text as our author.

48

On Idol Sacrifice.

8 - 11: 1

Instead of starting with the occasion that brought him to the discussion of the consumption of meat sacrificed to idols, as a real letter writer would do, he immediately begins his treatise with an excursus on knowledge - on knowledge in all possible forms, relationships, and oppositions (verse 1-3). First (verse 1), when he concedes to knowledge and acknowledges to the Corinthians: yes, we all have knowledge, and you too have it, he limits this knowledge through love. Immediately after that, knowledge (verse 2) is the disapproved apparent knowledge, and after the unmotivated, inexplicable digression on it, it suddenly appears as a passive, being recognized by God, and as a consequence of love for God (verse 3). Three turns are overhurried and none of them come to fruition. The last one is especially empty since the author immediately proceeds to discuss the true knowledge of the nature of idol sacrifice - that is, the knowledge he referred to in verse 1 and the only knowledge that could be relevant here.

The issue at hand was the correct theory, which had to lead to the correct practice.

Let us now explain how it happened that the author, in that introduction, quickly jumped from the correct theory to the apparent knowledge and then lost himself in the vagueness of his being recognized by God. He cannot truly present the correct theory - his own consciousness about the subject is unclear - hence, after his concession (verse 1), he immediately retreats into the antithesis against apparent knowledge - finally, to the height, but not really described by him, of being recognized by God.

His lack of clarity regarding the correct theory is immediately revealed.

In verse 4, he sets about justifying the more liberal view, wanting to give it recognition and explain its legitimacy. In verse 7, he intends to follow it up with the limitation that consideration for weaker brothers requires, but this restriction takes effect before and without any real acknowledgment of the validity of the freer view - the practice corresponding to the correct theory must give way to the practice that denies the theory before it is recognized as legitimate.

He wants to develop the theory of free practice in verse 4 and recognize its legitimacy - (yes, there are no idols in the world) - but the second half of this sentence already brings a glaring disharmony into the whole - a disharmony that is immediately and thereafter (verses 5 and 6) maintained alone, as the author now assumes the existence and essence of idols and only denies the belief of others that they are also gods.

This stark contradiction proves that the author himself is still unclear on the theory. He does not possess the free, correct, and self-assured theory - no wonder, then, that he could not see the corresponding free practice! His anxious and convoluted expressions presuppose the free theory and practice as an acquisition of his time, but he does not dare to assert both. And when he recommends self-denial from verse 7 onwards as if this indulgence towards the weak is the free work of love, he needs expressions that even require condescension towards the idolatrous consciousness of the weak.

By leaving the screaming dissonance of his presentation, according to which the weak ones—(who, according to V. 9.13, are only annoyed by the free theory and practice and want nothing to do with it)—would be exposed to the danger of contamination and complete ruin by the enjoyment (V. 7 and 10), in which they can easily participate or to which they can be tempted, we point out the fundamental and baseless nature of this assumption. We also note how the author, in V. 7, bases the danger to which the weak are exposed on their presupposition of the actual essential nature of the idols, in short, on their idolatrous consciousness, and recommends that they be treated with care for the sake of this consciousness.

Where such contradictions exist, it is not surprising that, from V. 7 onwards, no sentence is carried out correctly, but is rather permeated by

corresponding minor contradictions. And in essence, the author cannot be blamed if he wants to quell the entire dispute and label the decision as indifferent with the phrase in V. 8: the exercise of freedom does not help, the omission does not rob, the decision is called indifferent.

However, he himself has recognized this indifference the least—he has not led with any particular example—he is not impartial—he protects the weak instead of teaching them about the baselessness of their idolatrous consciousness and raising them to freedom. He only addresses the strong and free and tries to persuade them to give up their right as something indifferent instead of defending the theory that makes the corresponding practice important. He does not address the weak; he only protects them, but by doing so, he makes them an authority for the educated.

51

Throughout the entire ninth chapter, the apostle presents himself as an example of one who voluntarily relinquishes his rightful claim and accommodates himself to the weak to the extent that he becomes weak with them.

So one can roughly see what the author intended, but he introduced his digression abruptly and without motivation—he did not properly develop the main category that was at stake here. The lengthy discussion of one of the rights that the apostle has relinquished, namely the right that belongs to the clergy over the laity, betrays the hierarch who is using this digression untimely to justify his own right theoretically. If he were to finally explain in what way and form the apostle became weak with the weak, he himself would be unable to answer the question.

If he introduces the digression abruptly with the question "Am I not an apostle?" it would be correct if his argumentation were consistent and he assumed the recognition of his apostleship from the outset, and then showed that he had relinquished all the rights that his character as an apostle entitled him to. But he does not argue in this way—he does not argue correctly and spends too much time in verses 1 and 2 proving his apostolic character by claiming to have seen the Lord and that the Corinthians are his work in the Lord—as if they alone were his work—as if he had not founded other communities as well!

52

Here, where the rigorous argumentation depended on the secure assumption of his privilege and its unconditional recognition, the anxious argumentation

for the actual justification of his privilege was least appropriate.

And what freedom can be meant by the question, "Am I not free?" Clearly only the freedom that he himself renounced - whatever freedom that may be. His question in verses 4-5, "Do we not have the right to eat and drink? The right to take a sister as a wife, as do the other apostles?" can at most be used as a basis for such freedom - even the discussion of the right of the clergy, from which he did not benefit (verse 15), can still be related to it. But all connection finally disappears when he describes his unconditional freedom (verse 19) as his independence from everyone.

Moreover, how vague is the first characterization of his freedom in verse 4 - how uncertain the author moves when he describes it as the power to eat and drink, leaving it indefinite whether it is the freedom of consumption that he dealt with in the previous chapter, or the right to maintenance that he only mentions later.

What a notion, furthermore, that Peter was wandering around, that the twelve (verse 5) were wandering apostles who were well known to the Corinthians. Only later, in the second century, were they known to everyone as such!

53

Finally, how inappropriate it is to associate Barnabas with Paul's person and present him to the Corinthians as coordinated with Paul when asking whether they did not have the same right to marriage as the other apostles! As if he had come to Corinth with the Gentile apostle!

All these anachronisms lead to the same period, as does the elaborated theory of the right of the clergy to be supported by the laity in verses 7-13: the clerics are the army, the military power of the struggling church and have the right to demand their pay as such - they are the planters and shepherds who must live off the fruits of their labor - even the law that prohibits the ox that treads the corn from having its mouth muzzled, supports their right - their pay is just, even if it is a disproportionately insignificant consequence of their spiritual endeavors as something purely bodily - they finally take the place of the Old Testament priests who also enjoyed the sacrifices they offered and the altar they tended.

Finally, any doubt that this theory about the legitimacy of the claims of the clergy could belong to a time other than the second century is dispelled by the application appended to the last argument (verse 14), that the Lord also decreed that those who proclaim the Gospel should live by the Gospel. The author knows of this provision of the Lord from the instruction He gave the

Twelve at the first sending out (Mark 6:6 and Luke 10:7), only here the instruction originally intended for the Twelve is transformed into an instruction for the seventy.

54

Now let us see how the apostle positions himself towards this theory - that is, whether the author succeeded in harmoniously combining his interest in the hierarchical theory with his intention of setting the apostle as an example of self-denial.

However, he did not succeed! When the apostle intervenes in the midst of that theoretical discussion (v. 12), he assures that he did not make use of this unshakable right, which is guaranteed by all possible authorities, by analogy, by the law, by the greatness of the priestly gift, by the privilege of the old priests, and by the corresponding arrangement of the Lord. He uses a sentimental expression that immediately puts an end to the seriousness of the whole thing.

"We endure everything," he says - so is the fact that he earned a living with his own hands the result of being robbed by others? But he resigned voluntarily, did not want to make use of his right - so there cannot be talk of endurance; or if the Corinthians did not want to give him anything, his whole reputation would crumble.

As the reason for enduring everything, he refers to his intention to avoid any obstacle to the gospel - but what if it was rather a matter of right? Could he harm the gospel by accepting the legally determined support? Could one suspect selfishness in a capable man who accepted support? Could he even tolerate the insult of suspicion against his right in the first place?

55

All of this is as disjointed and fragile as the excursus he develops in verses 15-18 about his glorious exceptional position, which he obtained through renunciation of that priestly right, but cannot bring to its conclusion. He would rather die, he says in verse 45, than give up his glory. In verses 16 and 17, he now sets about describing the exceptional position that establishes that glory: first, he argues that when he preaches the gospel, that is, even without any special distinguishing circumstance, he is doing nothing special - he must do it, willingly or by force, he must obey the necessity. But he is wrong - it is also wrong in this preparatory discourse that he speaks of the reward for the service under this necessity; it is wrong that

he transitions in verse 18 to satisfy the expectation that the reader has harbored: to finally have a precise description of his name and an explanation of its relationship to the necessity of the evangelical sermon - instead he attaches himself to the inappropriately inserted keyword of the reward, asking what his reward is - instead of describing his exceptional behavior, he asks about the reward for that behavior and what it consists of. The author has become completely entangled in the confused knot of his disconnected ideas.

The freedom and independence towards everyone, which he speaks of in verse 49, is something completely new, even though the author speaks as if it is still the freedom of self-renunciation that he has spoken of before, as noted above. But let us allow him to come to the intended execution and see if he can succeed in creating a specific notion of the apostle's renunciation of his self-reliance. So how did the apostle do it when he became a Jew to the Jews? Well, since the author lists the Jews twice to give the appearance of many classes to which the apostle is equal, first as Jews, then as those who are under the law (in order to later designate the Gentiles as those who are without law) - how did the apostle go about making himself equal to those who are under the law? Did he subject himself, to please the Jews, to the law? Did he assert, for the sake of the Jews, the necessity of the law? What nonsense! Even his assurance of love would not have helped him, as the Jews knew him as an opponent of the law.

56

The whole thing is a phrasal antithesis, for which the author himself could have provided the least substantiated explanation and formation.

What an inappropriate turn it is when he suddenly, in verse 23, after just describing the bliss and salvation of others as the purpose of his condescension, refers to his intention to partake in the Gospel as the reason for his behavior. But he already has the Gospel! As a chosen apostle, he is already intertwined with the Gospel from the outset! He lives in the Gospel, so how could his pursuit be to partake in it?

Hence the contradiction! He wanted to give a depiction of the struggle (verses 24-27) required to win the Gospel - he wanted to use the gymnasium and its struggle as a broad image in the style of the rhetoricians of his time, and particularly by suddenly giving the image a new, unprocessed turn, and presenting the asceticism, the numbness, and the imprisonment of the body as the true Christian form of struggle.

With a very detailed introduction, in which the author (1 Corinthians 10:1-13) presents the example of the Israelites in the Old Testament who, although having enjoyed the same benefits as the church, such as baptism, spiritual drink, and spiritual food, had lost the heavenly blessing, as a warning to the church as a divinely ordained example, he finally proceeds to give the decision which he had not yet dared to give regarding the question of eating meat sacrificed to idols.

Regarding the remarkable details of that introduction, such as Christ following the Israelites in the desert as a rock providing water, the cloud that shielded the people and the sea they crossed containing the water of their baptism, and the fact that the baptism happened to Moses, as well as the otherwise insignificant and hardly worth discussing differences between individual historical assumptions about the way in which the disobedience of the Jewish people was expressed and the statements in the Old Testament, we readily and willingly leave them to the author for further clarification. What interests us now is whether he actually dares to bring the question of eating meat sacrificed to idols to a decision.

Furthermore, we leave all further inconsistencies, such as the unmotivated admonition in verse 10 that the Corinthians should not murmur like the people in the desert, the sudden talk of temptations when there was no mention of them before and no mention of them afterward, the convoluted phrase that God had only sent them bearable temptations so far (verse 13) and would not burden them with temptations of which the end was not foreseeable, whereas one would expect a turn of phrase that greater vigilance was needed now, since infinitely greater temptations were coming because of the previous mention of the approaching wave (verse 11), to its own diffuse nature and let it be. We focus instead on what the author actually dares to do.

After he has been twisting around the subject, trying to forbid the consumption of sacrificial meat, even though he lacked the courage to express the ban outright - after he has half-heartedly conceded that consuming such meat is not necessarily sinful but also not advisable, without daring to retract it altogether, he now (V. 14) suddenly assumes that such consumption is idolatry.

As he proceeds to justify and explain this assumption, especially by showing that just as partaking of the blessed bread and cup of Christ's body and blood creates a communion with Christ, so too does consuming the meat of idol sacrifices create a communion with the idols themselves (v. 16), he suddenly changes course to accommodate his earlier statement that idols are nothing, stating that the consumption of meat offered to idols results in communion with the demons (the same demons to which the Gentiles offer sacrifices) - without specifying the relationship between the idols revered by the Gentiles and these demons.

He would like to completely prohibit the consumption of this meat. According to the assumption that it creates a communion with the demons, he should completely prohibit it. However, he cannot. The freedom that he is essentially opposed to had become too powerful during his time for him to be able to completely destroy it - the circumstances of daily life and the inevitable intimacy with related or friendly Gentiles made it impossible for Christians to completely avoid this consumption.

59

So the author, after that argumentation that should have led to a completely different result, suddenly returns to that old expression (IV. 23-24) that freedom is indeed valid, but must be sacrificed for the sake of others. Thus, he finally resorts only to that last resort that already served him well above: he quashes the question, advises those who shop at the meat market not to inquire whether the meat offered is sacrificial meat, and in the event of an invitation to a pagan banquet, he advises them to eat what is offered without asking whether the meat comes from a sacrifice. Only in the event that someone - (of course, a pagan, he means) - explicitly draws attention to it as "sacrificial meat," does he command (V. 28-29) not to eat, but with an endless confusion of expressions when he proceeds to give the reason for this abstinence. If he starts with "for the sake of him who pointed it out," one would think that he does not want anyone to please him by eating meat that he explicitly identified as sacrificial meat - but he continues rather: "and for conscience's sake" - so one would think for one's own conscience, whose preservation he explicitly intended when he forbade it the moment before (V. 25-27) to inquire at the market or at the banquet whether the meat available is sacrificial meat - but no! He explicitly states (V. 29) that it is not one's own, but the conscience of the other, namely the one who dropped the hint, that is meant - he cannot admit that one's own freedom would be judged by someone else's conscience - if this expression stood alone, one would expect it to lead to the explicit instruction not to deny one's own freedom for the

sake of someone else's conscience, namely the weak - but it really refers to the one who drops the hint - so because the first one who comes up with the fact, freedom should come to an end? It can only exist in secrecy, in the hiding place of forcibly induced unconsciousness - as soon as a light falls into the hiding place, no matter who it is, it should be withdrawn? For the sake of him who drops the hint, should it suddenly come to an end? On what petty chance does it depend! What punishment is the loss of Christian freedom for the pagan who dropped the hint!

60

And how petty is all his previous concern for his own conscience when he immediately (v. 30) declares the consumption to be allowed in any case, as long as thanks are given for what is consumed! That is to say, how little success could his restrictions have had when freedom was already so firmly established that he had to insert its principles - as in v. 26, the principle that the earth and everything in it belong to the Lord - into his anxious clauses?

The only result the author unwittingly achieved was the total confusion of his presentation - a confusion in which we must also include the juxtaposition of the aphorisms (v. 31-32), one of which states that everything, including eating and drinking, should be done for the glory of God, while the other advises avoiding causing offense to Jews, Greeks, or the Church of God.

61

However, if he did not consider it necessary to connect the command to avoid all offense with the preceding concession of full freedom, if he did not find it necessary to tell us what kind of offense he was referring to, how different groups, such as Jews, Gentiles, and Christians, understood this offense, and why it was to be avoided in a particular way and for specific reasons, then we do not expect him to provide us with any further details regarding Christ's demonstration of this condescension when he encourages the Corinthians to follow his example as a follower of Christ in 1 Corinthians 11:1. Before we, like many interpreters, accuse the author of relying on his readers to extract the details on this matter from that unclear and confused passage of the epistle to the Corinthians (15:3), we must first prove that the epistle's appendix was already added to it when the author wrote it and that the epistle itself existed at that time.

On the other hand, we can add a new detail to our discovery concerning the

author's relationship with the gospel accounts. There is nothing more natural than the instruction regarding the pagan feast in verse 27, "Eat anything sold in the meat market," while the instruction in Luke 10:8 to the seventy disciples, "Eat what is set before you," interrupts the flow of thought, is unnecessary repetition since the subject was already fully addressed in verse 7, and, if, as is highly likely, it also refers to the question of meat sacrificed to idols, this reference is not emphasized and, in itself, is quite elegant and, in the present context, is an ostentatious addition.

62

In short, only in the first Corinthians letter is this passage a natural and original part of the whole. However, Luke, who had the same Gospel text in mind as the author of this letter, borrowed that phrase for his instruction of the Seventy.

The Lord's Supper.

11: 2-34.

If the main questions that needed to be asked have been resolved so securely that there can be no doubt about the composition of our letter based on the gospel source text that underlies Luke's gospel, which itself is already a later version of the original gospel, it would be completely pointless for us to go into detail about the discussion of women's head coverings (verses 2-16) and to show the same labored and contrived character of our author's presentation that is now firmly established as the consistent characteristic of his exposition.

63

We only note that the author, who now brings together everything he knows about worship, starts with the attire of both sexes, not only talking about the head covering of women but also about the necessity for men to appear with uncovered heads while women should cover their heads with a veil.

We leave him to his dogmatic proof, in which the fact that Christ is the head of man plays a major role, without detailing his argumentative power.

He may also justify that he does not notice the contradiction between his current assumption that women pray or prophesy publicly in the congregation (v. 5) and his later prohibition that women should not appear in public in the congregation (1 Cor. 14:34). At best, we can only suggest how

he came to ignore this contradiction. He has just spoken (1 Cor. 11:4) of the man who appears in public in the congregation being uncovered, and immediately afterward, when he wants to speak about women in the congregation, he uses the same categories that he had just used for men.

He may also remain in possession of the mystery that lies in the reference to the female head covering as a "power" (v. 10), as well as the mystery of why the angel requires the covering of the female head.

Indeed, after putting the head of both sexes in order, he may well (v. 16) terminate the whole dispute *) with the blunt remark: "But if anyone wants to be contentious about this, we have no other practice—nor do the churches of God" — namely, the practice that women appear with uncovered heads. We may be indifferent to this bluntness in itself, but this entire passage serves as evidence for the assertion that the author knows a well-established church custom and could speak (v. 2) of a long-established tradition regarding worship in general.

*) The introductory phrase is also improperly constructed, as he intended to say "if anyone should seek to argue," but used the inappropriate verb form "sehte."

64

The author has long accustomed us to his frugality. When he now moves on to the proper celebration of the Lord's Supper and wants to eliminate the disruptive influence of sects and divisions (V. 17-18), we do not demand from him anymore that he really show us how this influence manifested itself, whether it had a theoretical discord or practical divisions at its core, since he knows himself what he means later on when he gets to the point. He speaks nothing more of party divisions and only criticizes the separation of the rich from the poor.

The meal he refers to is the love feast known as the last supper of Jesus. When he acts as if he only wants to describe the disturbing influence of sects and heresies on this feast in V. 20, he criticizes in V. 21-22 that one person takes their food first, so that one goes hungry and another gets drunk – he means that nothing is left for the poor, but he does not say it clearly – he relies on everyone knowing roughly what he means. The underlying arrangement is well known enough to the readers of his time – the arrangement he speaks of has long been established.

65

He now describes the event in the life of Jesus on which the institution he is discussing is based - he says (v. 23) that he received it from the Lord, but the truth of the matter is that he is simply copying it from that Gospel source, which Luke has combined with the accounts of his other sources in a clumsy way.*)

*) Hence, the disruptive repetitions in Luke's account.

After this description, he applies it and makes self-examination a duty so that unworthy consumption does not result in judgment and death (v. 27-30). He has forgotten his sects and factions, and it is only a necessary recourse to at least address some of the previous accusations when he commands at the end that no one should partake prematurely, but rather wait for those who have not yet arrived (v. 33). He has even forgotten the contrast between rich and poor.

66

On Speaking in Tongues.

12 - 14.

As mentioned earlier, it is not of interest to us to demonstrate the author's helpless ineptitude in new cases after our previous characterization. Therefore, we have no interest in showing how, in the general introduction to the section on spiritual gifts, in which he explains the unity of principle and the equal dependence of all individual abilities and gifts on the One Giver, he attempts to create a futile entrance. By reminding his readers in verse 2 how they were irresistibly drawn when they went to their idols, he wants to conclude that now, all the more, since they no longer have to deal with dumb idols, they are under the guidance of a Spirit who is the source of all their gifts and who retains supreme control over them. Instead, in verse 2, he comes to the negative determination that no one who speaks in the Spirit of God can curse Jesus. He then comes to the positive determination that no one can call Jesus Lord except in the Holy Spirit, and only then, in verse 4, does he arrive at the statement of the unity of the Spirit and the diversity of gifts.

The idea he now elaborates on until verse 30 - (the members cannot be anything more than members and must submit themselves to the One Spirit and the Whole) - is too clear for us to discuss it at length here. We only note that when he speaks of the faith in verse 9, he is not referring to the faith of

the Romans letter; that the catchphrases in verse 13, "whether Greeks or Jews, slaves or free," are borrowed from a context that has nothing to do with the present one; that the sentence in verse 28, "God has placed first apostles in the church," presupposes the historical conclusion of the apostolic circle, and finally, that the continuation of this sentence, "then prophets," echoes the Montanist superordination of the prophets over the apostles.

67

The transition to the digression on love, which the author wants to present in chapter 13 over all spiritual gifts and everything that can be related to it (1 Corinthians 12:32), "But strive for the greater gifts. And I will show you a still more excellent way," can only be called unsuccessful.

Regarding the entire course on love, the following can be said: regarding faith in verse 2, we should once again not think of anything less than the faith in the Nömerbrief. The author could only mention the martyrdom by burning if this type of martyrdom was already known to his readers. In verse 8, he begins to present love as the enduring power that surpasses all other gifts and strengths, but he does not actually complete this idea. He suddenly returns to the present and says that now faith, hope, and love remain, but the greatest of these is love. He says as little about why love is the greatest as he did about why it endures over everything else. He is content with being able to find an unfinished phrase at least in a new, similar one.

The author now returns (1 Corinthians 14:1) to the spiritual gifts, particularly wanting to speak about speaking in tongues.

But how can we expect real clarification on this topic from a writer who, after just placing love above everything else, immediately connects the call to seek love (1 Corinthians 14:1) with the command to strive for spiritual gifts, and so confusedly that he commands both with the mere comparative and the particle of opposition, "but even more" the pursuit of prophecy in the same breath?

68

It is as if prophecy does not also belong to the gifts of the Spirit!

We can certainly explain how the author came to this confusion: when he wrote the exhortation "seek after the spiritual gifts*)", he already had in mind the particular gift of speaking in tongues, knowing that he would immediately address it and subsume it under prophecy - but an author whose intentions and expressions are so confusedly intertwined cannot give

us a real picture of speaking in tongues.

*) denn das kennen die πνευματικά, diese -- an sich schon haltlos ausgedrückte Allgemeinheit nur seyn.

Certainly, no one could describe speaking in tongues more clearly as a silent conversation with God, inaccessible to anyone else, than the author does when he says in verse 2 with the most unequivocal terms that the speaker in tongues speaks not to people, but to God alone, and when he justifies this statement with the fact that no one hears him - (hears, not understands, because hearing, if it does not have the opposite of that hearing as a presupposition, which is only the physical affection of the ear by the sound of the spoken word, never means understanding). Then, after setting up this opposition in verse 3, that the prophet, while speaking in tongues, speaks of excessive mysteries, consolation and encouragement to others, thus contributing to the practical benefit of others, even with this opposition in mind, the author still uses the simple formula in verse 4 that the speaker in tongues builds only himself up, while the prophet builds up the congregation, so that the opposition assumed earlier still stands, that the former speaks in silence with God, while the latter speaks aloud to the congregation. The author does not even step out of this opposition when he only allows the speaker in tongues to be valid alongside the prophet in verse 5, if he interprets his conversation with God for the edification of the congregation.

69

However, in the next moment, the author falls out of this assumption, even though he acts as if he still moves within it. His metaphors (v. 7-10) that musical instruments are only recognizable to the listener when they maintain their distinctive sound in their playing, that the trumpet can only call to battle when it gives the clear, conventional sound that is immediately recognizable as a signal for battle, that every language in the world, no matter how many there are, has its own particular sound* — all these metaphors are based on the assumption that the speech of the tongue speaker is outwardly audible, but not understandable, and lead the author to demand that at least interpretation be added.

*) Here, the various languages are only a metaphor. The author knows nothing yet about the Pentecost miracle of the Acts of the Apostles, in which the speaking of the apostles in all the languages of the world is the miracle itself.

But even with this demand, which is based on a premise that is fundamentally opposed to the initial assumption, the author is not

consistent. When he first proposes it (v. 13), he asks that the speaker of tongues himself provide the interpretation, but later on (v. 27-28) he assumes that the speaker of tongues is different from the interpreter by nature and from an existing ecclesiastical institution.

70

Both contradictions, regarding the nature of speaking in tongues and the relationship of interpretation to it, make it impossible to form a clear and specific idea. And if we want to draw a conclusion, it can only be that the author had no clear idea of an ecstatic phenomenon, which, if it ever really existed, was already in decline at his time.

Resurrection.

15.

As the author transitions to the proof of the necessity of resurrection and wants to introduce a proof, the fact that Jesus really rose from the dead, he leads the reference and reminder of this proof (verse 1) with the words, "Now I would remind you, brothers, of the gospel I preached to you" - as if he could still make known to them what he has already preached to them, what they have even accepted and are to hold fast to!

One thing was certainly already firmly established when the author wrote - very firmly! namely, the report of the appearances of the risen one, to which he later refers to let the denial of the resurrection of the believers shatter against the actual resurrection of the Lord - this report was already given to him: in that gospel that the author of this letter used together with him from the original source of the present Luke Gospel. Our long-established discovery is now receiving new confirmation, namely that when the author of this letter makes the specific statement that the risen one first appeared to Peter, only in the Gospel of Luke (24:34) is this appearance assumed as the first in a very confusing way, but not described itself. This confusion proves that the original Luke used a foreign text - but he used it briefly. On the other hand, our author has reproduced the assumption of this text in a simple positivity, and only one thing has not succeeded for him - namely, to integrate the reference to something known, established, into a harmonious relationship with his Corinthians.

71

When the author then speaks of the appearance that was also granted to

him, without saying anything about the place of it, we will leave him the tasteless and affected designation "untimely born," which he gives himself to indicate his own worthlessness, and we only point out how the further characterization he gives of himself (v. 9) - "I am the least of the apostles" - refers to the apostles as a closed historical phenomenon, and his statement (v. 10) that he worked more than all of them, even presupposes the long-completed conclusion of his own historical activity.

As the author now transitions to his argumentation, he expresses his astonishment (v. 12) at how, despite preaching about the resurrected, there could be people among the Corinthians who deny the resurrection of the dead - but he has not fulfilled his obligation to characterize or even make conceivable these deniers any further. Of course, he could not accomplish the impossible, as such people did not exist in the Catholic communities of his time.

72

Moving on to his argumentation, in verse 13, "if there is no resurrection, then Christ has not been raised," he assumes that there are real Christians among those who deny the resurrection, as his argument is a direct threat to them and announces that if they do not accept it, they will not have the resurrection of Christ either.

As if it were even possible for confessors of the resurrection of Jesus to deny the resurrection of the dead.

The author has made a serious mistake and made it impossible for all interpreters who held to his assumption to explain this argumentation. His assumption is simply false, wrongly formed, and this enormous error is due to the fact that in a letter to the Corinthians, when he finally wanted to secure faith in the resurrection and refute doubt, he believed he had to assume doubters and deniers among the Corinthians themselves.

Furthermore, this confusion arises because he argues for Christians, in the interest of Christians against pagan doubt, and appeals to the Christian assumption and asserts that under the assumption of pagan denial, there would be nothing in the Christian acceptance of the resurrection of Christ.

73

The whole is a general treatise from a later time when Christians were affected by the pagan view of the end of all things and were freed from this affection by looking to the steadfastness of their fundamental assumptions.

In this way, i.e. correctly understood, the whole is perfectly clear. However, it was to be expected from the author's previous statements that he does not prove himself a master even in this exposition, and that he starts again from the beginning when he has already come to the conclusion (e.g. V. 29).

We will leave the reflection on his assumption that the reign of Christ comes to an end when it has achieved its purpose and goal, the submission of death (V. 24-28), as well as the reflection on the mode of the resurrection that is to be expected shortly, in which a wonderful new body replaces the corruptible one, and those who live at the time of the end are transformed.

Here we only note that when the author (V. 29) cites the practice of members of the community being baptized for beloved relatives who had already died to prove the senselessness of denying the resurrection of the dead, this reference to the practice of substitute baptism once again takes us into the late period from which this letter can never be removed.

Furthermore, when the author (V. 32) refers to a fight with wild beasts that he claims to have experienced in Ephesus, the silence of the Acts of the Apostles has nothing to do with it - at least not according to the certain results of our criticism. However, the author himself has done everything to destroy his own reputation. He himself realizes how impossible it is that he could have escaped from the wild beasts he claims to have faced, and therefore adds the qualifying phrase that he "fought with beasts after the manner of men" - that it was only a human semblance when he was in the power of the wild beasts. He also speaks of Ephesus as if it were a foreign city that belonged to his (completed) history - thus forgetting that he himself is in Ephesus at this moment (c.f. 16:8-9).

74

The late writer, rather, who already knew the many kinds of martyrdom, allowed the apostle to fight with animals "according to human judgment" in this danger, of course, the apostle could not have perished.

The Conclusion.

16.

Most of what the author touches upon in conclusion: the matter of the collection for Jerusalem, his intention to come to Corinth himself, Timothy's impending arrival, will only be able to be understood in its true light through the criticism of the Second Corinthian Epistle.

For now, we only note that he suddenly mentions three Corinthians who are present with him at the moment, without thinking that their presence could have made the intervention of Chloe's household unnecessary for his instruction about the Corinthian condition, without even saying a word about how the three came to him and what they want from him.

75

However, he knew very well what they were meant for. He created them to finally present true hierarchs in them and to recommend obedience and submission to their leaders to the communities.

They are true hierarchs because in them, the imperfection of the community is overcome to perfection. What is lacking in the community (v. 17) is contained in their person and activity. They are the complement of the community, which fills the community's lack.

Therefore, the author rightfully says (v. 18): they have refreshed my spirit, *) and he knows what he wants when he adds: "acknowledge such men!" that is, "be subject to them" (v. 16) - because they - they have ordained themselves as deacons (v. 15) - (in any case, the author has the other two, who are with Stephanas about Paul's person, already in mind when he observed in verse 15 that the house of the same has ordained itself for the service) - they are the leaders and the community must obey them.

*) Inappropriately, he adds: and yours.

Finally, the author himself appears once again as an enthusiastic, threatening hierarch. He pretends that the letter so far has been dictated by another, but finally (v. 21) the apostle himself writes the greeting with his own hand, and he believes it is necessary to use this opportunity for a key statement. If the apostle himself sets his hand in motion at the end, a powerful, shattering statement must follow - and the curse over the one who does not love the Lord follows (v. 22)!

Criticism of the Pauline Epistles

by

B. Bauer

Third and Last Section

The Second Letter to the Corinthians.

1852

3

The Opening.

1: 3-11.

What drives the author, the supposed apostle, to speak at length about his distress and suffering in the opening? Is he trying to show that a man who suffers so much cannot be as worthless as the people and opponents in Corinth thought, and thus to change their opinion? However, he assumes their sympathy and even hopes that their intercession (v.11) will continue to save him from the death that threatens him daily.

So did he want to show that there was still something in common between him and the Corinthians, despite all the misunderstandings and disputes? But he does not hint that he wants to use the commonality of suffering for this purpose - he simply assumes it as the most valuable commonality among believers, and the late author has used the familiar and common idea

of the apostle's suffering and martyrdom very unsuccessfully for the opening of a letter that is filled with almost nothing but strife and quarrels.

As misguided as the overall structure of the opening is, its individual parts are just as aimless. For example, in verses 6 and 7, the apostle's suffering and comfort are for the benefit of the Corinthians - through his suffering and comfort, they themselves are lifted up and comforted in their own suffering - thus his suffering is representative - but this idea is immediately confused with the other idea that they share the same sufferings he is experiencing, that they endure them patiently, and that their patience results in their comfort.

4

When the Apostle further speaks of his sufferings (vv. 8-11), he only throws out unclear and superficial allusions. Did he perhaps rely on the bearers of the letter to provide details? But could he himself write in such a vague and confused manner even under this assumption? Especially if he counted on the Corinthians' intercession, should he not have clearly and explicitly stated what it was to be directed towards? Instead, he says he is suffering in Asia - how indefinite! He asks the Corinthians to assist him with their intercession so that he may be saved from "such a death" (v. 10) - what ambiguous and unstable specificity, if Asia is the scene of his suffering! Finally, how bombastic he speaks when he gives the reason why they must cooperate with their intercession for his salvation: "so that the grace bestowed on me by many persons might be acknowledged by many with gratitude for me"! What insecurity of consciousness the embarrassed author betrays when in this closing sentence, which is not prepared by anything, he introduces the elements that are brought into the discussion all at once unnecessarily twice.

The structure of the introduction corresponds to the fate with which the author transitions to the topic.

The Topic.

1: 12 - 2:17.

It is indeed, as the apologists say, a "swift transition" when the author in verse 12 uses a "for" to move on to his defense against the Corinthian opponents - but this transition is not only swift but also unnatural.

With his "for," the author acts as if he wants to add an explanation or justification to the beginning or its concluding sentence - and he moves on to his defense.

He addresses his opponents in Corinth - but doesn't say who they are and what they have against him!

Just a moment ago, in verse 11, it was still self-evident that the Corinthians would give him their intercession - but now, all of a sudden, he assumes that he has nothing more, or at least nothing more important, to do with them than to fight a quarrel.

He appeals to his opponents (v. 12) about the sincerity and simplicity of his conduct - but he also wants to speak later about the truths of faith; therefore, he adds the assurance that he did not walk in "carnal wisdom" in the hope that this qualification would stimulate the idea of doctrine.

And what are the accusations that the Corinthians made against him? They are said to have belittled him (v. 15-16) because of the change in his travel plans, and therefore accused him of dishonesty, variability, and unreliability!

What petty quarreling! Should a man engage in this? To launch into an excursus on God's "yes, yes, no, no" in response to refuting a petty rancor and counter-arguing his reliability?

His plan (v. 15-16) was supposed to be to visit Corinth twice - but after his first letter to the Corinthians (C. 16, 5-7) his plan was completely different - he only wanted to visit them once and for a longer time!

So on what basis did his opponents make their accusations? On the first or

second plan? But how did they know about the second one?

He even calls this second plan his initial plan in v. 15 - but initially, in his first letter to the Corinthians, the plan was different - which means that the author of the second letter to the Corinthians cannot firmly establish the assumptions of the first letter - he did not write the first letter.

In v. 15, he speaks of the "grace" of his second visit - how affected! Only a later writer would use such language.

He wants to justify in v. 17 his previous failure to come, the omission of his trip, the change in his plans, but instead of giving the reason immediately, which he only develops in v. 23 - that he did not come precisely because he wanted to spare the Corinthians - he anxiously turns back and forth, wondering if he might have made his plan lightly.

So the accusation was that he made plans carelessly? What a petty quarrel! He is the one who creates this quarrel, and its emptiness is reflected in the fact that he immediately loses himself in it.

When he asks if he used "levity" *) when he made his plan, he wants to refer to something assumed and implied by his opponents, he wants to prove that the levity they accuse him of is an impossibility - but he should have explained this assumption and implication of his opponents, instead of just alluding to it with an article.

*) τη ελαφρία

7

Immediately after this brief reference to his opponents' presumed opinion, he drifts into the general question of whether it is his way to follow the voice of the flesh in his decisions, so that his yes is no and his no is yes - but since nothing in this context leads to the charge of presumption that is based on their yes or no, and since the author wants to refute the charge of inconstancy and immediately afterwards (v. 18) affirms his constancy, it is clear that he has made a false turn to the reminiscence of that evangelical saying about the reliability of a mere yes or no. Actually, he should have said: so that my yes is yes and my no is no.

Now let us use the author's vaguely held assurance of the reliability of his word to the Corinthians (v. 18), even though it only concerns the firmness of his intentions, to launch into an excursion on the firm foundation and

consistent agreement of his doctrine with itself (v. 19-20) - he may well lose himself in an unmotivated turn of phrase - but how can he also appeal (v.19) to the well-known preaching of Silvanus and Timothy and their proven reliability for the Corinthians? If the Corinthians were not faithfully devoted to him, how could they trust his pupils more? If the Corinthians doubted his authority, what significance could his pupils have for them?

8

The late author, on the other hand, made a mistake - he thought it would be visually appealing to group the Apostle's disciples around him.

Finally, after the author has circled around the themes of the reliability and consistency of his preaching and God's promises in a dogmatic excursion on the efficacy of God in believers in general (V. 21-22), he returns to the old accusation in V. 23, as if it were still on everyone's mind, and swears with a solemn oath that he only did not come to them to spare them - but can the fact that his truthfulness is doubted by petty souls really justify the use of such a strong oath: "I call God as witness against my soul"? Must he swear so strongly when he wants to assert the steadfastness of his yes and his no against petty quarrelers? If he has to deal with such petty malice, must he really lower himself to their level with a terrible oath?

And how insidiously he takes back the strong statement he just made as an unfounded assertion the moment after! His explanation in V. 23 is based on the assumption of his unrestricted power to punish as Lord and Judge - how anxious it is, therefore, when he adds in V. 24: "Not that we lord it over your faith!" How can the Corinthians acknowledge and feel the good intentions of his sparing them if he has no judicial power over them?

The sneaky hierarch will finally reveal himself when he speaks of the open rebellion that the Corinthians dared to commit against the condemnation of the unclean made by the author of the first letter.

9

Slowly and through a multitude of anxiously intertwined phrases, he makes his way to the point where he finally has to admit his defeat and tries in vain to overcome the open rebellion through his feigned concession.

Explicitly, he says in 2 Corinthians 2:1, "I made up my mind not to make another painful visit to you." As if he had only felt sorrow the first time he was with them and won them over, as if the victory he achieved in their conversion could have been a cause for sorrow!

In his fear, he has made a mistake. Clearly, he assumes, like the author of the first Corinthians, that before the composition of that letter, the apostle had only been to Corinth once. Since he also wants to immediately follow the assumptions of the first letter, he must also maintain the assumption that during the period between its dispatch and the composition of the second, the apostle did not touch Corinth, and yet he speaks of his presence in Corinth, which was associated with sorrow? Certainly, but he also avoids saying a single word about the sorrow he felt at that time. He does not dare to say outright that this sorrowful presence in Corinth was his first and only one up to this point, and he has made it possible, through this cautious reserve, for it to gradually become the second presence of the apostle in Corinth until the end of the letter (2 Corinthians 12:14, 13:1).

So anxiously and depressed does the author continue that in his reflection in verse 2, he does not dare to form the corresponding clause, "who will then give me joy?" to the introduction: "For if I grieve you." He feels that he is not giving the correct conclusion that corresponds to the introduction. Instead of forming the required clause, he makes a new start with "And who will give me joy if not the one who was grieved by me." He speaks in his anxious and embarrassed way as if he only had the Corinthians in the world and writes so bombastically and vaguely that he completely loses his Corinthians in the indifferent concluding participle.

10

Now, his argument about the Unchaste, who is handed over to Satan in the first letter?

So, he wrote to them (in his earlier letter), so that before his arrival, the cause of the distress would be removed? At that time, "he had confidence" in them, that his joy would be theirs - meaning that they would obey him in everything to please him?

He speaks as if his trust had been completely justified - and they did not justify it - they did not support his judgment of the Unchaste.

"I write to you," he continues in verse 4, "in great distress and anguish of heart" - but he does not say a word about what caused the distress that would justify the severity of his first letter - he also does not give any hint as to what his first letter expressed about his anxious mood at that time.

Furthermore, "I did not write to make you sad," he says - so they are really sad - even to tears (2 Cor 7:8)?

On the contrary! They took the matter rather lightly and forgave the

offender, while the author of the first letter was not concerned with causing or preventing sadness, but with removing evil - not with his personal relationship to the Corinthians, but with a moral necessity.

11

When the author finally gets to the subject of the offender who was handed over to Satan in his first letter, he continues to circle around the keyword "distress" and refers to him as "someone who has caused distress" in the most refined way possible. He says that the offender did not distress him, but to put it mildly, "partially distressed them all" - "partially," whereas a man who is certainly progressing would have said "basically, actually all of you."

Then, he states in verse 6 that it is sufficient that the majority of the congregation has reproached the offender - thus assuming that the Corinthians did not fulfill his demand, and he is satisfied with their leniency towards his severity. He submits to them, does he not? Does he subject himself to their opposing judgment?

What would have been the consequences for the Apostle if he had written the first letter or even the second letter! First, he handed over the offender to Satan, and now he admits that his step was too daring and hasty, that he did not calculate everything and did not know the congregation. He takes back his step and accepts the opposite of what should have happened according to the demands of his first letter. Even more! He wanted to perform a miraculous punishment in his first letter, and now he must admit that it did not happen, and he must approve that the Corinthians accepted the offender's plea for mercy without further consequences.

The Apostle did not write either the first or the second letter, and the author of the former could not have written it. Instead, the latter speaks as a wavering man who wants to control the hierarch of the first letter and yet maintain and ensure his authority, but who ultimately exposes himself to danger, only to miss his goal in the end.

12

Is the evil really healed if he covers it up and agrees with the frivolity with which the community has treated it? Is the matter really settled if he now conceals the evil that he once handed over to Satan and bows to the leniency that entered against his will?

The supposed apostle even stoops so low as to adopt the Corinthians' perspective, pushing his approval of the leniency they showed the offender

so far that he (v. 7) even makes the demand that they "rather forgive and comfort him, so that he may not be overwhelmed by excessive sorrow."

He is jealous of the Corinthians' autonomous action. In order to also have something to do with it, to also participate, he demands that they do even more of what is in the eyes of the author of the first Corinthians letter a punishable crime - they should forgive even more - forgive! And they have not forgiven the offender in opposition to the severity of their own moral view, but in opposition to the murderous severity demanded by him, the apostle! - So that the offender may not be overwhelmed by despair! - And with the forgiveness, the matter has long been settled!

He is not yet at rest! He demands in v. 8 that they should confirm their love for that person in a legally binding manner - as if their autonomous decision had not long since been executed! He absolutely wants to insert his intervention and create the appearance that what they are doing on his request is giving their autonomous decision full validity. He wants to save the exterior, remain the supreme authority, and yet oversteps his bounds in his words, demanding that they remain masters and sanction their love!

13

He justifies in verse 9 his right to the current intervention by stating that he had written to them from the beginning in order to test their faithfulness and unlimited obedience - he acts as if the test had been successful, and they had shown disobedience!

As an addition to their forgiveness, in verse 10 he adds his own - as if their disobedience could be transformed into obedience by his forgiveness! As a reason for his leniency, he cites the necessity to counteract the schemes of Satan, which aim at the destruction of the church (verse 11) - as if unity is secured when discord is covered up - as if Satan must be defeated when the sacrifice that was supposed to be handed over to him is taken away from him by the soft-hearted sympathy for the offender!

After this unfortunate discussion about the disobedience of the Corinthians, the author (verses 12-13) suddenly returns to his earlier remark (verse 4) about his inner restlessness, without, however, detailing or justifying this return. At that time, he says, he had no peace in his heart when he came to Troas and "a door was opened to him in the Lord" - but this parenthetical statement remains idle, has nothing to do with the statement about his fear, and is and remains a mechanically inserted keyword from the first letter to

the Corinthians (chapter 16, verse 9).

14

Therefore, in Troas he was plagued by unrest to such an extent that he went to Macedonia because he did not find Titus - thus, he expected him - expected him with news from Corinth? Indeed! For in 2 Corinthians 7:5-7, he meets him in Macedonia and is uplifted by his comforting news about the favorable attitude of the Corinthians - but according to the assumption of the first letter, Timothy was sent to Corinth, and the author of the second letter says nothing about a change in plans or about a new mission for Titus after Timothy had returned - he believes he is in the best harmony with the assumptions of the first letter.

The mere mention of Titus causes him to burst into jubilation - so Titus really brought him such uplifting news from Corinth - did the news of Titus really give him the occasion to play his three-fold game with the catchword "smell" (V. 11-16) - did he really see from the events in Corinth that God through him was spreading the scent of his knowledge throughout the world, that he himself was a fragrant aroma of Christ to God, i.e. a pleasant sacrifice, that finally his apostolic atmosphere was a scent of life to life for believers, and a scent of death to death for the lost?

He even boasts very expressively: "And who is equal to such a task?" he asks in verse 16 - that is, I alone am able to breathe in and spread life and death around me - not the multitude of heretics who distort orthodox doctrine (verse 17) - he alone has this power of life and death - and he has just realized that he is powerless and impotent against the crime that was formally condemned to death in the first letter!

15

The author has already forgotten about the deep concern that he had previously mentioned, and is now focused on one thing - he wants to praise the apostle and his ministry.

The Ministry of the Spirit.

3.

The telling "again" in verse 1 - ("do we begin again to commend ourselves?") - proves that the author of the present letter did not write the first letter, for

in it, the didactic discussion of the system of faith and morals did not allow for the preoccupation of the apostle with himself, and the author, when he related the apostle to the faction leaders, spoke as a mediator, even as a weak syncretist.

The author of the first letter knew of the factional strife, he even took it for granted, but he could not describe it; the contradictions surrounded him, but in his consciousness, they were blunted, and it was precisely his indifferentistic attitude, which made him unable to fight, that enabled him to draw the dogmatic sum from the factional struggles.

The same man wanted to place this sum under the authority of the apostle to the Gentiles - he wanted, for example, in his treatise on meat offered to idols, to assert freedom, but he again gave it up, along with the authority of the anti-Jewish champion of Jewish scruples, and after having unsuccessfully alluded to the conflict between the apostle to the Gentiles and the apostle to the Jews at the beginning of his letter, he demanded that the decision about the value of teachers be left to divine judgment.

16

The author of the second letter, on the other hand, wants to fight - let's see if the outcome is favorable to him; he wants to intervene in the dispute between the law and the gospel - let's see if as an original hero or as a follower, as a creative spirit or as a weak reformer!

A man who is somewhat sure of his cause will actually, like the Apostle of this letter, engage in a detailed discussion of whether he, like "some," needs letters of recommendation to the Corinthians. If Paul, really fighting for possession of the Corinthians with church factions and their leaders who sought to expand their influence, can he come to the question of whether he needs letters of recommendation from them? Can he really, even if only letters of recommendation to the local congregation are considered, move in the figurative excursus, into which he immediately runs after that introductory question, only in the assumption that it concerns letters of recommendation from the Corinthians? A man who is in a real, living, personal struggle and must strictly focus on the question at hand - is he able to hold onto the starting point so loosely that he first calls the Corinthians his letter, written on his heart and known and read by everyone - that he then calls them a letter of Christ, which is taken care of by him, yes, by him, the apostle - and that finally, at the end of this sentence, he lets the letter be written into the hearts of the Corinthians?

17

Impossible! Or does one still want to assert the opposite? Then show me just one authentic letter of a world-historical figure in which the clarity of thought and language is not equally great (for that is and remains impossible) but can only be found in a remotely similar way.

In a time when factions were fighting for supremacy and disputing over which one represented the Catholic expression of the collective consciousness, the Paulinist wants to say that he doesn't need this party spirit, his proof is the existence of the Church, the enduring and lasting scripture of Paul - (for his master's deeds testify for him) - but he is so dependent on the fact that the letter is addressed to the Corinthians that he lets the apostle speak as if Corinth were his only deed and possession, and his clumsiness alone is to blame for confusing the starting point and goal with each other when transferring the later church usage of letters of recommendation into the early times of the community.

Let him now, while just establishing it as a certain and beyond doubt fact that the Corinthians are his, that they are even Christ's letter, make his anxious assertion of his faithful confidence that it is so, in V. 4 - let him lose himself in an anxious and far-reaching restriction in V. 5 - ("not that we are competent in ourselves" and so on) - in a restriction for which there was not the slightest reason and which itself remains floating - in a restriction whose turns remain unclear and presupposes contrasts that he cannot even shape.

18

Enough! With a casual relative clause, he comes to the topic that now occupies him, to the parallel and contrast of the two testaments.

Despite a lot of floating and cumbersome phrases, this explanation is clear in general, at least pointing out what the author wanted to say with it. Therefore, we don't need to go into detail and we just ask ourselves the question: where did the impulse for this digression on the contrast between the Old and New Testaments come from?

Does the author really have opponents who venerate the law? But where does he say that? Has he dropped a word during his previous back and forth, which could form a real impulse for this explanation? Or does he make an application to his opponents in Ephesians 4:1? Not even that! What he lets follow his explanation is only a moral application in general - in short, no fighter, no hero, only a reflecting dogmatist. And if in a casual parenthetical

clause in verse 6 - ("for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life") - he assumes the contrast between the Old and New Testaments, which he wants to explain later, as known from the outset, he proves himself that this contrast was already given to him as a finished dogma.

19

The Ministry.

4.

Despite the insignificance of the content of this chapter, we will proceed from verse to verse and demonstrate the formlessness that pervades the whole, even in the smallest details, and the weakness of the power of expression that is characteristic not only of the author but of Catholicism in general, the victorious expression of Christianity.

By using the formula "Therefore, since we have this ministry" (v. 1), the author returns to the far-reaching explanation of 3:6-9 to allow the Apostle to speak of his personal leadership, and in the following phrase, "we do not lose heart," he speaks so generally that he includes believers in the expression of the majority. He had just spoken of the glorification of all believers (3:18), and while this category of the whole still echoes in his mind and even dominates him at this moment, he is also thinking of another category of the whole, namely, the behavior of the teachers of his time.

From avoiding cowardice, he moves to refraining from secret shameful behavior (v. 2) without saying what prompted him to make this turn. The following addition does indeed show that he means by "secret shameful behavior" the dishonesty and distortion of the Word of God; the former should be the general expression, the latter the specific one, but he has formed an untenable generalization.

In the same breath, the Apostle expresses his conviction that "by the open statement of the truth" he commends himself to the conscience of all people - what a hypochondriac he is! What dependence on judgment - what self-contemplation in people's judgments!

20

"Before God" he recommends himself at the same time - how insidiously he draws the appeal, after it has long hovered before the tribunal "of the people", with a half turn to the divine judgment!

After he has extensively developed in chapters 3 and 4 the fact that his gospel is hidden only in the lost, he wants to justify it in verse 5 with a "for" - ("for we do not preach ourselves, but Jesus Christ, the Lord") - but this justification is in itself baseless and also superfluous, since he has just attributed the blindness of the lost to the activity "of the god of this world" - Satan, who owes this name to the Gnostics.

Suddenly, in a confused and completely unsuccessful sentence, in which he drags the verb belonging to the subject along in an unmotivated relative clause *), he justifies in verse 6 his right to proclaim the gospel - God has shone it into his heart - but only the later apologist could have formulated this common saying, and even then with this ornate and overloaded formation of words - ("for the illumination of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ").

*) ος ελαμψεν

Just as suddenly, in verse 7, he comes to the description of the weakness of the human vessel in which the power of God is located - without reason - without any objection based on his sufferings preceding it - all the more unnatural since according to the general basic assumption all believers are destined to suffer and even the suffering of the Lord was based in the divine order of salvation and the world - nothing but the later play with an opposition that is based on the dialectic of the assumed Paulinism and that also formed the constant struggle for life of the heathen apostle.

21

With the sentence in verse 12, "So then death is at work in us, but life in you," the conclusion is supposed to be given, but instead the matter takes on a new, unprepared direction. Until now, the contrast between suffering and victory, between constant dying and miraculously wrought revivification in the person of the apostle, was concluded. Now the contrast is between his death and the Corinthians' life - a contrast that is even less prepared, as the dying was previously bodily and the life is now spiritual.

Instead of remaining with the Corinthians, the apostle suddenly turns back to himself in verses 13-14 and expresses his conviction that he too will attain to life - but he has just previously (verse 11) already secured his life completely, that is, carried out this contrast as far as it is enclosed in his person.

And how ornately he justifies his conviction that he too will penetrate into life! He says that he has the same spirit of faith as well - as if faith could still be a question for him!

Only after an extensive digression, in which he deduces his preaching from his faith and proves the necessity with which it follows from the Old Testament citation "I believe, therefore I speak," does he come to the initially intended conclusion from his faith to his resurrection - thus after a very misguided turn, as the apostolic activity of the hero stems from his calling and from the conviction that is based on the entire state of the world and on the actual necessity of the calling of the Gentiles, i.e. from a conviction that is not solely concerned with his personal interest and the affairs of his inner spiritual life.

22

As we pass by, we note that the author (v.14) expects a collective resurrection with the Corinthians, while the author of the first Corinthian letter still hoped to experience the parousia of Christ. Let us now continue with the confusion of the line of thought.

The author has long since left behind his historical struggles, whose deadly force brought about the life of the Corinthians, when he (v.13-14) derived from his personal faith the certainty of his future resurrection. But he realizes that he has not developed the connection between his daily dying and the revival of the Corinthians; therefore, he returns to it in v.15 and now says that all of this - everything that can only be his future resurrection guaranteed in his faith - happens for the sake of the Corinthians!

With "therefore" (v.16) - "Therefore, we do not lose heart" - he would like to go back even further and once again draw the conclusion, present the personal behavior that follows from the significance of his office - and he speaks (v.16-18) about the insignificance of temporal tribulation that all believers must have in view of the future glory.

23

Furthermore! The confusion in the last discussion, the entanglement of the spiritual life that he brings to the Corinthians with his sufferings, and the resurrection to life that is certain for him personally in his faith, primarily arises because he rushes towards the following discussion on the resurrection - and now, as he stands close to his goal, as he should firmly and securely make the transition, he speaks (v.16) of the daily, ongoing renewal of the inner self!

But enough of that! He has reached his goal!

The Heavenly Body.

5.

His readers also know the goal, it is before their eyes - it is the dogma of the heavenly body, which takes the place of the earthly body after death. It is so firmly established that he only briefly mentions it with his catchwords and uses the formula "for we know" as the well-known proof for the invalidity of his previous discourse on the excellence of eternal glory.

(So he is not the author of the first Corinthian letter, because while the author of the first letter calmly and confidently still hopes to experience the Parousia, he (the author of the second letter) desires the dissolution of his earthly body into the heavenly body (without any intervention of death, but also without any consideration of the Parousia) - while in the first Corinthian letter, the glorification of the deceased takes place at the Parousia, the author of the second letter imagines it such that the heavenly body immediately takes the place of the earthly body for each individual after death.)

24

The author assumes that his theory of the heavenly body is so well-known to his readers that he immediately presents the keywords in metaphorical form at the beginning of his explanation, relying on the fact that his readers will immediately think of the twofold body when he speaks of the God-wrought building and the eternal house not made by human hands, which the believers will inhabit after the destruction of the earthly dwelling. According to his view, this theory is so familiar to readers that he immediately expresses his desire for the heavenly body to be given to him without the intervention of death, so that the new garment will consume the old one almost naturally and painlessly, since possession of the new body will make the dissolution of the old one hardly noticeable.

He has strayed away from the actual topic very quickly and even presents this digression to his desire as the justification for the previously assumed doctrine of the dual body with the clumsy transition in verse 2 - ("for in this we sigh") - as commonly known!

In the midst of this sigh, he makes the statement in verse 3 that we will not appear naked - (meaning that we will certainly rise again, since he considers continued existence and resurrection possible only under the condition of corporeality) - thus, he suddenly refutes opponents without introducing them, doubts which he does not really present!

Finally, he wants to prove in verse 5 that his sighing refers to a real, not just a dreamed-of good, stating that he and the believers have been prepared by God to receive the heavenly body - forgetting that he has already established the assumption on which his sighing was based as established at the beginning of this explanation in verse 1.

25

Although this retrospective justification takes the turn as if it were to conclude the digression on his sighing, the author begins in a different form to express his longing to depart from earthly life and be with the Lord in verse 6, and he continues in verse 8, where he ends with this turn, to describe his desire to leave this life as the expression of his bold courage - as if courage were not rather to be proven in the struggles of this life! He wanted to speak of bold courage and instead expresses the painful concern*) in verse 6 that as long as one is in the body, one is separated from the Lord!

*) V. 6 θαρrouντες ουν παντοτε και ειδοτες

As high as the confusion has risen, the author is still not satisfied - he knows how to raise it even higher. After expressing his "courageous" wish just now to dwell at home with the Lord rather than to wander in the foreignness of bodily life, he wants to draw the conclusion with "therefore" **) and in this conclusion he puts both cases, whether one is at home or abroad, as indifferent in verse 9 - "therefore we strive to please the Lord, whether we are at home or abroad"!

**) διὸ

After a common saying (verse 11) about the judgment that the Lord will judge each person according to his deeds, the author, the supposed apostle, returns to his position before people in general and before the Corinthians with the concluding particle "thus" - "since we know the fear of the Lord" - and notes that he thus seeks to persuade people (of the righteousness of his conduct), but that God is manifest and also hoped to be manifest in the conscience of the Corinthians - what a connection! Assuming that he has spoken only of himself, especially in the common saying about judgment, was the fear of the Lord, to which he attaches such great importance, a

major part of the preceding topic? Can fear really determine him to such an extent in his apostolic activity? And what anxiety and constant worry about his recognition! A man who truly accomplishes great things and is convinced that he is following a great inner calling should be so anxious about people's recognition?

26

And this whining for recognition, the apostle is supposed to defend, excuse, and teleologically explain against the accusation that it is self-praise! The author, who has in mind his later talk about the self-glorification of the apostle, even leaves out the actual accusation and its defense: "that is not the case, I am not going too far, I am not speaking too strongly," in the transition to this explanation - (so anxious he is inwardly preoccupied with these apologetic expressions!) - and dictates to the apostle only the justification of his defense: "for we are not promoting ourselves," to the pen.

No! The apostle does not want to recommend himself, he just wants to give the Corinthians a reason to praise him again, as they have forgotten his merits - so it is still only about his glory, about his recognition!

27

The author believes that certain people are raving about the apostle, and he describes them as those who "boast to the face and not in the heart." However, he forgets to mention who these people are boasting about, or rather, he is unable to clarify the opposition and say who these people are boasting about since it cannot be the Corinthians themselves (as it does not refer to the name given by the apostle), and he cannot say that these opponents are boasting about themselves, as the opposition he wanted to create would have been as twisted and meaningless as it already is.

From this circling around unexplained keywords in pointless and unclear oppositions, we highlight only one incidental point.

We see the apostle defending himself in verse 13 against the charge that he is overstepping his bounds, without any motivation or even presentation of this accusation - a charge that preoccupies the author later and is already in his mind here. The love of Christ, whose urging he claims excuses him in verse 14, may further lead him to an excursus on the life-giving power of the death of Christ and the goal to which the new life should be directed and dedicated, in verse 15 - we do not ask for coherence - nor do we ask for it when he draws the conclusion from the preceding with the phrase "so that" in verse 16 and takes the latter for itself alone.

"So that from now on we know no one according to the flesh, even though we have known Christ according to the flesh, yet now we know Him thus no longer."

28

"So that we" *) - but he doesn't say a word about why he speaks of himself alone with such emphasis and why this conclusion from a sentence that dealt with believers in general should concern him alone.

*) ωστε ημεις

"From now on" - how? from now on, when he writes this? Has he only now formed an opinion**) about the power of Christ's death and the purpose of the believing life?

**) V. 14 [corrected from 15] κρίναντας

No! He means: from the point where I learned to judge in this way - where I judged for the first time - as if that point were now - as if the discovery of that judgment were his conversion - as if this judgment were not rather formed from pre-existing dogmatic keywords!

"He no longer judges anyone by the flesh from now on" - by the flesh? Does he have Jewish-minded opponents in mind who judge people based on the perceived advantages of their natural descent? Cr doesn't say a word about it!

And did he really perceive Christ in a fleshly way up to a certain point? But when? When did the turnaround happen? He doesn't want to say that earlier than Zude, he had formed a fleshly image of the Messiah - but rather as a Christian, he initially saw the Redeemer in a fleshly way - so when was that? How long did it last?

The author himself could not say, for at this moment he confuses two things - he has the historical development of Christian consciousness in mind, and he imagines it in such a way that the "fleshly" perception of the person of Christ prevailed earlier, and he simply makes this history of the apostle, whom he still wants to secure the credit for being the originator of the spiritual perception and preaching even in this confusion of subjects and ideas.

29

One more thing! In the concluding sentences (v. 17-21), the author, instead of moving forward, allows himself to be pushed and confused by individual keywords in ever new directions. In v. 19, he presents God in a way that is closer to Docetism as the immediate cause of reconciliation, with Christ only as the bearer of the effective God - he wants to prove to us again that he did not write the first Corinthians letter, in which Christ (1 Corinthians 15) is the independent mediator of history and through his free act brings about the absolute rule of God.

Admonitions.

6

In the last closing sentence (Chapter 5, verse 20), the Apostle, as an ambassador of Christ, urged the Corinthians to devote themselves to reconciliation. Therefore, when he moves on to the actual exhortations in Chapter 6, verse 1, the continuing resonance of this statement forces him to make the transition with particles *) that give the appearance that he is adding something new to the previous statement. He wants to say that not only are we doing this (urging you as ambassadors of Christ), but also this (urging you as fellow workers). However, what follows is nothing new, but only an inflated repetition of what was said before.

*) συνεργουντες δε και παρακαλουμεν

30

Furthermore, he does not say whose co-workers he is referring to - whether the other apostles, the leaders of the Corinthian community, or the community itself - he has taken a cue from the first letter to the Corinthians, where (chapter 3, verse 9) the apostles are God's co-workers, without adding the necessary further specification.

He has hardly introduced this exhortation when he launches into an excursus on the ministry, which must be firmly maintained in every kind of suffering and is, in fact, asserted against death, tribulation, and poverty - thus an excursus (verses 5-40) that can refer to the apostle alone and is worked out according to the image assumed historically - with which, let the commentators with their infallible acumen determine when, if at all, the

apostle thought of himself with the contrast between his poverty and enrichment and enriching power (verse 40), we only note that the author, rather, borrowed those celestial praises of the gospel and the contrast along with the preceding account of unsuccessful mistreatment and the turning of sorrow into joy.

After a affected and unfounded address to the Corinthians (verses 41-43), the author returns to his exhortation - he urges them (verses 14-17) to avoid communion with unbelievers and with idols - but he does not say a word about how this condemned communion manifests itself; the most likely thing is that he is thinking of the discussion in the first letter about participation in pagan sacrificial meals, but he has left this reminiscence unfounded and even given it a false turn, as if the freethinker, with his unscrupulous enjoyment of sacrificial flesh, confesses himself as a follower of idols!

31

Once again, the topic is the adulterer!

7.

The matter of the adulterer does not leave him in peace. After having resolved it by submitting to the rebellious decision, he now gives it a new turn by praising the submission and obedience of the Corinthians.

At the beginning (v. 2-3), the miracle worker, who in the first letter acted decisively in the name and with the power of Christ, still wriggles before the outraged community. He can't assert enough that he hasn't wronged anyone, ruined anyone, or unjustly taken advantage of anyone - what an inappropriate category in this context! - but with repeated references to the comforting news that Titus is said to have brought him from Corinth (v. 4-7), he suddenly praises their contrition, rejoices (v. 8-9) in their godly sorrow, and after the aside on divine and worldly sorrow (v. 10), he revels in their transformation.

32

They have shown "zeal" (v. 11) and did not think to follow his command! They tried to "justify and excuse" themselves - and instead left him to figure out how to justify his violent action! He praises their anger over the wrongdoer - and they forgave him! - their fear - and they did not shy away

from God's punishment or the apostle's rod! - their longing (presumably to see him) - and they acted as they pleased and left him to himself! - their zeal for the apostle and against the guilty party - their assertion of right - the purity of their behavior and conduct in the whole matter - and they took the side of the evil against the apostle!

Yes, he took the whole matter with the wrongdoer from the outset only to put it in their hands, so that (v. 12-16) their zeal for him would come to light, and he is pleased that they have passed the test so admirably. He was not serious about making the wrongdoer unhappy and delivering him to Satan - that is, the author wants to say - he is not the terrible and irritable hierarch as the author of the world's first letter has tried to portray him.

The Collection.

8 - 9.

The collection for the "saints" in Jerusalem, mentioned in the first Corinthian letter, is a welcome opportunity for the author of the second letter to try his antithesis art on a new subject, that is, to overstretch the opposites to such a degree that they miserably collapse.

33

He cannot find words grand enough to describe the zeal with which the Macedonians have already gathered their collections in 1 Corinthians 8:2-5 - he describes in lofty and affected language how they have sacrificed themselves in their poverty, how they have given beyond their means voluntarily and without any urging. He wants to contrast this with the tardiness of the Corinthians, whom he calls upon to do the same with a series of similarly ornamented and clumsy phrases, even resorting to flattery (verse 6-11) to encourage them to do good.

If this elaborate antithesis makes the whole thing suspect, if the supposed contrast rests on the assumption that the Macedonians were simply self-sacrificing - deeply poor, then the author finally destroys his own work in a ruthless way.

The antithesis was initially based on the assumption that the Macedonians had simply sacrificed themselves voluntarily - but soon after (in 2 Corinthians 9:2-4), he tells the Corinthians that he actually incited the Macedonians to perform the act of love by presenting to them the Corinthians' own example, by portraying their long-standing willingness. Initially, he wanted to provoke

the Corinthians through the admirable and superlative example of the Macedonians - now he admits that he incited the Macedonians through the praise of the Corinthians. First, the Macedonians were the means by which he wanted to influence the Corinthians - now it comes down to the good will of the Corinthians being the means by which he influenced the Macedonians!

34

But at least the Corinthians who appear in this letter knew very well how unfounded their reputation was - even the supposed apostle knows and betrays his internal anxiety and insecurity when he adjures them (9:3) not to shame his praise of their willingness - the anxious calculation with which he promises them God's blessing and the powerful intervention of the prayers of the supporters for their help (9:6-14) reveals how little he trusts their willingness - in short, he cannot maintain any of his assumptions, cannot execute them purely, and has not even cut off the dangerous, all-destroying conclusion that the willingness of the Macedonians may be a mere invented means to kindle their own enthusiasm, just as the praise of their willingness has stimulated the Macedonians.

Finally, the fact that the author attributes to the apostle himself and to the Greek communities a relationship with the "saints" of Jerusalem is evidence of the artificiality of the whole mechanism.

We will leave aside the question of whether the believers in Jerusalem were all poor, whether they suffered particularly or alone under the pressure of unbelievers - but if the author in 8:14 hopes to make the Corinthians willing by reminding them how they can help the lack of the saints in Jerusalem in the current world by using their (worldly) abundance, then those saints (in the future of completion) would help them with the abundance of their (spiritual) goods - then we can seriously ask whether this is truly Pauline.

35

If furthermore the apostle sends with Titus, who is supposed to prepare the collection of the Corinthians, another brother whom the communities have expressly given him as a companion on his journey abroad, so that (v. 19-20) any suspicion regarding his collection and handling of the collection may be cut off from the outset, then the questions become even more dangerous and the whole thing collapses hopelessly before their appearance.

So the communities that have assigned a companion to the apostle on his journey abroad, i.e., the communities in the Holy Land, are the communities, the true communities, while the outlying communities are not actual communities, only the diaspora, scattered shoots of the true, real community? So the Holy Land is also the true focus of Paul's apostolic work - his true home, the center around which he moves? He does not work independently and by virtue of his divine calling alone, but the Palestinian communities had the authority to assign him a deputy for a business abroad? The communities of the Holy Land had such a secure and self-evident authority over the outlying shoots that they could levy a contribution of their own authority and immediately send agents to collect it? And the apostle is so weak that he takes an official companion as a guarantee against suspicion and slander?

Rather, this entire mechanism is the product of the same apologetics, the same Judaism, which we have traced in the Acts of the Apostles and which made the Pauline revolution even more useful to the Church by subjecting it to the ideal representative of the statutory, the original community in Jerusalem.

36

(By the way, we note that in his unfounded manner, in 9:22-23, the author announces another assistant - also a worthy man and delegate of the communities - after Titus and that companion, without thinking that the Corinthians could not possibly know who the first and second worthy men were, unless he specifically named them.)

Apology of the Apostle.

10 - 12.

The vehement and outbursting behavior which the author suddenly adopts from the beginning of the tenth chapter contradicts the anxious restlessness and concern that he has expressed so far about the reception of his first letter, to such an extent that we are justified in turning Semler's assumption, that the following from chapter 10 is actually a third letter from the Apostle, into the suspicion that a later hand added this part to the author's anxiety work.

The style in this second part is almost always firm, the movement abrupt,

the language harsh, while the author in the first part twists and turns anxiously to create the appearance of the best harmony between him and the Corinthians.

37

When the author in chapter 7 described the divine sadness that a first letter had caused, his issue with the Corinthians had been resolved. Nevertheless, in chapters 10-12, he still sees fit to speak "harshly" and seriously against those who did not recognize his apostolic authority and who must have had general support among the Corinthians, if he feels it necessary to defend his apostolic reputation in a letter to them. With this argumentative defense, he therefore risks the reconciliation that had just been concluded in chapter 7 being called into question again.

As much as can be said for the assumption that the work of a later hand begins with chapter 10, there are still overwhelming reasons to support the unity of the author.

It is true that the discussion of his personal dignity in this new section calls into question the previous conclusion of reconciliation. However, the author has also previously, for example in chapter 7, when he depicted complete harmony between himself and the Corinthians, spoken as if their mutual agreement on the same matter had already been established beyond all doubt. Furthermore, after thoroughly discussing the tax issue in chapter 8, he makes an attempt in 9:1 as if he is only now beginning to speak on the matter. It is true that the language in this new section is harsh and severe, but it still suffers from the confusion that characterized the earlier part of the letter and occasionally becomes as anxious and evasive, especially in the excursus on the wondrous ecstasy (12:1-6), as it was before.

38

As positive evidence for the unity of the author, we can finally point out in the first part the keyword of self-praise of the Apostle, which only receives its explanation in the execution of this second part, as well as the briefly mentioned antitheses on the sufferings and heavenly life force of the Apostle - antitheses that are only now fully developed.

"I, Paul, myself" - the author wants to say: now Paul himself, the true Paul, appears as he really is - with these words the Apostle moves on to the

request that if anyone accuses him of being humble before the Corinthians in person, but bold and confident when he is away from them, they should not force him to justify the accusation and the general perception of him *) as someone who should always appear with unshakable confidence in all circumstances, and when he returns, to be bold and unscrupulous against his opponents and slanderers.

*) Ch. 10:2 λογίζομαι

Thus, the author immediately forgets the assumption he just made and wrote himself in the beginning of this section, and overturns the initial accusation with its opposite.

Nevertheless, the more this unnatural change of assumptions and the confusion of contradictions, the more this lack of planning demonstrates the artificial nature of the entire plan, the more the author himself reassures us against doubts about the validity of our argument that his work is based on the interests of a later time.

39

After the antithesis of the second accusation has displaced that of the first, or rather in the same breath in which he presents the second, he gives the accusation (v.2) a twist, stating that the apostle "walks according to the flesh" (i.e. acts on his own authority, following only his own interests), without however saying what this autonomy, this dictatorship of his own interests consists of. He actually has the later accusation in mind, the one made against Paulinism in contrast to the negation of those who submitted to the statutory, the positive, tradition, and established order.

Despite the contradictory appearance, the author has his apostle say in v.7 that he belongs to Christ as much as others do. However, he does not say in what this contradiction of appearance consists and who the others are who want to belong to Christ alone and preferentially - he writes so unclearly because he drags the opponent of the law into the later dispute about the connection of the apostles with Christ and about the value and superiority of the original apostles, and assumes that the dispute itself is widely known. To put it briefly, he borrowed an isolated catchword from the polemic of the first Corinthian letter.

"But the letters," his opponents object - "they are impressive, in them he overestimates himself, whereas in his actual, historical appearance he is weak and insignificant" (v.9-11) - really? "The letters"? So the Corinthians received a whole series of letters from the apostle, so that the letters could become a category for them?

When the late author wrote, it was only then that there was a series of Pauline letters, and as such, the letters were generally known, and there was a debate about their value, as well as the historical legitimacy of their supposed author.

The apostle is (v. 12) above all reproach - standing alone for himself - he does not measure himself against others, only against himself - he has his God-ordained standard and calling to which he must adhere.*) However, the author immediately confuses this clear statement by combining it with an apologetic explanation that the apostle, satisfied with the divinely determined measure that led him to the Corinthians and, as he surely hopes, will lead him further, never wants to gain fame in a foreign sphere of influence (10:13-16).

*) The words συνιᾶσιν, ἡμεῖς (v. 12, 13) are a later addition, destroying the coherence and stemming from a reader or copyist who did not understand the meaning of this explanation.

For him and the Corinthians, there could be no doubt that he had indeed reached them with his calling and measure. However, the idea that he would hopefully and surely surpass them stems only from the late Paulinist's assumption of his master's universal recognition. Finally, the idea that he never mixes in a foreign sphere of influence takes us back to the time when Paulinism and the Petrine faction of Judaism were fighting over the extent of their domains.

In the midst of an endless discourse on the folly in which he wishes to engage and which they would only reluctantly allow him to do (C. 11, 1) - with which he wants to justify the accusation that he is foolish in his speech (V. 6) - which would actually do them a favor since they are willing to tolerate fools (V. 19) - the supposed apostle conducts a multitude of negotiations, among them the most serious, in which it is about the salvation of his readers.

But does he really speak foolishly or was it time to indulge in folly when it comes to strengthening the wavering Corinthians in the simplicity of their devotion to Christ - when the danger of the times has risen so high that there are false teachers who preach a different message and spread a different gospel (V. 3-4), and when among the pseudo-apostles there is even one who regularly interferes with the work of the apostle to the Gentiles and whose

coming the Corinthians can only be prepared for? *)

*) V. 4 ὁ ἐρχόμενος, which in this determination can only be Peter of the later tradition, who always follows Paul the iconoclast, to destroy his work.

Rather, the author was mistaken when he allowed a category, which in essence only referred to a part of the following exposition, to extend too far and subsume the discussions of true life issues.

He might well call the exposition on his principle of not accepting anything from the Corinthians (C. 11, 7-15) a foolish talk, as long as he had carried it out clearly and coherently, for even ordinary folly has its method.

42

From the beginning, it is already a mistake when he calls his not accepting anything from the Corinthians for his support a self-abasement, in contrast to the fact that they were elevated by his preaching of the gospel (V. 7), while he immediately after (V. 10) calls it his boast in Achaia.

In the first Corinthians letter (1 Cor. 9:12), the others, his opponents, live off the gifts of the congregations to whom they preach their gospel. Now, all of a sudden, they work for nothing, just like him, thinking it necessary to forego any support from the Corinthians to avoid any pretext of greed. But he lives off the gifts of the Macedonians. Thus, the reason that determined his behavior towards the Corinthians had no validity with the Macedonians? Were there no false apostles in Macedonia who disputed with him for possession of the congregations and tried to strike him with the charge of self-interest?

Furthermore, the false apostles followed his example of disinterestedness, so that they would be found to be the same as him in all respects (V. 12), yet they accused him of greed. Is his disinterestedness just his expedient against their suspicion of the intentions that guided him in his work?

What a confused tangle of the pettiest intrigues! Or rather, into what a labyrinth has the author entangled himself through a couple of keywords of the first Corinthians letter!

Those false apostles whom he calls the "super-apostles" in 2 Corinthians 11:5, i.e., the original apostles, boasted of being Hebrews, Israelites, or Abraham's descendants - I am that too, he replied in verse 22. But he does

not say what that name and its emphasis mean - the author did not understand how to give shape to the later accusation that Paulinism was actually just a refined heathenism and the apologetic response of the Paulines that they did not think of detaching themselves from the context of tradition with their master, and to give this negotiation a proper footing on the standpoint of his master.

43

When the apostle boasts of his sufferings (V. 23-33), we leave it to the acumen of commentators to explain how he could have spent twenty-four hours on the seabed like a second Jonah - and we also gladly leave it to them to resolve the dispute about whether the solemn oath in V. 31, which follows the conclusion in V. 30 that the apostle only wants to boast of his weakness, still stands as evidence of the insignificance of this enumeration of his trials, or whether it is meant to confirm the sincerity with which he boasts of his weakness, or whether it is intended to support the lingering reference to his Damascus adventure (V. 32-33).

The heathen apostle has yet another claim to fame - his visions and revelations. He wants to give an example, but he does it in a affected way, speaking of himself in the third person and inwardly rejoicing that his readers will already know who this marvelously favored man is - no, not only affected, but also timid and uncertain - the author speaks in such a vague manner precisely because he is unable to really express the supposed vision. The whole thing consists of meaningless phrases: "I know a man in Christ, whether in the body or out of the body, I do not know - God knows - such a one was caught up to the third heaven - and I know such a man, whether in the body or out of the body, I do not know - God knows - he heard unspeakable words," etc.

44

Once again, the Apostle returns to the teleological explanation of his sufferings (V. 5-7) - they were given to him so that he would not be exalted by the ecstasies and revelations with which he was especially blessed - but in truth, he wants to arrive at the divine interpretation of the apparent contradiction, that is, at the Pauline axiom that grace reveals its superiority in human weakness. Therefore, he had to plead with God three times to

remove the thorn from his flesh, to free him from the persecutions of the satanic angel, that is, from that suffering, to pull him out of that struggle that only Satan could provoke in him - therefore, God had to answer: "My grace is sufficient for you, for my power is made perfect in weakness!"

But he does not want to be completely weak - he has also proven himself to be a true Apostle, a miracle worker, among the Corinthians (V. 12-13) - a very dangerous title, after his intended miracle of power over the adulterer had completely failed!

45

Final section:

13.

Even on his hierarchical supremacy, he does not want to give up completely.

Only when the hierarch "acts too grossly", as he believes is happening in the first Corinthians, his Pauline liberalism arises - (so the main purpose of his letter is to remove the appearance that Paul had actually misused the power given to him by the Old Testament in a spirit of destruction) - despite all this, however, he still wants to connect the hierarchical authority system with his Pauline-colored liberalism.

As a hierarch, he therefore wants to speak sternly at last and threaten the rebels with the application of all means available to him under his punitive power - but unfortunately, he is just as unlucky in his wording as he has been so far.

It is now firmly established for him that he has been to Corinth twice already - presumably, the proceedings of the first Corinthians gradually turned into a stay in Corinth - so on his second visit, he had already "told them beforehand" that if he came again, there would be no mercy - that is, he had found alarming disorder on his second visit, and instead of intervening immediately, he only spoke of what he would do on his next return. Instead of showing his power, instead of performing one of his supposed miracles, he went away and showed the rebels his back with a threat! He could not master the community, found no point of contact, and now hopes to win by repeated threats!

All of these concerning consequences of his attitude do not bother him – he is only pleased with the power and strength of his threat. In fact, he says, "I will not spare, since you (v. 3) want to feel the Christ speaking in me," meaning to test how strong he is in him.

At the same time, he returns to ironic mockery of his weakness (v. 4, 7, 9) – referring to a discussion that had already gone far beyond all limits. Immediately following this quarrelsome and meaningless banter, he adds the usual blessings (v. 11-13), which after such an unproductive and pointless discussion, naturally come across as very cold and meaningless.

One more thing: at the end of that final threat, he says (v. 10) "since he is absent, he writes them this, so that he does not have to apply sharpness when he returns with the power the Lord has given him, to build up and not destroy" – but if he can threaten and, to mention the miracle of the first letter no more, apply sharpness when he returns if necessary, then he must also have the power of judgment and destruction. It is therefore clear: the author has included here, as he has already done before (1 Corinthians 10:8), an apologetic turn of the later Paulinists, with which they sought to refute the accusation that their Master was only a spirit of destruction.

The Letter to the Romans.

I will immediately address the main issue that the critical apologists could not consider due to their unbroken assumption of the Pauline origin of the Letter to the Romans - the actual difficulty that must have remained hidden from them.

Section

9 - 11.

While the doctrinal theme is completely developed in the first section, Chapters 1-8, and in Chapters 9-11 there is no new doctrinal material regarding righteousness before God, while the former section is fully self-contained, in the latter three different and contradictory explanations are strung together regarding the question the author is dealing with. While Chapter 9 introduces a completely new question and not even an attempt is made to establish any kind of connection or even an appearance of connection. While all of this leads to the question of whether a single author could compose such disparate material and place it immediately next to each other, especially if the author of Chapters 1-8 was capable of producing such a disjointed composition. In his apologetic effort to establish the connection between these two sections *), Dr. Baur goes so far as to claim that "from the standpoint of the question answered in Chapters 9-11, Paul was led to the doctrinal discussion contained in the first part of the letter (Chapters 1-8)."

*) The Apostle Paul, p. 349.

Every thought of a privilege of the Jewish people - of a prerogative that so deeply occupied the author of Romans 9-11 - is completely defeated in the first part (chapters 1-8). Every particular claim of Judaism is refuted, and the argumentation is led from the center, as the finiteness and weakness of the law itself, and therefore the necessity of its abolition, is demonstrated.

The author of Romans 9-11 speaks as a Jew and from attachment to the Jewish people - in the previous section, however, the matter of the Jews and Judaism is decided and settled.

Chapters 1-8 deal with everything related to the superiority and necessary negation of Judaism with complete clarity and sublime impartiality - and yet the man who conceived and carried out this extraordinary execution with complete confidence should still have a thorn in his heart?

He has just decided on death and salvation, judgment and life - and yet he still wants to exempt the Jews from judgment?

Impossible!

But let this preliminary reflection on the opposing standpoint of both sections only stimulate doubt about the unity of the author - the detailed investigation of the latter will lead to proof that the second section was added later to the first section.

49

His constant heartache for Israel, says the author in chapter 9, verse 3, is so great that he wished *) he could be cursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of his fellow Jews, his own people by race. This wish, in its tremendous exaggeration, is entirely groundless. As a Christian, Paul could not wish for banishment, and as an apostle, he had duties to fulfill that made such a wish a sin against his calling. He belonged to the Gentiles and could not dispose of himself freely in favor of the Jews.

The enumeration of the prerogatives that belong to Israel in verses 4-5 is also a series of exaggerations and groundless assertions. "Sonship" could no longer be the special privilege of the Jews, after it had acquired a higher meaning in Christianity. Similarly, the glory and the covenants, and the fact that they have the "divine worship," are expressions that place too much emphasis on the legal cult. Finally, the fact that they have the patriarchs as their own is a glory that reveals too much veneration for the ancestors of the people as a holy corporation, and is foreign to the author of the first part, who especially emphasizes Abraham.

*) ἡὐχόμεν the addition "if it were possible" (ἂν [?]) is in the mind of the author, but he drops it.

50

In the concluding sentence of this enumeration, Christ is called the almighty

God (v. 5) and praised as such - a phrase that is foreign to the author of the first part. The highest praise, reserved solely for God (C. 1:25), has been directly transferred by the author of the second section to the descendants of the patriarchs.

As the author now proceeds to the intended argumentation (v. 6), he omits the intermediate link and motive for the continuation - namely, the contradiction between God's privileged treatment of Israel and its current rejection - and assumes, with a simple "but" and an impossible Greek transition *), the idea of which can only be roughly indicated **), that everyone is concerned with and aware of this contradiction that he now wishes to resolve.

*) οὐχ οἷον δὲ . . .

**) "not as if the word of God had fallen."

However, this contradiction did not exist for the author of the first part or for the first editors of the gospel, for whom divine judgment on the Jewish people did not pose a scruple. Nor did it exist for the original Jewish Christian, who may have felt pain but also accepted it, nor for the Gentile Christian, who did not necessarily look down on the rejection of the "people," even with mockery and Schadenfreude. It only existed for the later speculative dogmatist, who pondered the meaning of the old promises and asked himself whether Israel's unbelief could indeed be a permanent obstacle to their complete fulfillment.

The solution to this contradiction (v. 6) is supposed to lie in the fact that not all who are of Israel are Israel - the author thus turns away from the direction his introduction prescribes. How can the distinction between spiritual Israel and the physical one help if it is precisely this people that is involved - this people for whom the author wanted to become a curse?

51

Therefore, it is of no help when the contrast between Ishmael and Isaac is cited as evidence for the statement that not all who are of Abraham's seed are his children. The author needed this contrast because he wanted to come to divine election.

Accordingly, the true children of Abraham (v. 7) are those chosen by God, while in the previous part of the letter, faith is the sure offspring of Abraham.

Isaac, the promised one (v. 8-9), is the type of the children of promise.

Therefore, the promise is much too narrow, while in the first part, Abraham is endowed with the inheritance of the world and the fatherhood of many nations.

What happened with Esau and Jacob also proves to the author (v. 10-13) the independence of divine election, but not as previously from the natural determination of origin, but from the merit of works, thus a new contrast that again does not consider the faith of the first section!

Now, when the author wants to prove (v. 14-18) that the arbitrary election of divine justice does not contradict, and only brings forward Bible passages that teach the same arbitrariness of election, and when he wants to refute the objection (v. 19-21) that man is not responsible for his actions and his nature, and in his response, he tautologically only repeats the objection, we will not burden ourselves with the useless effort of elevating these meaningless expressions even to the level of a semblance of an answer. We simply acknowledge that the vague indeterminacy of religious ideas, especially the vague notion of divine omnipotence and uniqueness, allows for no other solution to the contradictions and difficulties associated with it than the tautological repetition of the same.

52

Enough! - In His free power, God has allowed the Gentiles (v. 22-23) to reach righteousness that comes from faith, but Israel, except for a small remnant, has been rejected (v. 24-26) - but really rejected? No! They have experienced the punishment (v. 31-33) for their unbelief - so the author has suddenly shifted to a new direction in his argumentation. He wants to remove the difficulty, which was just supposed to eliminate the unconditionality of divine election, now (in Romans 10) by reflecting on Israel's unbelief.

In this part of his argumentation, he also proves that the first section does not come from him.

In order to portray the unbelief of the Jews in all its culpability, he points out how the word of faith was so close to them in the preaching of the apostles - even goes so far as to use an Old Testament quote (Romans 10:6-7) to illustrate this closeness and to present the antithesis that one does not have to ascend to heaven or descend into the abyss to bring Christ. Afterwards (v. 14-18), again only to highlight the unbelief of the Jews, he indulges in a series of contrived phrases about the necessity, actual existence, and general dissemination of preaching - all antitheses and phrases that the

author of the first section could not have thought of, since for him, salvation is given and effective in Christ's work, without any further question.

53

When the author wanted to introduce his antithesis of bringing down and bringing up Christ to the statement that the word is near in the preaching of the messengers of faith, he very inappropriately inserted the remark (V. 8) that it is in the heart and mouth of believers, and before he gets to his exposition on the existence and general dissemination of the preaching, he indulges in an equally inappropriate digression (V. 9-10) about the necessary connection between heart-faith and oral confession. The catchphrase: if you confess with your mouth "Lord" *) betrays the reason for this confusion - the author had that gospel saying: "Not everyone who says: Lord! Lord!" at the wrong time in mind, and if he wanted to be considered as one person with the author of the first section, he was also mistaken in attaching too much importance to confession as recognition of the dogma and as a condition of salvation. The faith that the first section deals with possesses such intense vitality, its effectiveness and validity before God is so firm that there is no reason for distinguishing between oral confession and sincere honesty, just as there is no need for the clause that heart-faith must necessarily be added to confession.

*) κύριον ἰησοῦν

54

Neither the divine will nor the unbelief of the Jews can remove the sting from the heart of the author - the rejection of the people remains an unbearable thought for him, and he will only find peace again when he has completely abolished it (Chapter 11).

First, he returns (verses 1-7) to the idea of the remnant that still remains from the people - an idea that was already inappropriate above, but now even more so, as it now concerns the preservation of the people as a whole with the utmost seriousness.

He offers himself as proof (verse 1) that God has not rejected his people - but is he, himself the people? Just because, as he emphasizes, he is descended from Abraham, must the people as a whole, the entire people be accepted into grace?

And is he really from the tribe of Benjamin? Did he really need this obscure reference to his tribe to confirm his descent from Abraham and to make the eventual pardon of his people more certain?

Rather, let us pay attention to how Benjamin was the last, unexpected, and final one in the circle and succession of his siblings, so it is clear that this apostle's descent from Benjamin is a symbol made later for his relationship to the original apostles - he is also the last, unexpected, and final one in his own way!

Finally (verse 11), the author comes to the ultimate fate of the people as a whole, abandoning the idea of the small chosen remnant, but also revealing his true character by allowing the Jews in Christ to speak purely and completely.

55

First, he starts from the assumption that has been historically documented in the Acts of the Apostles: that the unbelief and fall of the Jews served to bring the Gentiles into possession of the gospel (v. 11). But he immediately continues, asking: if their fall is riches for the world, and their failure riches for the Gentiles, how much more their fullness? The interest of the world, the interest of the nations, he wants to say, therefore demands the end result: their full, unimpaired acceptance.

However, he cannot proceed boldly and securely to this conclusion. He is hesitant, he is troubled, as he derives the conclusion by means of this inference, feeling at the same time that he cannot really set the middle term of this conclusion into motion, and therefore cannot prove why it is in the interest of the nations for all Israel to be saved. It is his own hesitancy and troubled state that he presumes to exist in the minds of his Gentile readers, which he seeks to dissolve in the following passage.

"Indeed, I speak to you Gentiles," he suddenly addresses the Gentile Christians as a special class of his readers, pretending to want to dissolve their objections to his paradox. However, he cannot motivate why the Gentile Christians would be troubled or concerned about his paradox, just as he was not previously able to establish a lively relationship between his argumentation and a mixed audience of Gentile and Jewish Christians. He has always been preoccupied with his own doubts and speculations.

He feels so uncertain, he moves so timidly, that he (v. 13) justifies his right to address the Gentiles by appealing to his apostolic office.

56

“Thus far,” he says *), in this reflection on his calling, “thus far as an apostle to the Gentiles, I boast of my ministry in order to make my fellow Jews jealous and save some of them!

*) ἐφ’ ὅσον

“Thus far” – how contemptuous for his calling! He is not essentially, not above all others, the apostle to the Gentiles – no! He must also look back at his people, at his flesh, yes, even in the same moment when the Gentiles believe that it is dedicated to them alone, he must let his ministry serve the benefit of his people!

Moreover, “thus far I am now...”**) – so he is also something higher – only temporarily is he the apostle to the Gentiles.

**) ἐφ’ ὅσον μὲν

When the author wrote, the theological explanation already existed that the fall of the Jews mediated the acceptance of the Gentiles – he had just approved and applied it for his purpose, but it is not supposed to be the final solution – he does not want to accept it at all now. He now goes straight to his goal. If the rejection of Israel, he says in verse 15, means the reconciliation of the world, what then is the acceptance of grace if not life from the dead?

No! Life does not come from death, but from life.

The “wild shoot” grafted onto the root of the olive tree in verse 16-17 receives the new life-sap – the holiness of the branches comes from the holiness of the root.

57

The community draws its life force from the Jewish national life - it is not a higher organization with its own unity point and its own more highly developed juices. It is not the awareness of its break with Jewish national life that gives the community or enhances its self-confidence of its peculiar and transcendent nature over all previous forms of life - rather, the converted Gentiles, who are on the standpoint of this section what in the primitive gospel, if we may bring together such disparate things, is the community emerging from the break with heathenism, would be sacrilegious if they forgot that Judaism is the source of their life.

While it is otherwise a historical law that the nations whose internal struggles and oppositions generate a new principle of life must leave the implementation and ultimate shaping of it to nations that stood outside of the struggle as barbarians, but possess, in their freedom from the considerations and scruples associated with those struggles, the basic condition of higher historical capacity and educational power*) - while this law has also received its plastic expression in the primitive gospel - the author of the present section ascribes to the Jewish national life such far-reaching and even absolute power that it survives its internal rupture, reassembles all its members, and finally also resolves the opposition between the converted Gentiles and its own unbelieving children.

*) Here I still leave standing the common assumption that the struggles of the Jewish national life led to the emergence of Christianity and the Greco-Roman world assumed the shaping of the new principle of life.

58

When the fullness of the Gentiles has come in, meaning that Judaism has achieved universal dominion, then the Jews who had misunderstood the significance of their national identity in their unbelief will also return to it (Romans 11:25-26).

The author has correctly and consistently carried out this abstract and living universality, which he views as the goal and end of history, by reducing the historical embodiment, the Gospel, to something temporary. Only for now (Romans 11:28), "in respect of the Gospel" *) — only as long as the evangelical opposition between the converted Gentiles and the unbelieving Jews persists, can he regard the latter as his enemies — but the destiny that they possess by nature, which will also triumph over their momentary blindness, makes them his beloved. The error that resulted in the historical opposition between the chosen Gentiles and the rejected Jews will pass away, but so will the Gospel itself, which consists of this opposition. It is only something interim — the end is the universal Judaism.

*) κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον

One thing is certain, however, that the author of this section has taken the turn that connects Jerusalem's ultimate fate with the fulfillment of the Gentiles' ultimate fate from the Gospel of Luke and adapted it for his own purposes *) — but I dare not answer in the affirmative whether he already

had the current Gospel of Luke and with it the Acts of the Apostles in his hands. It seems more likely to me that whoever gave the Gospel of Luke its present form borrowed several categories from this section of his childhood history, such as that of mercy, of the "fathers," and the weight he places on the privileged relationship of the Jews to God.

*) Luk 21:24 ἄχρι πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ ἐθνῶν.

Rom 11:25 ἄχρι οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ,

59

Section

1 - 8

The only substantive work in the epistolary literature of the New Testament, the first section of the Romans, was written at a time when the dogmatic concept of grace as such was already firmly established and when the objections that the legalistic consciousness raised against it were widely disseminated and well-known.

Certainly, the astute and thorough dialectician who wrote this section, like any educated thinker who grasped the subject at its core, gave a new form, even greater sharpness and correctness, to the objections he encountered, which his opponents could not impart to them - so certain is he to have removed from the objections the hateful character that religious interest always tends to give them - so certain is he to have elevated them to the dignity of natural antitheses of his own dialectic only when he brought the given concept of grace to its ultimate fulfillment and raised it to the absolute ruler of the entire spiritual world. Despite all this, however, it will remain firmly established for anyone who respects the laws of the real world that the author found the material for his dialectic and assumed that his readers were familiar with it.

60

No thinker has ever emerged or will ever emerge who did not make use of the turns of his dialectic, even if they are truly new and witness to his original creative power, from existing consciousness. Even the enthusiast or sophist who believes he is setting forth something utterly new and the ideal of the future in an extravagant utopia can only draw the material for his

chimerical structure from his actual environment, and so the one who really establishes a new law of the world is far more dependent on his environment - his dependence is at least expressed in the conscious tension with which he regards it - he is entangled with it - he combines the elements that correspond to his self-confidence in his new formula - he transforms the turns that conflict with him into the opponents of his formula - the firmness and security of his new structure rests precisely on the substratum he knew how to find in his environment.

The contrasts with which the author deals belong to his time, not just to the supposed Romans to whom he is writing. He himself did not even dare or attempt to link the objections to which his dogmatic development leads him - such as the objection in 3:5 whether our unrighteousness does not serve as a foil for God's righteousness, whether he does not abolish the law (3:31), whether we should continue in sin (6:2), so that grace may abound even more - with the presumed occasion that he is writing to the Romans. In the course of his dogmatic exposition, he forgot the Romans. ---

- to such an extent has he forgotten his assumption that he is writing to Gentile Christians in a community that testifies to the triumph of Paulinism (Romans 1:8) that he drops it and speaks as if he is only dealing with Jewish Christians and the limitations of their legal consciousness. —

The desperate situation created by this contradiction, and the impossibility of reconciling the assumption of the opening (Romans 1:1-15), which states that the supposed apostle is addressing a purely Gentile-Christian community, with the assumption of the following exposition, which answers the objections of Jewish-Christian readers, is demonstrated by the last excruciating attempt of Dr. Baur, who refers to the second section of the present Romans (Chapters 9-11) as "the center and core of the whole,*) a section that the author of the preceding doctrinal exposition did not write.

*) Der Apostel Paulus p. 42.

According to Dr. Baur,**) the external occasion for the letter is therefore "the objection that was raised against the participation of the Gentiles in the grace of the Gospel, or against Pauline universalism - the objection that as long as Israel as a nation, as the people chosen by God, did not partake of this grace, the participation of the Gentiles in it appeared as a curtailment of the Jews, as an injustice against them, as a contradiction to the promises given by God to the Jews as a people" - that is, a "concern" of Jewish Christians about the "mass" of Gentiles who were coming to the Gospel, about which history knows nothing. This concern is even completely foreign

to the author of the section on which Dr. Baur bases his hypothesis. The author's concern does not stem from the large "mass" of converted Gentiles, nor does it deal with the priority question of whether the Jews should be the ones to share in salvation before the Gentiles can be allowed in. Rather, it is simply a question of whether the rejection, the constant rejection of the people as a whole, is compatible with the divine promises. For him, the important thing is to subdue the evangelical, the historical opposition in general, the opposition that threatens the privilege of the chosen people, and to subjugate it in its universal Judaism, in any case, regardless of whether the converted Gentiles are many or few.

**) Tübinger Zeitschrift 1836. III, 72, 92. Der Apostel Paulus p. 344.

62

Only in one formula of the first section is Dr. Baur so fortunate as to be able to establish a connection with the second section, and he even refers to it *) as a reference to the conditions which are specifically dealt with in ch. 9-11 - he means the formula that the Gospel is a power of God (ch. 1, 16) for the salvation of everyone who believes, "first for the Jew, then for the Gentile" - but even this finding is only an illusion, since the preference that the first section grants to the Jews as an unquestionable and universally recognized one is excluded in the second by the absolute divine arbitrariness, by the unbelief of the Jews, and by the final solution that the Jews will only share in salvation last.

*) The Apostle Paul, p. 338.

63

On the other hand, this formula is highly important and decisive in another respect.

Already when it appears for the first time (at the cited passage), it contradicts the ruthless dialectic with which the first section dissolves the difference between the Gentiles and the Jews. But when it appears for the second time, in the discussion of the universality of judgment, and in the same moment (C. 2, 9-11) when the author expressly emphasizes that in judgment there is no partiality with God and both Jews and Gentiles are equally subject to God's righteousness, and when it also says that the judgment will come to the Jew first and also to the Greek, then it is clear that it has intruded at the wrong time, that it was not just formed by the author, but was already given and so familiar to him that he also cited it in the wrong place.

But a man like the one who formed this first section - could he really have been capable of making such a mistake? - Could he really have become so weak and, in a moment when he describes the ruthless character of divine justice with his strict dialectic, add a formula that hints at a Jewish superiority and grants them the honor of priority?

64

I must confess that I consider it impossible. However, it would indeed be a rare coincidence if an essay, to which several thinkers, not only the author of the second section, added their works, had remained without interpolations - interpolations, the possibility of which, after the one has been securely proven, is established, and whose proof may be left to later investigations.

I will raise another question only for now - demonstrate its urgency and also leave its answer to later investigations.

The essay defending the absoluteness of grace against the objections of the legal consciousness from chapter 1, verse 18 to the end of chapter 8 is the core to which several later Pauline apologists added their works - preceding it is a lettered introduction that contradicts its direction outright and instead turns to Gentile Christians, whose faith is so perfect that it serves as a witness to the triumph of Paulinism before the whole world. Now, is it not possible that this lettered introduction, to which the actual essay is attached with a clumsy "for" (E. 1:18), is a later work?

At the very least, the possibility is very serious, and while it is enough for us to have continued the investigation up to this point, whose fundamental elements have only just been formed, to raise this question, we can set the task for those who must consider the whole question to be inadmissible to explain how the author of the dialectical masterpiece on the universality of divine grace and human sinfulness could have used the unclear phrase in the lettered introduction (C. 1:14) that he is a debtor to Greeks and barbarians, wise and foolish. Indeed, we can also let them continue to ponder the meaningless question in the future, whether in that phrase the Jews or the Gentiles are the barbarians, whether the Romans are a fraction of the Greeks, whether the Hellenes are the wise and the barbarians are the foolish, whether among the latter the Jews or the Gentiles are to be understood - they will never answer the question, for the only correct answer, that the author of this lettered introduction threw together a couple of keywords from the first Epistle to the Corinthians *), will always seem absurd to them.

*) 1 Cor 1:19-24

65

As for the question of when this first section originally originated, we do not want to attach particular weight to the parenthetical remark in C. 2, 16 "according to my gospel" - it is certain that it presupposes written gospels and refers specifically to the gospel section on the last judgment - but the clumsy and disruptive way in which it intrudes into its current context raises the urgent suspicion that it is one of those interpolations that originate from the authors of the later parts of the current letter.

On the other hand, the bloody character and general spread of the persecutions presupposed in the passage from C. 8, 18 to 39 definitely point to a later time, to which the ecclesiastical transformation of gnostic categories (E. 8, 38-39) also belongs.

66

Finally, if we compare the grouping and construction of Romans 8:38-39, "neither death nor life, nor things present nor things to come" (can separate us from the love of God) with the parallel passage in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (Chapter 3, verse 22), and if we further note that everything is clear and natural in the latter, while in the former everything is sought and will never be able to be consolidated into a clear thought, it is certain that this first section of the Epistle to the Romans was written before the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

Section

12 - 14

Having shown that the second section (Chapters 9-11) of Romans did not come from the author of the first, we need not ask whether the latter was capable of writing the exhortations that are jumbled together in Chapter 12, or whether it was truly possible for him to completely forget the central point of his faith, his writing style, his gift and skill of language, and the force with which he holds on to the main idea and groups everything else around it.

However, I also cannot believe that the author of the immediately preceding section (Chapters 9-11) could have simply transitioned to this accumulation of exhortations with a meaningless "therefore" (Romans 12:1), in which

nothing reminds us of or even alludes to the theme of his essay. A man who had such a specific interest as the patron of this universal Judaism, a man who held this interest so close to his heart, was not capable of completely forgetting it in a composition that would give the appearance of practical application, and he had no reason to open the unordered series of exhortations with the call to present the body as a sacrifice pleasing to God (Romans 12:4).

67

This practical section, in which another author weaves in another stiff appeal of the apostle to his divine legitimacy (Ch. 12: 3), stems from a different author who had the first Corinthians letter in mind.

When he (Ch. 12:3) speaks of a measure of faith as it has been allotted to each by God - of a measure of faith that is not that singular, absolute power of the first section that appropriates salvation, but is generally just the Christian ability and virtuosity - he has transferred the category of distribution and measure determination, which the first Corinthians letter correctly applies to the grace-giving and Christian capacity and competence, inappropriately to faith. *)

*) 1 Cor 7:17 ἐκάστῳ ὡς ἐμέρισεν ὁ Θεός, ἕκαστον ὡς κέκληκεν ὁ Κύριος.

Compare 1 Cor 12:11

Rom 12:3 ἐκάστῳ ὡς ὁ Θεὸς ἐμέρισε μέτρον πίστεως

He has at an inappropriate time the execution of the first Corinthians letter on the harmonious unity of the various grace-giving in mind and even copies it almost word for word - his acquaintance with this execution unconsciously turns into the assumption that it is also known to his readers, that he hints at the common origin of the various grace-giving in a carelessly thrown participle in V. 6 and sets up his exhortations for the proper application of them without giving a verb in V. 7-8. *)

*) 1 Cor 12:12 καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἓν ἐστὶ καὶ μέλη ἔχει πολλά, πάντα δὲ τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος τοῦ ενός, πολλά ὄντα, ἓν ἐστὶ σῶμα, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστός.

Rom 12:4-6 καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι μέλη πολλά ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ μέλη πάντα οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει πρᾶξιν, 5 οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σῶμά ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ, ὁ δὲ καθ' εἰς ἀλλήλων μέλη. 6 ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα

For individual keywords in this passage, it is also worth comparing with: 1 Corinthians 12:4, 11, 25.

translate: Daß er nicht ursprünglich schafft, beweist er ferner, wenn er in seiner Anweisung zur richtigen Anwendung der Gnaden- gaben, die er nach der Anleitung des ersten Korintherbriefs auf- zählt und die sich auf die Leitung und Erbauung der Gemeinde beziehen, auch die Anweisung einfügt, wie man die Privat- wohlthatigkeit (V- 8) üben solle.

Er kennt also schon den evangelischen Spruch von der rechten Art deö Almosens (Matth. 6, 3), wie in seiner Anweisung (C. 12, 14): „segnet, die euch verfolgen“, der evangelische Spruch: „segnet, die euch fluchen“, widerklingt oder vielmehr ungehörig verändert ist.

Das positive und beruhigte Verhältniß, welches die Ermahnungen C. 13, 1—7 zwischen der Gemeinde und der weltlichen Obrigkeit voraussetzen, widerspricht nicht nur der revolutionären Absonderung, die der erste Korintherbrief (E. 6, 1) den Gläubigen zur Pflicht macht, sondern auch der Voraussetzung des blutigen Zerwürfnisses, welches nach dem Schluß vom ersten Abschnitt des Nömerbriefs zwischen der Gemeinde und der Weltmacht statlfindet.

In the excursus on love as the fulfillment of the law (E. 13:8-10), the author combines elements from the two Gospel passages in which Jesus transitions from individual commandments to the ultimate moral necessity (Mark 10:19-21) and sets forth the greatest commandment (Mark 12:29-31). Additionally, for his category that the love of the law is "fulfillment," he uses the saying about absolute fulfillment (Matthew 5:17, 48).

The material was given to him, but he was not able to master it or harmoniously integrate it into his work. Immediately after his statement about the fulfillment of the law, he uses the phrase "and this" *) as if he were going to further establish the excellence and necessity of love and give the reason why believers should be all the more moved by it. Instead, the text refers to the established nearness of salvation and infers from this secure datum the abstract necessity of abandoning the works of darkness (v. 42).

*) καὶ τοῦτο

Love is forgotten; its necessity is neither justified nor is any conclusion drawn from its sole value.

Furthermore, in his reflection on salvation, which is closer than one believes (v. 44), he also uses a saying from the Gospel about the parousia, but again he is unable to process and appropriately continue it, since the crisis of the parousia disappears in the abstract contrast of the bright day to the darkness (v. 12) that follows.

70

In a sudden and abrupt transition to a new topic (C. 14, 1): "But the one who is weak in faith, receive him", the author provides the keywords of a dispute that he assumes is known to everyone, but he is not able to say even one clear word about the matter that should actually be the focus.

Although it is clear that weak faith should not consist in fear of enjoying meat sacrificed to idols, since it is not even mentioned once, it emerges from the contrast (V. 2) that the weak person is supposed to be a strict ascetic who avoids any meat consumption, as long as this formal contrast is assumed. However, the matter itself remains completely unclear. It is already highly fluctuating and unstable that the strong person is said to believe he can eat anything, when it only comes to the enjoyment of meat or to ascetic renunciation. Moreover, it is inexplicable why the common way of life, which was undoubtedly prevalent at the time of the author, is described as an expression of particular strength - it remains equally inexplicable why asceticism, an exceptional way of life, should be considered an expression of weakness - since asceticism could not have been so widespread in any case, as the extensive talk of this excursion assumes, the consideration that is required of the strong person with respect to the weak person remains incomprehensible - finally, if the author wants the consideration he demands of the strong person to be carried so far that he (V. 21) prescribes that one should renounce one's own freedom and simply accommodate oneself to the weak person, the unnaturalness of this statement becomes apparent. The abstract nonsense that it leads to reveals its vacuity and its overly artful origin.

71

To put it bluntly, the author has, as evidenced by the borrowed keywords and entire sentences *), had the first Corinthians' poorly written discussion about the consumption of meat sacrificed to idols in mind. However, he has turned his copy into a confused jumble by using expressions from his source material, which relate to a very specific dispute, without any further thought, and applying them to the question of the value of asceticism, thereby adding echoes from the evangelical discussion of Jewish purity laws to this already

jarring dissonance.

*) Compare with Rom 14:13 τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ σκάνδαλον.

1 Cor 10:32 ἀπρόσκοπτοι γίνεσθε

1 Cor 8:13 ἵνα μὴ τὸν ἀδελφόν μου σκανδαλίσω.

Rom 14:6 ὁ ἐσθίων κυρίῳ ἐσθίει· εὐχαριστεῖ γὰρ τῷ θεῷ· καὶ ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐσθίει, καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ τῷ θεῷ. v. 8 [corrected from 7] . . . ἐάν τε γὰρ ζῶμεν, τῷ κυρίῳ ζῶμεν, ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν, τῷ κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκομεν.

1 Cor 10:31 Εἴτε οὖν ἐσθίετε εἴτε πίνετε εἴτε τι ποιεῖτε, πάντα εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ ποιεῖτε.

1 Cor 10:30 ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εὐχαριστῶ

Compare also Romans 14:19 and 1 Corinthians 10:23, Romans 14:15 and 1 Corinthians 8:11.

72

Therefore, all those uncertainties that do not even deserve the honorable name of contradictions or difficulties - therefore, the recommendation of consideration for the "weak" and finally the command of submission to them - therefore, the appeal to the Lord, who has given him the conviction (V. 14) - (cf. Mark 7:15) - that nothing in itself can defile a person.

In the tangle of this confusion, there is - or rather loses itself purposelessly and without leaving even the slightest echo, after having appeared unmotivated and unprepared - the reflection on the contrast between those who observe a specific day and those who do not. This is clearly as inappropriate an allusion to the Gospel discussion about Sabbath observance as the previous appeal to the Gospel's struggle against Jewish dietary laws. And once again, the observation of that day and its profanation is only described as an indifferent contrast in itself because the author remains dependent on that type of the first Corinthians letter, according to which freedom and restraint are lowered and raised to the same level.

Conclusion.

15 - 16.

Tertullian's declamations about Marcion's violent actions against the Letter to the Romans, which is said to have formed part of his collection of Pauline

letters - I say "said to have" because I initially leave the question of whether that Gnostic really had the collection in his hands, which Tertullian attributes to him, undecided - are so worthless and lacking in substance that they give us no clarification about actual differences between individual redactions of this letter.

73

Only that well-known note of Origen's *) informs us that there were copies of this letter in which the current two concluding chapters were missing, or rather in which the current chapter fourteen was immediately followed by the doxology of chapter sixteen, verses twenty-five to twenty-seven.

*) in his commentary on Romans (on Ch. 16:25).

Even if Origen's statement about Marcion removing the last two chapters of the letter is accepted, we will not even ask whether he actually had a copy of the letter without even the crudest attempt at a conclusion in his hasty accusation. As for those copies in which the doxology immediately follows the fourteenth chapter, Origen explicitly states that they still contained the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters, and he only speaks of a rearrangement of the current components, but this alleged rearrangement is only evidence of a gradual growth of the letter: the immediate connection of the doxology with the fourteenth chapter takes us back to a time when the current final two chapters did not yet exist.

Even if that note from Origen did not help and raised doubts, we would still ask whether these two final chapters were written by one of those authors who added their own contributions to the dialectical masterpiece of the first section, and the answer would be a resounding no.

74

The author of this concluding section, like his two predecessors, is a Pauline apologist who seeks to gain recognition for Paulinism by blunting the sharpness of its opposition. Like them, he is a tool of that Catholic direction which made Paulinism useful to general consciousness by reconciling it with Christian Judaism. However, while the author of chapter 1-11 allowed the Pauline category of grace to serve his universal Judaism, and the author of the following section (chapter 12-14) transformed Pauline faith into Christian virtuosity, expressed in the correct evaluation and application of the gifts of grace, as well as in the accommodation to the weak, the author of the final chapters, in the same way as it happens in the Acts of the Apostles, made Paulinism one of the peripheries that revolve around the Jewish center, which is represented by the supposed original community and its holy Jerusalem.

The confusion in the consciousness of the latter, in which Paulinism and Christian Judaism intermingled, was so great that he speaks in the same breath (chapter 15, verse 8) as if his readers were born Jews, and justifies his right to write to them with his calling as an apostle to the Gentiles (verse 15-16). The first time he wanted to add the dogmatic justification to his occasional sentence that Christ had accepted them (verse 7), namely, that Christ was a servant of circumcision - the obligated one - and a servant of the Jews through the promise to the fathers; the second time, he copied the formula of the introduction (chapter 1, verse 5) to make the unity of the author certain, an intention that he achieved so little that he apologized for the audacity of writing to his readers more daringly than their known perfection allowed, making the daring author of the first section a timid and uncertain person.

75

When he added his supplement to the letter, the second Corinthians letter already existed. He borrowed from both the first Corinthians letter and the second Corinthians letter the keywords of that quarrel with opponents who left their homeland, which was already chimeric in itself, and suddenly went from Corinth to Rome. Only a copyist, only such an awkward copyist as the author of this appendix, was able to have the apostle suddenly speak (v. 17) of "the name" that he has "in Christ," i.e., to introduce a keyword from the first Corinthians letter without any preparation or motivation *) - only the copyist of the second Corinthians letter could have the supposed Paul suddenly speak (v. 19) of the signs and wonders that are supposed to establish his calling as a Gentile apostle beyond doubt - only to the second and first Corinthians letters is the here essentially purposeless exposition on the collection, with which the apostle is about to travel to Jerusalem, (v. 25-27) taken *) - finally, the mouthpiece that the copyist performed when he easily transferred Aquila and Priscilla along with the church in their home from Ephesus to Rome **), proves that the entire accumulation of personal information in the concluding chapter is a later composition.

*) Rom 15:17 ἔχω οὖν καύχησιν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ
1 Cor 15:31 καύχησιν ἣν ἔχω ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

*) Compare Rom 15:25 with 2 Cor 9:1. Rom 15:26 with 2 Cor 8:4. Rom 15:27 with 1 Cor 9:11. 2 Cor 9:6-12

**) Compare Rom 16:5 with 1 Cor 16:19

76

The mention of the collection for "the saints" in Jerusalem was not

completely purposeless. If Jerusalem was the starting point and support base for the apostle and the Greek sphere of influence he operated in, then this pivot point must now demonstrate its importance as the first great sphere of influence extends to its outermost end in Illyria (Romans 15:19), and the apostle is already on the verge of crossing the second western sphere of influence to its outermost end, all the way to Spain (Romans 15:24). Therefore, the apostle must first prove his loyalty to Jerusalem and the holy community of believers (Romans 15:25).



The Pastoral Epistles.

Having now demonstrated the late origin of the four "major letters" that were previously considered as indisputably genuine, and assuming the unauthenticity of the nine other letters as proven by Dr. Vaur, the task left for my criticism is to incorporate the result obtained by the latter scholar, and in some respects expanded by Mr. Schwegler, into the broader context provided by my criticism of the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and my work on the four major letters. Specifically, I will dissolve the false opposition that those two scholars created between the supposedly only unauthentic letters and the four major letters, and demonstrate the literary dependence of each author on the others, thus establishing the possibility of a historical overview of the development present in these letters.



I will begin with the conclusion of this developmental sequence: the Pastoral Epistles.

When the presumed author Paul entrusts the bishops to the care of his assistants and entrusts his colleagues with the supervision of the hierarchical organization of the churches, it is only the expression of the historically accomplished mediation between Paulinism and Catholicism. The former has gained such great historical power, at least as an all-powerful name, that the establishment of the episcopal and hierarchical constitution is considered complete and secure only when entrusted to the authority of Paul. The latter, Catholicism, on the other hand, celebrates its final triumph by forcing the opponent of the law and all statutory elements to submit and acknowledge its divine right completely. The reconciliation of both powers is brought about by their mutual victory - by each having triumphed, they have subordinated the other.

The victory, the reconciliation of both powers, this alternating submission of one to the other is not as new as the apologetic critics of the Tübingen school think - the preparations for this conclusion are found in those very documents that they consider as evidence for the original Pauline freedom.

"Where - asks Mr. Schwegler *) - where does Paul give any reminder of bishops, presbyters, deacons in his letters to the Corinthians, to the Galatians? Where does he assume an already determined social organization through such offices? There is no trace anywhere of specific offices and dignities for the management and governance of the whole, much less of a leader at the head of the whole."

*) Post-Apostolic Age, II, 150.

The answer is my critique of the two Corinthians letters.

79

In the first, as I have shown, the hierarch strives to assert his authority over the community - in the second, the hierarch sneaks up until he makes an open threat that the community should try and put it to the test whether the Lord of the Church is not powerful in him.

For me, the author of the first letter to Timothy also responds - he knew very well that the first Corinthians letter (1 Cor. 12:28) already knows specific rulers of the community and (Ch. 16:16, 18) commands submission to the supreme power of the church rulers, that he modeled individual formulas for him and even borrowed them directly. The price of his candidates for the bishop's seat, those who strive for a beautiful thing - his deacons who acquire a beautiful honor step (1 Tim. 3:1, 13) - is modeled after that exhortation to the Corinthians, according to which they should unconditionally submit to the brave ones who prove themselves (1 Cor. 16:16, 17) by their dedication to deacons and complement the community's deficiency - the first Corinthians letter (Ch. 14:34) is also borrowed the command (1 Tim. 2:12) that women should not teach in the community - finally, the instruction that a bishop cannot be a neophyte, but must be a member of the community (1 Tim. 3:6), has its parallel in the weight that the author of the first Corinthians letter places on the fact that the brave deacons of the community are the first fruits of Achaia.

All three pastoral letters set the orthodox norm of doctrine against the false teachers (1 Tim. 1:3, 10, 6:3, 2 Tim. 1:13, Titus 1:9, 13, 2:1), but the author of the first Corinthians letter also speaks of a canon of Catholic doctrine established in all communities (Ch. 4:17, 7:17) - thus a canon of Catholic doctrine; the opposition of Catholic norm and false doctrine, which is given to the author of the last letter, is already so established and profound that he seeks to justify and explain it in the general statement that there must be heresies (1 Cor. 11:19); finally, the author of the first letter to Timothy is so aware of the connection between his view and that of the Galatians letter that he even copies the parallel of that letter directly for his sentence "if

anyone else teaches." *)

*) 1 Tim 6:3 εἴ τις ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ Gal 1:8 ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔαν, beforehand
V. 6 there is talk of a ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον

80

The coordination of faith and love, which is shared by the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim. 1:14, 2:15, 2 Tim. 1:13, Titus 2:2) with the group of letters to the Colossians, Ephesians, and Philippians – the designation of Christian religiosity and religion itself as godliness and piety **), these abstract categories of pagan-Greek enlightenment – the grounding of salvation in theoretical knowledge ***) – the elevation and petrification of faith, which in the original Gospel and in the first section of the Epistle to the Romans is the subjective all-powerful force that makes salvation its own, into the Catholic objective rule of faith ****) – all of this is neither explained nor placed in its proper opposition if one regards it †) as an expression of a supposed later Ebionitism or contrasts it with the view of a larger or smaller series of supposed eight Pauline letters. It does not belong to a limited or exceptional direction but is the product of that general Judaism innate to humanity (and indeed also of the historical Judaism that continued to affect the community) that transfers the power of the new self-consciousness to a rigid formula – it is the satisfaction that the hunger of the masses for a positive ordinance has procured for itself – the expression of the reaction that the fearful and order-dependent crowd exerted against the original revolution that made salvation (see, e.g., the section of the original Gospel on the Canaanite woman) almost a self-willed conquest of faith and originally drew salvation from an entirely new excitement of self-consciousness. This reaction is the work of the entire second century, *) of the entire community of this time; it expressed itself immediately after the revolution had reached its conclusion in the original Gospel and the first section of the Epistle to the Romans, and those who wish to oppose it with a more extensive contrast in the complex of several Pauline letters can be left to their futile efforts to demonstrate in the two letters to the Corinthians the view of faith and true righteousness from the first section of the Epistle to the Romans.

**) θεοσεβεια and εθσεβεια. e.g. 1 Tim 2:2-3, 16. 2 Tim 3:5. Tit 1:1, 2:12.

***) 1 Tim 2:4 σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν. 4:3. 2 Tim 2:25, 3:7. Tit 1:1

****) e.g. 1 Tim 1:19, 4:1, 6, 10. 2 Tim 3:8. Tit 1:4

†) For example, as Schwegler does in the same work (2, 141), in reference to the importance given to theoretical knowledge.

*) We will also find them, for example, in the works of Justin.

81

If it were not for the general categories, the fear and concern that the supposed apostle has for the steadfastness of his assistants, his anxious instructions for their behavior towards the heretics, would testify to the danger and wide spread of heresy - nevertheless, the author of the first letter to Timothy, who goes into the most detail, cannot give us a specific picture of the heretics, their followers, and their entire circle. Those whom Timothy should distinguish himself from and avoid are always only "some" who have suffered shipwreck in faith (1 Tim. 1:19) - "some"*) who have strayed from the faith (1 Tim. 6:10) - even when the author, to interpret the horror of the last times that have now come, refers to the evangelical proclamation of the Parousia (1 Tim. 4:1), they are again only "some" who adhere to the spirits of error and the teachings of demons.

*) ΤΙΝΕΣ

82

The rigid unity of monotheistic consciousness, which aims to encompass everything, cannot truly submit to any single particularity - the opposition it struggles with in history cannot be clearly articulated for itself, nor can it be shaped in a tangible way for others, since it is formless itself. The positive, dogmatic consciousness can only conceive of doubt and theoretical experimentation and errors, which it seeks to suppress as a demonic power. No religious or churchly significant person, with few exceptions, whose work required the use of criticism, as in the case of Luther, could truly grasp and realistically depict their opposition.

Just like the author of the first Corinthians, the author of the first letter to Timothy also seeks to establish true gnosis in opposition to the false one, which he explicitly refers to as the falsely-called gnosis, but he, like the former, is unable to shape and intelligibly carry out this opposition.

83

The author of the letter to Titus wants to attribute the heretical Gnosis (Ch. 10:14) to the Judaizers and thus disarm the accusation that it is essentially Pauline - but he cannot provide a single piece of evidence to support his counter-charge and even has to contradict himself to the extent that he calls

a Greek poet an unsuitable prophet against them in the same breath in which he describes those "out of the circumcision" as the chief heretics (Ch. 1:10, V. 12).

The author of the first letter to Timothy also wants to oppose people "who want to be teachers of the law", i.e. people whose theory is about the meaning of the law, but who, as he says (Ch. 1:7), "do not know what they are talking about, nor the things they so confidently affirm"; but he is rather subject to the double criticism that he has neither understood how to appropriately reproduce the argument of his opponents, nor to give internal coherence to his own opposition. When he remarks against them (V. 8), "we know that the law is good, if one uses it properly," it necessarily follows that the opponents reject the law unconditionally; on the other hand, if he immediately continues (V. 9) with "realizing (knowing well *) the fact that law is not made for a righteous person, but for those who are lawless," then it should follow that the opponents maintain the unconditional validity of the law. The author has not even understood the dialectic of the first section of the letter to the Romans, which he has before him at that moment, and he very unsuccessfully uses the formula he borrowed from it - the formula: "for we know" (Rom. 7:14).

*) and that even in the singular εἰδὼς while the plural preceded:
οἶδαμεν δὲ

84

Only in one dogmatic point is he clear, certain of himself, and more decisive than the author of the first Corinthians and its imitators in the Romans letter - in the rejection of all distinction between certain foods. Although he has those two letters in mind - his statement (chapter 4, verse 4): "Every creature of God is good", is modeled after the statement of the Corinthians letter (chapter 10, verse 26): "The earth is the Lord's, and everything in it", and that of the Romans letter: "Nothing is unclean in itself" - in his statement: "And nothing is to be rejected if it is received with thanksgiving," the keyword: "thanksgiving" resonates from those two letters *) - but he knows nothing more of the consideration that they want to dedicate to the weak - the struggle of the Colossians letter has borne fruit for him.

*) 1 Cor 10:30. Rom 14:6

We need not say a word about the unworthiness of the anxiety that the supposed pagan apostle harbors for the steadfastness of his assistants**)

and for their recognition in communities whose leadership is nevertheless entrusted to them - we only note that this anxiety and uncertainty are inherent to the vague nature of monotheistic consciousness, and that the apostle's fear of being despised may be a threat modeled after the first Corinthians letter. *)

**) 1 Tim 6:13, 14, 20. 2 Tim 1:15. 4:10

*) 1 Cor 16:11 (when Timothy comes) μή τις οὖν αὐτὸν ἐξουθενήσῃ.

1 Tim 4:12 μηδεὶς σου τῆς νεότητος καταφρονεῖτω

Tit 2:15 μηδεὶς σου περιφρονεῖτω.

Also compare 2 Tim. 3:10 with 1 Cor. 4:17 and 2 Tim. 2:1 with Ephesians 6:10.

85

The authors of the Pastoral Epistles were familiar with the Acts of the Apostles.

We will not attach importance to the fact that in 1 Timothy 4:14, Timothy received his office through the laying on of hands by the presbytery, as Barnabas and Paul were also installed in their office in the same way in the Acts of the Apostles. Both practices could have been modeled independently of each other according to later church customs. However, the fact that Timothy's appointment to his office was brought about by prophecy **) corresponds so literally to the report in Acts of the Holy Spirit revealing to the prophets in Antioch the appointment of Barnabas and Paul to their office (Acts 13:1-3) that we must recognize the latter report as the original for this feature.

**) 1 Tim 4:14 This prophecy is already alluded to in chapter 1, verse 18.

The faithfulness of Timothy's mother (2 Tim. 1:5) is also directly modeled after the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 16:1), only the author of that epistle has given specific names to Timothy's mother and grandmother whom he praised.

86

The memory of the Apostle's sufferings and persecutions "at Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra" (2 Tim. 3:11) is based on the account in the Acts of the Apostles chapters 13 and 14, just as the Apostle's glory in serving God with a pure conscience from his forefathers is modeled after his defense speeches in the Acts of the Apostles *).

*) 2 Tim 1:3 τῷ Θεῷ, ᾧ λατρεύω ἀπὸ προγόνων ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει
Acts 23:1 ἐγὼ πάσῃ συνειδήσει ἀγαθῇ πεπολίτευμαι τῷ Θεῷ ἄχρι ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας.
Acts 24:14 λατρεύω τῷ πατρώῳ Θεῷ
Compare also Acts 23:6, 26:4

The first apology, in which everyone abandoned the Apostle (2 Tim. 4:16), but with the Lord's help was so successful that the message was heard by all nations, is an exaggeration of that glory in the Epistle to the Philippians, where the Apostle describes his purpose for his sufferings as the defense and confirmation of the gospel (Phil. 1:7, 17) and also complains that he has no one like-minded around him**).

**) Phil. 2:20, 21. Tim 4:10, 16, The key phrases in 2 Timothy 4:6-7 are also taken from Philippians 1:27-30, 4:3, 3:12, and 1:23.

One more thing! Whether the Apostle's reflection on the contrast between his calling and his former hostility to the Lord was sought and forcibly brought about by the apologist, we will leave to their own judgment — but that he presents himself as the chief proof for the evangelical statement that Christ came into the world to save sinners, being the first sinner himself — that he wants to be the primary evidence for the longsuffering and compassion of Christ and the example of all future believers (1 Tim. 1:12-16), we will also label it as what it is without waiting for the apologist's approval, as an embellished and excessive self-reflection — that is, as the laborious and misguided work of a later writer.

The question of whether the authors of the Pastoral Epistles were familiar with written Gospels is already answered by the fact that we have demonstrated their dependence on all the other groups of Pauline letters. Although they use the same formula with which the various authors of the Romans letter cite the Apostle's reference to a Gospel uniquely his own (Rom. 2:16, 16:25), they do so with the same ill fortune. This is just as unfortunate as the Apostle of the First Corinthians letter, who, at the same moment that he appeals to a revelation he received personally and

immediately from the Lord (1 Cor. 11:23), had to betray that he borrowed his information from the scripture of Luke.

Thus, the emphasis placed by the author of the Second Timothy letter (2 Tim. 2:8) on the Davidic descent of Jesus, attested by his Gospel, proves that he is familiar with the current Gospel of Luke. And when the author of the First Timothy letter (1 Tim. 5:18) coordinates the two sentences that the ox who treads out the grain should not be muzzled and that the laborer is worthy of his wages as sayings from the scripture, he proves that he has Luke 10:7 in mind and has been referred by the author of the First Corinthians letter (1 Cor. 9:9) to the Old Testament parallel.

88

It is certain that the letter to Timothy that currently appears first is a later imitation of the one that is now second.

In the former letter, when Hymenaeus and Alexander are mentioned as examples of those who have only strayed from the faith (1 Tim. 1:19-20), it is vague and meaningless. The matter is given more weight in the current second letter, where Hymenaeus and Philetus are listed as representatives of the heresy that holds that the resurrection is not a future event, but only a process of this earthly life (2 Tim. 2:17). The note in the current first letter *) that the apostle has handed Hymenaeus and Alexander over to Satan is also without weight, whereas the note in the current second letter (2 Tim. 4:14) that "Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil" and the wish "the Lord will repay him according to his deeds" at least has the appearance of weight.

*) *ibid.*

When the author of the current first letter turned this wish into an action of the apostle, he copied the judgment that the author of the first letter to the Corinthians had executed on that criminal (1 Cor. 6:5).

The Letters to the Thessalonians.

89

With the constantly recurring formula, "for you know - you are aware - you remember," the author of the first Thessalonians letter painstakingly prepares the common ground for the discussions between himself and the community he is writing to. He has the Apostle remind his readers of things that should have been so familiar to them that they did not require such anxious and deliberate reminders. Finally, he draws on notes from the Acts of the Apostles, to which the Thessalonians could have been reminded with any other, except for this lengthy, in-depth formula.

"For you yourselves know, brothers and sisters, that our coming to you was not in vain" (1 Thessalonians 2:1 *) - really? Was their memory that strong?

"After we had already suffered and been mistreated in Philippi, as you know" (1 Thessalonians 2:2 **) - really? Do they really know? Still, even though it happened just recently?

*) αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἶδατε

**) καθὼς οἶδατε

90

"You remember our labor and toil" (2:9 *) - really? Did it really need to be mentioned? Wasn't it self-evident that they would remember how he earned his living by working with his own hands?

"You are witnesses, and God also, how holy and righteous and blameless was our conduct toward you believers, as you know" **) -

(We sent Timothy to strengthen and encourage you in your faith) "for you know that we are destined for this" ***) -

"When we were with you, we kept telling you beforehand that we were to suffer affliction, just as it has come to pass, and just as you know" ****) - really?

And if he reminds them to continue to be more fully obedient to his instructions, can he really rely on them still knowing his commands? †)

And just as fortunate as he is, being able to rely on them still remembering his visit among them ††), they are also fortunate, being able to rely on him still remembering their calling †††) - this is the pinnacle of fortune and - misfortune, which the author has experienced with his composition.

The author is an unfortunate copyist.

*) νημονεύετε γάρ

**) Ch 2:10,11 καθάπερ οἶδατε

***) Ch 3:3 αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἶδατε

****) Ch 3:4 καθὼς καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ οἶδατε

†) Ch 4:2 οἶδατε γάρ

††) Ch 1:5 καθὼς οἶδατε οἱ ἐγενήθημεν . . .

†††) Ch 1:4 εἰδότες τὴν ὑμῶν ἐκλογὴν

91

The community is supposed to have been recently established, the apostle is only supposed to have been separated from it for a moment (C. 2, 17), and yet he has a strong desire to see them again, he has wanted to come to them once or twice (v. 18), and has only been prevented from doing so by Satan - he has copied the wish expressed by the apostle at the beginning of the Romans' letter (C. 1, 10-13) at an inappropriate time and exaggerated the simple remark that he had been prevented from fulfilling his wish to get to know the community personally. He was inspired by the cliché of the one or two-time plan from the Corinthian letters.

He used a cliché from the first Corinthian letter for his phrase, which states that the apostle wants to restore the deficiency found in the faith of the Thessalonians *).

The catchphrases of the same letter are repeated in his phrase, in which the Thessalonians should rightly honor their ecclesiastical superiors who work on them. **)

*) Ch 3, 10 καταρτίσαι τὰ ὑστερήματα τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν? — he wants to do what the ecclesiastical superiors at Corinth (1 Cor. 16, 17) have done for their congregation (τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα ἀνεπλήρωσαν).

**) Ch 5:12 εἰδέναι τοὺς κοπιῶντας ἐν ὑμῖν
1 Cor 16:16 ὑποτάσσησθε παντὶ τῷ κοπιῶντι
V 18 ἐπιγινώσκετε οὖν τοὺς τοιούτους

In addition to the Corinthian letters, he also used the Galatian letter.

His unnatural fear for a community he is supposed to have just left, the fear that prompts him to send Timothy to Thessalonica, is modeled on the second Corinthian letter, from which he also took the consolation that his envoy brings him back *). The catchphrase, however, that he is afraid he may have worked in vain among the Thessalonians is borrowed from the Galatian letter **).

*) It's just that the messenger who is Timothy in the first Corinthians is Titus in the second - compare 1 Thessalonians 3:6-7 and 2 Corinthians 7:6-7.

**) 1 Thess 3:5 μήπως εἰς κενὸν γένηται ὁ κόπος ἡμῶν
Gal 4:11 μήπως εἰκῇ κεκοπίακα εἰς ὑμᾶς.

92

In his exhortation not to defraud the brother in any matter, he remarks: "For the Lord is the avenger of all such, as we also have forewarned you and testified." -- A much too precious expression for such a simple moral commonplace -- a phrase he borrowed from the discussion in the Galatians' letter about the curse of anyone preaching another gospel.***)

***) 1 Thess 4:6 καθὼς καὶ προείπομεν ὑμῖν καὶ διεμαρτυράμεθα
Gal 1:9 ὡς προειρήκαμεν καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω

"Just as he has been approved by God to be entrusted with the gospel, so we speak, not to please men, but God who tests our hearts." -- He wants to be the apostle of the Galatians, the apostle who received his gospel through divine revelation and who seeks to please not men but God as a servant of Christ. †)

†) 1 Thess 2:4 οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωποις ἀρέσκοντες
Gal 1:10 ἢ ζητῶ ἄνθρωποις ἀρέσκειν

In the question "For who is our hope or joy or crown of boasting? Is it not you?" the keyword of boasting as well as the construction of the sentence points to the second Corinthians' letter ††) -- the first and second Corinthians'

letters with their talk about his selflessness, which he demonstrated by working day and night to earn his living -- talk that is even more inappropriate in the present letter, since the apostle's stay in Thessalonica, according to the only source the author could use (Acts 17:2), lasted only three weeks *). Finally, the contrast is borrowed from the first Corinthians' letter, that the apostle's gospel came not in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Spirit.**)

††) 1 Thess 2:19 τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν στέφανος καυχήσεως ἢ οὐχὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς

2 Cor 7:14 ἡ καύχησις ἡμῶν (Compare 2 Cor 3:2)

2 Cor 2:2 τίς ἐστὶν ὁ εὐφραίνων με εἰ μὴ

*) 1 Thessalonians 2:5 πλεονεξίας compare 2 Corinthians 7:2, 2 Thessalonians 2:9. Compare also 1 Corinthians 4:12 and 2 Corinthians 11:9.

**) 1 Thess. 1, 5 and 1 Cor. 2, 4. Also compare 1 Thess. 1, 6 with 1 Kor. 11, 1.

93

It is worth mentioning the confusion of the passage in which the Apostle notes that the Thessalonians suffered the same from their own countrymen ***) as the churches in Judea suffered from the Jews - they, the Thessalonians, from their Greek, pagan countrymen †) - no! - they also suffered from the Jews, because the author is thinking of the Jewish intrigues that persecuted the Apostle to the Gentiles from Asia to Greece, according to the Acts of the Apostles, and already threatened the church in Thessalonica in its birth - the Jews are supposed to be the opponents of the Thessalonians, because the author calls them "the enemies of all people" ††) - the author even designates the persecutions that the Thessalonians also suffered a moment later (v. 16) as evidence of the hostility with which the Jews opposed the Apostle in his work of salvation among the Gentiles - in short, the Jews are supposed to be those own countrymen of the Thessalonians, and they cannot be - they are their pagan countrymen, and it is supposed to be the Jews.

***) 1 Thess 2:14 ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων συμφυλετῶν.

†) for the Thessalonians are said (1 Thess. 1, 9) to have originally been heathens.

††) 1 Thess 2:15 πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐναντίων. Tacitus Histories 5:5 adversus omnes alios hostile odium. Compare and that odium humani generis in Tacitus Annals 15:44.

94

As for the doctrinal content of the letter, which is overshadowed by lengthy reminiscences of things and situations that should have been clear to the Thessalonians even without these laborious refreshers, and by moral maxims, the author steps back too much. Namely, the instruction about the Lord's return, he has taken everything he presents to arouse faith from the gospel discourse on the Parousia and the first Corinthians letter.

He even admits that his readers know very well about the time and the moment, that the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night, that is, his readers know the main thing from the gospel. He has even borrowed the construction of the decisive sentence from the gospel himself *).

He explicitly states (C. 4,15) that his explanation is based "on the word of the Lord" - but in truth, he derives his comfort that the Lord will come for the dead as well as the living from the sentence structure of his description of the Lord's appearance, which he takes from the first Corinthians letter. **)

*) 1 Thess 5:1 περὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων καὶ καιρῶν
Mark 13:32 περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ τῆς ὥρας
The thief in the night is taken from Luke 12:39.

**) 1 Thessalonians 5:14-16 compared with 1 Corinthians 15:51, 52.
1 Thess 4:16 [corrected from 5:16] ἐν σάλπιγγι Θεο.
1 Cor 15:52 ἐν σάλπιγγι ἐσχάτῃ
"At both places there is also a triple repetition..."

95

We cannot even assume that the author wrote his letter with the intention of addressing doubts and concerns about the Parousia - not a single aspect of his letter would support this assumption. Rather, he deals with the mere doubt about the resurrection in general, which, according to the type of the first letter to the Corinthians, still depended on the Parousia of the Lord. The cold nature and abstract origin of his composition is finally revealed in the fact that he gives a stiff imitation of the argumentation of the first letter to the Corinthians as a refutation of that doubt. *)

*) 1 Thess 4:14 εἰ γὰρ πιστεύομεν ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέστη, οὕτω

1 Cor 15:12 εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγήγερται, πῶς

And what about the author of **the second letter to the Thessalonians**? Does he really have the interest, as is assumed of him and his predecessor, to combat a specific deviation, the contempt for work, the view that secular work and effort are unnecessary in view of the proximity of the Parousia?

So, because the author of the first letter, before addressing the Day of the Lord, mentions the common saying about the respectability of life through manual labor in the course of his moral instructions (4:11) - because the author of the second letter, long after the conclusion of his excursus on the Last Judgment, after speaking as the supposed apostle about working for his own livelihood, calls on the readers to behave likewise (3:8-12) - therefore, both letters are supposed to combat a carelessness regarding worldly interests that is based on the assumption of the imminent Parousia?

96

Even if I take into account all the clumsiness that is inherent in both as composers, I must confess that in both letters I do not find the slightest reason to join the general assumption.

No! After the author of the first letter had compiled his frosty composition of the evangelical passages and the excursus of the first Corinthians letter on the Lord's return to combat doubt about the resurrection, the author of the second letter sought to dogmatically justify the later doubt about the proximity of the decision with his reflections on the causes that push back the Lord's return into a further distance. He has come to the conclusion that the worldly and diabolical opposition must first come to fruition and appear in its personal representative (C. 2, 6-12) before thinking about the Lord's parousia.

The author of the second letter does not speak as if he had written the first one, nor does he even openly refer to it - the warning in C. 2, 2, that they should not be disturbed by anything, even by a letter that seems to come from him *), as if the day of Christ is imminent - this warning can only refer to the first letter, but the author does not openly designate it as the subject of his polemic and is content with his hidden allusion.

*) μήτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ὥς δι' ἡμῶν

97

He did not write the first letter. Although he copied the greeting (1 Thessalonians 1:1-2) verbatim, he took several phrases from the first letter word for word, and a couple of times he allowed himself to be drawn into the track of assuming that the readers would remember a known circumstance or that something was notoriously established. *) However, where he speaks independently, **) his diction approaches that endless and random sentence structure found particularly in the letters to the Ephesians and Colossians, which winds through the intended topic through a confusion of constantly alternating side turns, that is, through nothing but relative clauses that pick up the keyword of the last phrase and carry it forward in a new direction.

*) 2 Thess 2:5. 3:7

**) e.g. Ch 1:3-10

The concluding remark (1 Thessalonians 3:17), "The greeting is in my own hand—Paul. This is a sign in every letter; this is how I write," is nothing more than an exaggerated echo of the remark in the first letter to the Corinthians (1 Corinthians 16:21).

After it has been proven that the author of the first Thessalonians knew and used the Acts of the Apostles, it is time to decide the question about Marcion's supposed Apostolicon.

Irenaeus and Tertullian are the first to report that this Gnostic possessed an apostolic collection of letters. Both assume that he mutilated the Pauline letters. Tertullian and, after him, Epiphanius provide more detail, stating that his collection consisted only of Pauline letters and that the Pastoral Epistles were missing from it. Marcion's collection therefore contained the ten Pauline letters that the present church canon contains, except for the Pastoral Epistles.

98

In the fifth book of his work against this Gnostic, Tertullian expresses his outrage over all the mutilations and falsifications that Marcion had committed to these letters - but from all his declamations, it only emerges that the variations that the letter collection presented to him consisted of insignificant omissions that no copyist, even with the greatest care, could avoid or were just different readings, which can still be found in manuscripts today.

If Tertullian's actual accusation falls to the ground - does his assumption

remain that Marcion really had the collection of those ten letters in his hands?

But on what is this assumption based?

On nothing!

Yes, if he had given us reliable information that Marcion had provided this letter collection, just like his Gospel of Luke, with antithetical comments - if he had actually conveyed some of these antitheses to us - then it would be something different.

But neither he nor the entire ecclesiastical antiquity can show us the slightest trace from which we could even suspect that Marcion had such a letter collection in his hands.

Once *) *Tertullian claims that the terrible heretic used the second chapter of the Galatians to deny all value to the Gospels that came from the apostles and their disciples as Judaizing products - but it is still too lenient when Semler* *) notes that it is "not quite certain, historically not clear, whether Marcion took the basis from the letter to the Galatians to not accept any of those Gospels that were here and there in the churches" and then raises the assumption that "it could all be just Tertullian's declamation" - declaimers, however, who, like Irenaeus and Tertullian, live on the firm assumption that the canon, as they possess it, has also been in the hands of all earlier heretics, can, if they give us arguments and conclusions instead of solid documents **) that are based on the current canon, do not give us the slightest insight into an antiquity of which they had as little idea as of the actual nature of the bedding, whose result was their own consciousness.

*) in the third chapter of the fourth book of his treatise against Marcion.

*) in his preface to Townson's treatise on the four Gospels. 1783. Part One.

**) by "more reliable", I mean that these documents must be more certain and trustworthy than, for example, that letter of Marcion's, which according to Tertullian (*De carne Christi*, ch. 2, ch. 4, §4) is supposed to bear witness to his knowledge of the other canonical Gospels and his earlier recognition of them. Even Semler says, in the same work: "The whole of history knows nothing about this letter; it must be a creation of Tertullian's, like so many other things." If the letter did actually exist, as one is almost forced to assume from

Tertullian's bold use of it, then it can only be a later apocryphal work, created on the basis of the church's assumption that Marcion must have known the entire canon.

99

Marcion only knew the writing of the proto-Luke — and several Pauline letters, which could only have been written after the Acts of the Apostles, the second part of the current Gospel of Luke, are said to have already been written at his time and to have been in his possession?

100

It is impossible. When Marcion flourished, towards the end of the fourth decade of the second century, there was neither an Acts of the Apostles nor the current Gospel of Luke.

The audacity with which Irenaeus and Tertullian speak of a collection of letters can only be based on the fact that it was circulating among his followers. The fact that this collection lacked the Pastoral Epistles, the latest product in the series of supposed Pauline letters, proves that it was formed before they were written.

Finally, what may still seem too daring in the above I will completely substantiate when I show evidence of the late date to which the letters of Clement, Polycarp, and Ignatius, which are partly *) frozen imitations of the canonical Pauline letters, belong.

*) i.e. apart from the expressions which are the product and expression of a more sophisticated reflection.

The Ephesians and the Colossians Letters

I fully agree with the explanation given by Dr. Baur regarding the reproduction of Gnostic ideas in the letters to the Ephesians and Colossians, and I only find it necessary to provide some further clarification on the question of the chronological relationship between this Christian transformation and the emergence of the original Gnosis.

The Valentinian concept of the cosmic nature of Christ's activity, which encompasses both the earthly and heavenly spheres of the world, the visible and invisible, and is of decisive importance for the world of spirits as well as for earthly historical life, is Gnostic in nature.

The Pleroma, which took up residence in Christ and decided to return everything to itself through reconciliation (Col. 1:19-20), is the Valentinian Pleroma, in which the totality of determinations that constitute the essence of the Absolute has come into existence - but unified, so that the majority of Aeons are abolished, and the dialectic between the Absolute and its revelation is simplified into a dialectic between the original abundance of the Godhead and its manifestation in the only means of its historical representation.

Just as in the Valentinian series of Syzygies, the heavenly marital unions in which the development and connection of the Degrisse world is idealistically executed, the church is the spouse of the ideal man (the Anthropos), so in (Eph. 1:23) the church is the Pleroma of Christ - its execution and fulfillment - its body, just as the woman (Eph. 5:28) is the body of the man - but at the same time, that Gnostic distinction between the mediator and his Pleroma is cancelled in the Catholic interest, as Christ is once again the one who fulfills everything in all.

Now, since the mystery has been revealed, the Church also teaches the wisdom of God to the principalities and powers in the heavenly realm (Ephesians 3:10). This is again the Catholic transformation of the Valentinian assumption that the work of redemption was of decisive importance for the heavenly world as well - the Catholic Church accomplishes here and now what the Sophia Valentiniani does as the Syzygos Christi for the completion of the heavenly world (the Pleroma) when it returns with the pneumatic

content of the Church to the same.

The "manifold" character of the wisdom *) that the Church reveals to the heavenly rulers and powers is a Gnostic catchword that only has a real meaning in the context of the Valentinian system, where the Sophia goes through a series of forms and modifications **) in her suffering state, while here, where the absolute and unique revelation is meant, it is completely meaningless.

*) 3:10 ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ

**) and therefore (Irenaeus asserts, Against Heresies, Book 1, Chapter 4, Section 1) πολυμερης and πολυποίκιλος [mean the same?]

103

The undoubtedly Gnostic turn is finally when the Christ of the Ephesians (chapter 4, 8-10) descends into the lowest regions of the earth to fill everything up and leads the prisoners thereof as the prize of his victory into the highest regions of heaven - it is the imitation of the descent into hell, which in Marcion's system is necessary for the liberation of the negative spirits of the Old Testament, i.e. the opponents of the Demiurge, which Marcion regards as the positive and good ones.

As I said, the fact that Gnosticism forms the historical assumption for the letters to the Ephesians and Colossians is so undeniable and obvious that it is only denied by those who, according to their basic assumption, must adhere to the ecclesiastical view of the origin of the canon. Only the question of the time when this modification of Gnosticism was possible and the extent to which this modification occurs in the New Testament canon, particularly within the collection of the so-called Pauline letters, can still be maintained.

In this respect, I have already shown that the first letter to the Corinthians has Gnosticism as its assumption. I only mention that the enumeration of the spiritual powers that Christ must still subject to the end so that the rule of God is completed (1 Corinthians 15: 24-28) - an enumeration that is literally identical to that of the letter to the Ephesians (chapter 1, 21) and is based on it also in terms of writing - was only possible after the emergence of Gnosticism and that the angels and powers and rulers, the height and depth, which according to the conclusion of the first section of the letter to the Romans (chapter 8, 38-39) have no more power over believers, are already the ecclesiastical modification of the Gnostic view of the Aeon series.

104

And the age of this transformation? Mr. Tr. Baur is of the opinion*) that the Letter to the Ephesians and its companion, the Letter to the Colossians, were written in a time "when the just-emerging Gnostic ideas still appeared as innocuous Christian speculations" -- but the historical analogy, whereby the basic ideas and keywords of a speculative system are only transferred into religious and church thought and language when both have fought through their original opposition, leads me to a later time, to which the course of the above investigation has also assigned those letters that were previously considered genuinely Pauline.

*) The Apostle Paul p. 436.

Finally, everything in the two letters to the Ephesians and Colossians that has its origin in Gnosticism has by no means taken on the form of having been involuntarily and innocuously swept into the realm of church and Catholic consciousness, and here accepted as involuntarily and innocuously as before - the Gnostic elements have rather been catholicized - philosophy has been transformed into theology, metaphysics into religion, the category of necessity into that of free divine self-determination, cosmic physics into morality - but according to the testimony of history, this transformation is a lengthy process and always presupposes the struggle between both worlds and perspectives and, after the struggle, an intermediate period in which the opposition has collapsed into indifference.

105

Also, the allusions to Montanism, which Mr. Baur and Mr. Schweigler have demonstrated in the letters to the Ephesians and Colossians, are not unique to them - at least the distinction between the perfection and maturity of adulthood and the weakness of childhood and the designation of the prophets as continuers and fulfillers of the apostolate have already been demonstrated by me in the first Corinthians letter.

And the authors of those two letters were aware of and used the latter. The natural language of the passage in the first Corinthians letter, "And God has appointed in the church first apostles, second prophets, third teachers" attests to its originality, while the clumsiness of the passage in the Ephesians letter, "And he gave some as apostles, and some as prophets, and some as evangelists, and some as pastors and teachers," *) reveals its secondary character. (Likewise, the list of vices that revoke inheritance rights in the kingdom of God (Ephesians 5:5), as well as the parallel passage in the Colossians letter (3:5) are formed according to 1 Corinthians 6:9-10, and the remark in Colossians 3:7 "in which you once walked when you lived among them" has its original in the expression of the first Corinthians letter (6:11), "And such were some of you").

*) 1 Cor 12:28 οὓς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ Θεὸς πρῶτον ἀποστόλους
δεύτερον προφήτας
Eph. 4:11 ἔδωκε τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας

That the Christ of the Ephesians and Colossians letters, as the focal point of all cosmic contradictions, has also proven himself as the unifying force in history and, in the organism of the church, in the new person of his community has overcome the historical contradiction of paganism and Judaism, no longer requires further elaboration after the discussions of Mr. Baur and Mr. Schwegeler. I only remark on the form of that opposition, according to which the pagans lived outside the citizenship of Israel, were strangers to the covenants of promise, and stood far away, while the Jews were close to the access to God (Ephesians 2:12, 17), that this preference for the Jews "does not completely contradict the genuine Pauline discussion of this question," as Mr. Schwegeler, in agreement with Dr. Baur, *) believes, since even in the first section of the Romans letter, the privilege and prerogative of the Jews is that they have been entrusted with the revelations of God (3:1-2).

*) The Apostolic Age, Vol. 2, pp. 365, 380.

106

Those whose apologetic consciousness is capable of transforming the later transformation of dogmatic efforts into the original expression of the first beginnings of Christian reflection will be in vain to try to refute the following evidence for the late origin of these two letters.

To the author of the letter to the Ephesians (3:5), the apostles are already a holy and past event. He refers to them as "the holy apostles," while calling himself "the least of all saints" (3:8), thus copying the designation used by the author of the first letter to the Corinthians (15:9). He tries to present his relationship with the Ephesians as a familiar one, but he forgets himself to the extent that he questions *) whether they have heard of his mission to the Gentiles. It is a pretentious vividness when he refers them to his writing (3:4) from which they can understand his understanding of the mystery of Christ. He copies the Galatians' letter (1:10) when he refers (3:2) to the revelation in which the mystery was communicated to him by God. Finally, in his description of the new man, the author of the letter to the Colossians (3:1) also reveals that he had the letter to the Galatians (3:28) in mind **).

*) Ch 3:2 εἰγε ἠκούσατε

**) Compare the baseless "if indeed you have heard" of the Ephesians (3:2) with the correct and natural "for you have heard" of the Galatians (1:13 ἡκούσατε γὰρ). The antitheses that are abolished in the new man of the Colossians (3:11) are too far-reaching and particularly lack the contrast of "barbarian and Scythian," whereas in the Galatians (3:28) they are at least correctly formulated. Another point on which the letters to the Galatians and the Colossians converge is their description of legal regulations as "the elements of the world" (Gal. 4:3, Col. 2:20).

107

The comparison of the Montanist interpretation of these letters with the Catholic assimilation of Montanism in the Gospel of John leads to an important observation. It is Montanistic when the Holy Spirit in the Ephesians is described as the mediator and completer of revelation, and the purpose of this revelation is the glorification of Christ (Eph. 1:14, 17), and when in the Gospel of John the Paraclete testifies of Jesus and glorifies him (John 15:26, 16:14). It is a Catholic assimilation of a Montanistic element when the mature adulthood of the church is called the Pleroma Christi in the Ephesians (4:13), and when in the Gospel of John, the Paraclete reveals to the disciples what Jesus could not tell them because of their weakness and immaturity. Finally, the coincidence of the Ephesians and the Gospel of John in the view that the exaltation of Christ is the condition for the communication of the gifts of the Spirit will answer the question of which of the two writings is older and will prove that the author of one had the other in mind.

108

When it says in the Ephesians (4:9): "He who descended is also the one who ascended," and further (4:8): "What does 'he ascended' mean except that he also descended," this is a clear and effective argumentation about the correlation of the two correlatives. The statement of the Jesus of the Fourth (John 3:13): "No one has ever gone into heaven except the one who came from heaven," has received a affected and floating attitude due to the evasive wording of "no one"—in short, it is a failed copy of that passage in the Ephesians. *) The antithesis of the Fourth, moreover, (John 4:34) "God does not give the Spirit by measure," is affected and even baseless, as it

lacks the opposite assumption to which it should be attached—clear and correctly executed, however, is the statement of the Ephesians (4:7): "But to each one of us grace has been given as Christ apportioned it." Finally, in the context from which the Fourth has taken these expressions (Ephesians 4:7-10), the idea that Christ's ascension is the necessary prerequisite for the distribution of spiritual gifts is really worked out—whereas the Fourth has completely disregarded this connection of ideas where he has brought in the catchwords of the Ephesians, and only later (7:39) does he add the remark that the ascension of Christ is the prerequisite for the communication of the Spirit.

*) Eph. 4:9 τὸ δὲ ἀνέβη τί ἐστὶν εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ κατέβη
John 3:13 καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς

The Ephesians letter, however, already presupposes late elaborations of the original gospel. The saying "Do not give the devil a foothold" (Ephesians 4:27) has its parallel in the Clementine Homilies* - the saying that one should not let the sun set on their anger is refined in the Apostolic Constitutions and designated as a scriptural passage in Polycarp's letters**).

As for the question of which of the two letters was written first, whether they were written by different authors or were variations by one and the same author on the same topic, I do not dare to determine anything for now, as I do not wish to add a new hypothesis to those already proposed.

*) Eph 4:27 μηδὲ δίδετε τόπον τῷ διαβόλῳ
Hom. 19:2 με δοτε προφασιν τῷ πονηρῷ

**) Apost. Const. 2:53. Polyc ch. 12

The Letter to the Philippians.

The dependence of the author of the Letter to the Philippians on gnostic ideas has also been demonstrated by Mr. Baur, and again we can only disagree with the same scholar in the way he seeks to explain the relationship of the Catholic writer to those assumptions.

It concerns the passage in chapter 2, verses 6-8, in which the humiliation of Christ is contrasted with the possibility that he did not desire, that is, to be equal to God.

At this point, the author of the Letter to the Philippians, as a Catholic, assumes that Christ existed in the form of God before his self-emptying *), that he was essentially equal to God - thus contradicting his own assumption when he speaks in the same breath as if Christ could have avoided self-emptying and made himself God equal from the outset if he had so desired.

*) Ch 2:6 ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων

In his heavenly home, before his self-emptying for the historical-human appearance, he presents the Lord with a temptation that was not possible for him in his divine state.

The gnostic Sophia, on the other hand, the last Aeon of the divine ideal world, could truly feel the urge to absorb the Absolute into herself, to come to an agreement with the Father, to grasp him and seize his divine greatness.

She is a part of the divine world, but only one of the determinations in which the Absolute has unfolded itself. She, who is in communion with the Absolute but is not it itself nor has grasped it, has the self-consciousness of lack that is grounded in her determination and can succumb to the desire for union with the ground from which she has arisen. For her, the difference and contradiction between her being-in-itself and her reality have meaning and significance. On the other hand, on the basis of the Catholic presupposition to which the author of the Philippians letter has transferred it, it is impossible. The gnostic Sophia could attempt the theft and feel the desire to seize the Absolute, whereas the Christ of the Catholic presupposition, who possesses the form and shape of the Absolute from the outset, could not and did not need to conceive the idea of this theft.

The attempt of the gnostic Sophia fails. Arising from the self-consciousness of her inner negation, her determination and limitation that separates her from the Absolute, it has only the consequence that her otherness is posited and she herself falls into the realm of emptiness and self-abnegation *). Therefore, she succumbs to the necessity contained in her determination. The Catholic Christ of the Philippians letter, on the other hand, voluntarily relinquishes himself.**) He does what the gnostic Sophia experiences and suffers as her inner necessity. That is to say, the metaphysical category of Gnosticism is transformed into a religious and moral one.

*) κενωμα

*) Ch 2:7 ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε

112

What time period does this polemic against gnostic categories and their catholicization belong to?

We have already answered this question, and if Dr. Baur asserts the same for the position of the Epistle to the Philippians as he has done for the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, we can only repeat what we have remarked on the relation of the latter to Gnosticism.

The ideas catholicized in the Epistle to the Philippians do not inherently bear "the stamp of Gnosticism," as Dr. Baur puts it,**) but presuppose the systematic elaboration of Gnosticism - they are not "taken in a still entirely unprejudiced manner," rather they form the subject of explicit polemics (Christ did not have in mind, like the Gnostic Sophia, to obtain equality with God by means of robbery), but they have already, as is always the case in the final stage of the conflict between metaphysics and theology, acquired such a great power as categories that they have subjected even their ecclesiastical opponents.

**) The Apostle Paul p. 464.

113

Except for this interesting aside that makes the Philippians letter a companion to the letters to the Colossians and Ephesians, it contains only phrases that the author has taken from the already existing Pauline letters and loosely strung together using the recurring keyword of joy.

Right at the beginning (C. 1, 4) he offers his prayer for the Philippians "with joy"; about his experiences in prison (E. 1, 18) "he rejoices and will also rejoice"; he will be preserved for the Philippians "for the joy of their faith" (C. 1, 25); he beseeches them to "fulfill his joy" and be of one mind (C.2,2); even if he is sacrificed, he "rejoices and rejoices with all of them, and in the same way they should also rejoice and rejoice with him" (C. 2, 17, 18); he has sent them Epaphroditus so that they may rejoice (C. 2, 28) and asks them (V. 29) to receive him with all joy; "finally" (C. 3, 1) i.e. when he does not immediately know what to say to them, he calls out to them: "rejoice in the Lord"; when he comes to the end, he again calls out (C. 4, 4): "rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say, rejoice"; finally, he "rejoiced greatly in the Lord" (C. 4, 10) when they took care of him again.

He himself feels that all of this is rather monotonous and repetitive -- after his call (C. 3, 1): "rejoice in the Lord," he therefore admits to his readers that he is always writing "the same thing" to them, and he helps himself out rather unsuccessfully with the remark that this constant repetition is not burdensome to him, but provides security to them, i.e. impresses the main thing on them. However, the embarrassment that drives him to this excuse arises not only from the feeling that he is always repeating the same phrase in the course of his letter, but also from the awareness that almost everything he writes is taken from the other supposedly Pauline letters.

114

For example, the remark in chapter 4, verse 15, that the Philippians "were the only church that shared with him in giving and receiving" when he left Macedonia, is a convoluted imitation of the assumption in 2 Corinthians that the apostle only accepted support from the Macedonians. (It is not necessary to explain in detail how the author, in this forced sentence, betrays his late era with the positive determination "church" and with his reflection on the early days of the Gospel).

He hopes to soon send them Timothy, just as he announces the same assistant to his readers in the first Corinthians letter; he also sends back their Epaphroditus, just as he sends back the deacons of the Corinthian community and, in the letter to the Colossians, Tychicus and Onesimus. (Colossians 4:7, 9).

The supposed apostle wants to send Timothy to the Philippians (2:19) so that he can find out how they are doing - just as he sends Tychicus to the Colossians so that he too can find out how they are doing; he recommends Epaphroditus to the Philippians just as he recommends the deacons to the Corinthians; the epistle is even so dependent on its original that in the same breath in which it recommends only Epaphroditus to its readers, it speaks as

if it has several people to recommend to them *); and finally, when Epaphroditus of the Philippians was in the service of the apostle (2:30) and he lacked the help of his compatriots, he "made up for the deficiency" - a false imitation of the remark in 1 Corinthians (16:17) that the deacons made up for the deficiency of their community in general.

*) Phil 2:29 προσδέχεσθε οὖν αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους ἐντίμους ἔχετε

1 Cor. 16:18 [corrected from 16:8] ἐπιγινώσκετε οὖν τοὺς τοιούτους

115

The Paul of the Philippians strives (E. 3:10) to know the Lord and "the fellowship of His sufferings, if by any means he may attain unto the resurrection of the dead." This is a highly confused and uncertain imitation of that passage in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians where the apostle (C. 4:10) boasts with complete confidence that he carries about in his body "the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body."

The Christ of the Philippians will (at the resurrection, C. 3:21) "transform our lowly body, that it may be conformed to His glorious body, according to the working by which He is able even to subdue all things to Himself." This is an irrelevant reflection on the all-conquering and subduing power that the Lord in the First Epistle to the Corinthians demonstrates in his struggle against all the enemies of God, including death (1 Cor. 15:25-28).

The Paul of the Philippians also wants to fight with the Jews, but his polemic and language are so uncertain that it cannot even be determined whether he wants to fight against real Jews or Jews who have turned to Christianity. He wants (C. 3:18) to fight against the enemies of the cross of Christ like the apostle of the other letters, but he remains at the level of intention, and can only refer to having often spoken to his readers about these shameless ones, and can only attest to speaking of them "now with tears." The more abstract his intention is, the more he can only rely on throwing exaggerating insults (C. 3:2): "Look out for the dogs, look out for the mutilation" (that is, not circumcision, because we are the circumcision, who worship God in the spirit) - his boast that he can boast more about the flesh than anyone else (C. 3:4) is borrowed from the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (C. 11:18, 22) - and the note that he is of the tribe of Benjamin (C. 3:5) is from the Epistle to the Romans (C. 11:2).

116

He knows the Letter to the Romans and would like to give its dialectics in

brief - but his consciousness is already too rigidly dogmatic, his language too ungainly, for his reproduction to consist of anything other than a clumsy combination of clichés. His sentence (3:9) "That I may be found in Christ, not having my own righteousness which is from the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God by faith" we need to add to with the cumbersome antithesis "not my own righteousness which is from the law," and the laborious double explanation of true righteousness, just to let the compiler characterize himself. *)

*) Also compare V. 10 and Rom. 6:5.

Finally, in the exhortation (4:1) "stand firm in the Lord" and in the hope that the steadfastness of the Philippians will provide him with the glorious testimony that he (2:16) has not worked in vain, keywords from the Letter to the Galatians (5:1, 4:11) return and their glory, that they are the joy and crown of the apostle (4:1), the Philippians owe solely to the first letter to the Thessalonians (2:19).

117

(Regarding the letter to Philemon, no further explanation is needed after Dr. Baur has shown that its motif, in which the apostle sends back to Philemon his runaway slave Onesimus, whom he has converted, not as a slave but as a companion and brother, is a variation on the theme of the Clementine Christian novel, which states that the separation of related individuals leads to a more intense union when they find themselves on the ground of Christianity. We only note that the author's skill in intelligently interweaving the keywords of the letters to the Philippians and Ephesians into the limited framework with his new theme has made this letter, which belongs to the group of letters to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians, a truly cohesive and self-contained whole - a glory that the author shares within this Pauline epistolary literature only with the creator of the great dialectical work that we possess in the first section of the letter to the Romans.)

brief - but his consciousness is already too rigidly dogmatic, his language too ungainly, for his reproduction to consist of anything other than a clumsy combination of clichés. His sentence (3:9) "That I may be found in Christ, not having my own righteousness which is from the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God by faith" we need to add to with the cumbersome antithesis "not my own righteousness which is from the law," and the laborious double explanation of true righteousness, just to let the compiler characterize himself. *)

*) Also compare V. 10 and Rom. 6:5.

Finally, in the exhortation (4:1) "stand firm in the Lord" and in the hope that the steadfastness of the Philippians will provide him with the glorious testimony that he (2:16) has not worked in vain, keywords from the Letter to the Galatians (5:1, 4:11) return and their glory, that they are the joy and crown of the apostle (4:1), the Philippians owe solely to the first letter to the Thessalonians (2:19).

117

(Regarding the letter to Philemon, no further explanation is needed after Dr. Vaur has shown that its motif, in which the apostle sends back to Philemon his runaway slave Onesimus, whom he has converted, not as a slave but as a companion and brother, is a variation on the theme of the Clementine Christian novel, which states that the separation of related individuals leads to a more intense union when they find themselves on the ground of Christianity. We only note that the author's skill in intelligently interweaving the keywords of the letters to the Philippians and Ephesians into the limited framework with his new theme has made this letter, which belongs to the group of letters to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians, a truly cohesive and self-contained whole - a glory that the author shares within this Pauline epistolary literature only with the creator of the great dialectical work that we possess in the first section of the letter to the Romans.)

Conclusion

The final conclusion of the investigation into the relationship between the Pauline letters and their position in relation to the Acts of the Apostles will be provided by the decision on the letter to the Galatians.

It is certain that the Pastoral letters are the last products of this epistolary literature. The first letter to the Thessalonians presupposes the Acts of the Apostles and, apart from the Corinthian and Roman letters, also presupposes the Galatian letter with its current introduction.

The author of the letter to the Philippians, a letter that concludes the series to which it belongs, used the second letter to the Corinthians, the first and second sections of the letter to the Romans, and the first letter to the Thessalonians.

The letters to the Ephesians and Colossians presuppose familiarity with the first letter to the Corinthians and with the letter to the Galatians.

When the third section of the letter to the Romans was written, the Acts of the Apostles did not yet exist, for the author of the latter has (in the speech of Paul to the elders of the church of Ephesus in Acts 20:35) inserted the catchphrase of that section regarding the reception of the weak in a completely foreign context and on a highly unmotivated basis *)—at least in its current form, the Acts of the Apostles did not yet exist even then, when the concluding section of the letter to the Romans was written, for the one who gave the Acts of the Apostles its final redaction imitated, in his reference to the words of the Lord, which he added to his unmotivated exhortation to receive the weak, the example of Christ for the reception of the believers among themselves (Romans 15:7).

The first section of the letter to the Romans is the oldest product within the circle of this literature, for it was known to the author of the first letter to the Corinthians, which immediately follows it in time and reproduces the catchphrases of his dialectic *) concerning sin as the sting of death and the law as the power of sin —if even the third section of the letter to the Romans precedes the Acts of the Apostles, then even more so does the first letter to the Corinthians, which was before the author of that section.

It can even be demonstrated that the Apollos of the Acts of the Apostles owes the essence of his character, his attitude, and his successes to the first letter to the Corinthians: he was originally (Acts 18:24) an Alexandrian Jew,

hence speculatively educated,**) and thus represents in his beginnings human wisdom, whose contrast to the divine the author of the first letter to the Corinthians deals with in the section in which he sets Paul and Apollos against each other—he goes from Ephesus to Achaia and Corinth, thus coming to the stage he occupies in that letter—by his struggle with the Jews, he performs a great service for the believers here, thus doing again what the Apollos of the first letter to the Corinthians does, he waters the planting that Paul has laid out***): only the author of the Acts of the Apostles has, in his own way, subjected the Alexandrian-educated dialectician both to Paul and to Christian Judaism, by giving him through Aquila and Priscilla, that couple friendly to the Gentile apostle, the Christian completion (Acts 18:2, 3, 26)—finally, that unmotivated and highly unfortunate appeal of the apostle to the selflessness he has shown in providing for his own livelihood *) was formed according to the presuppositions of the first letter to the Corinthians.

*) Acts 20:35 πάντα ὑπέδειξα ὑμῖν ὅτι οὕτω κοπιῶντας δεῖ ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν ἀσθενούντων.

Rom 14:1 τὸν δὲ ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει προσλαμβάνεσθε.

*) 1 Cor 15:56. Rom 7, 8-13

**) The writer of Acts even marks him out. emphatically (ibid.) as a scientifically educated man ἀνηρ λογίος.

***) Acts 18:27-28. 1 Cor 3:6

*) In that speech to the ecclesiastical leaders of Ephesus (Acts 20:33-34).

I must admit that I am not yet able to make a definitive decision regarding the relationship between the Second Corinthians and the Acts of the Apostles. However, one thing is certain: the Second Corinthians presupposes a detailed treatment of Paul's life. Its author firmly assumes that the life of the Apostle was distinguished by miracles and miraculous experiences. He already lives with the idea that suffering was the essential attribute of the Gentile Apostle but was always resolved into victory through divine miraculous help (Ch. 6:5-10). Even the enumeration of his sufferings, such as being beaten by the Jews and then whipped (Ch. 11:24-25), corresponds to the order in which the Gentile messenger,**) after being persecuted and mistreated by the Jews in Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra, is whipped in Philippi in the Acts of the Apostles. The fact that the alms collected in Antioch and sent by Paul of the Acts of the Apostles and his fellow traveler Barnabas to

the brothers in Judea is referred to as a service also agrees with the usage of the Second Corinthians. One of the two, the author of this letter or the author of the Acts of the Apostles, must have had the other's work in mind, but who? The way in which the latter (Acts of the Apostles 24:17) describes the gift that Paul brings to Jerusalem as one that he sacrifices to his people as his personal gift seems to me to be compelling evidence that the author of the Second Corinthians had an earlier treatment of the Acts of the Apostles in mind, and that the one who gave the latter work its final redaction borrowed its keywords from that letter.

**) Acts 11:29 εἰς διακονίαν. Compare 2 Cor 8:4; 9:12

121

Therefore, there must be a kind of pivot point where the Galatians letter stands: the letters that precede it do not yet know the present Acts of the Apostles, and among those that follow, the first Thessalonians and Philippians letters assume familiarity with it, not to mention the pastoral letters.

So what about the letter itself?

It knows the present Acts of the Apostles*). When Paul is brought into conflict with it, whether he should circumcise Timothy, who had a Jewish mother but a Greek father, but circumcised him because of the Jews among whom he lived, the conflict is just as naturally shaped as resolved. In contrast, the corresponding conflict in the Galatians letter, as I have shown, is already flawed and misshapen in its conception, and the author of this letter neither understood nor dared to give it a real solution, a real conclusion. Although he would like to contrast with the flexibility that Paul shows in the Acts of the Apostles, he would like to bring it about that the apostle freed the Greek Titus from the claims of Judaism, and yet he is so dependent on his original, the Acts of the Apostles, that he borrows a turn of phrase*), which would lead to the apostle submitting to the consideration of the Jews. Only the embarrassment into which this dependence on his original has entangled him is so great that he leaves the sentence that the turn of phrase demands unfinished and drops the verb completely.

*) Therefore, I must also overturn the opposite assumption that I left standing in my work on the Acts of the Apostles.

*) that expression that describes the authoritative character of the consideration for the Jews - Gal. 2:4 διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους. Acts 16:3 διὰ δὲ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς ὄντας ἐν τοῖς τόποις ἐκείνοις

122

The Paul of the Galatians is so jealous of his independence, which is even guaranteed by a special divine revelation, that from his side, it is inconsistency, false concession, even mistrust in the revelation he received when he goes to Jerusalem and presents his Gospel to the apostles of circumcision, whom he himself despises as only supposed pillars of the Church - even for the express purpose of testing his concern that he might be or have been running in vain, at the right source, at the right authority. Even this inconsistency can only be explained by the dependence on the Acts of the Apostles, in which the outbreak of the Antiochian discord over the validity of the law of circumcision - a discord that could not be resolved outside Jerusalem, naturally led to the sending of Paul and Barnabas to the apostles and elders of the early Church, to obtain a decision from them (Gal. 2, 2. Acts 15, 2).

123

The comparison between Paul and the original apostles was accompanied by a clause, as was also the decision that Paul and Barnabas received from the council in the Acts of the Apostles*). The Paul of the Galatians assures that he made every effort to fulfill the obligation that clause imposed on him to support the poor of the original community, just as in the Acts of the Apostles, the decision of the Antiochene community to send aid to the brothers in Judea is carried out by Paul and Barnabas**). The recognition by the original apostles in Galatians, upon seeing the grace given to Paul, that he had the right to testify to the community, is imitated in the Acts of the Apostles by the joy Barnabas felt when he saw the grace of God among the believers in Antioch, whose conduct he had investigated on behalf of the original community in Jerusalem***). Finally, in the Galatians, when the communities in Judea hear that the one who once persecuted them now preaches the faith he once destroyed, we hear in this stiff and laboriously formed sentence the patchwork of keywords from the Acts of the Apostles' account of the impact that Peter's report on the conversion of Cornelius had on the community in Jerusalem and the news of the conversion of the former enemy of the community †).

*) Gal 2:10 μόνον. Acts 15:28 πλὴν.

**) Acts 11:30 ὃ καὶ ἐποίησαν.
Gal. 2:10 ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι.

***) Gal 2:9 καὶ γνόντες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ
Acts 11:23 καὶ ἰδὼν τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐχάρη.

†) Gal 1:23 μόνον δὲ ἀκούοντες ᾗσαν ὅτι ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτε νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν ἣν ποτε ἐπόρθει, καὶ ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸ Θεόν.

Acts 11:18 ἀκούσαντες δὲ ταῦτα . . . ἐδόξαζον τὸν Θεόν.

Acts 9:21 οἱ ἀκούοντες. . . ἔλεγον· οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πορθήσας

Compare also Acts 8:1, 3 22:4 Gal 1:13

124

The haphazard way in which the quarrel between Paul and Peter is brought about in the Galatians is also due, as we can now demonstrate with certainty, to the clumsiness with which the author copied his original: only in the Acts of the Apostles is the accusation made by the Jewish faction against Peter that he has entered and eaten with uncircumcised people naturally brought about - only here is it really justified that Peter is living like a Gentile - only here was there a real reason for complaints against him (Acts 11:2-3).

In short, it is not the author of the Acts of the Apostles who is strange to Galatia, as I once thought, nor is Galatia a threatening land for him because of the struggles presupposed in the Galatians, which Paul must quietly and loudly pass through - but the author of this letter chose it as the scene of his struggles because it was still, as it were, virgin territory, not yet occupied by the Acts of the Apostles, which only presupposes communities here in general, and his successor, the author of the letter to the Colossians, followed him in choosing Phrygia as the scene of his struggles, which is only mentioned in passing in the Acts of the Apostles. *)

*) After this result, one can judge how well-founded all the previous analyses were of the "Galatian" and "Colossian" heresies and their relationship to the "seduced" communities.

Until now, the contradictions that I have demonstrated in the assumptions of the Galatians, for example, have been overlooked. Instead, people have attributed to the "seduction techniques" of the heretics in individual communities what was, in fact, encountered by the authors of these letters as a general ecclesiastical condition. Unfortunately, the authors of the letters had to force this general condition into the entanglement and history of a single community, since they had to assume that Paul intervened in these situations and had to fight personal adversaries who were trying to turn his followers away from him. The inner struggle of the church with its own Judaism, the struggle of its freedom with its own bondage, was now turned into an intrigue of individual Judaizing heretics who wanted to make up for the damage that Paul had done in individual communities, resulting in the relapse of Pauline free thinkers into bondage, and the Apostle's clumsy wounds over the possibility that a community he had just

engendered and that had just been securely free, had allowed itself to be lured back into legal servitude.

125

We are able to test the validity of the above conclusions by examining the relationship between the Pauline letters and the various redactions that the Gospel of Luke underwent, as well as the Luke writings that were used by Ur-Luke, the author of the first redaction.

The letters that presuppose the current Acts of the Apostles also know the accompanying Gospel of Luke, and their diligent use of it testifies to the authority it had already gained in the circles in which they themselves originated.

For example, how does the author of the Galatians come to call the original apostles "those who were reputed to be something" (Galatians 2:2) without any preparation for this abrupt expression and without any explanation of it, before he designates them in verse 9 as "those who were recognized as pillars," and in verse 6 as "those who were supposed to be something"? He has before him the clumsy expression of the Gospel of Luke (in the section dealing with the dispute among the disciples at the Last Supper), "who should be the greatest among them.*)

*) Gal 2:2 τοῖς δοκοῦσι. Ch. 2:6 τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι Ch 2:9 οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι. Compare Ch. 6:3 Luke 22:24 τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων.

126

The assertion of the Apostle in the Philippians' letter that he forgets what is behind and strains toward what is ahead is reminiscent of the saying of the person who is focused on what is behind, imitated **). Additionally, the "rejoice" in the Philippians' letter and the designation of the Apostle's co-workers as those whose names are written in the book of life echoes the saying, "rejoice that your names are written in heaven" (Philippians 4:3, Luke 10:20).

**) Phil 3:14 τὰ μὲν ὀπίσω ἐπιλανθανόμενος. Luke 9:62 βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω

The remark in the Ephesians' letter that one should not be swayed and tossed by every wind of doctrine is based on a symbolic application of Luke's account of the storm on the sea. Only Luke explicitly mentions the disciples not only battling against the storm wind but also against the waves.***)

***) Eph. 4:14 κλυδωνιζόμενοι. Luke 8:24 τῷ κλύδωνι

The frequent recommendation of prayer found in all these later letters aligns with the assumption in Luke's Gospel that Jesus sought prayer in solitude. Moreover, the exhortation in the Colossians' letter (4:2) to stand firm in prayer reflects the praise that Luke's Gospel gives to shameless persistence in asking (Luke 11:8).

127

The lost catchword in the Galatians letter about the false friends who want to "exclude" the believers, as well as that in the first Thessalonians letter about the Jews who want to hinder the apostle from bringing salvation to the Gentiles, is taken from the lament in the Luke Gospel about the legal experts who have taken possession of the key to knowledge and prevent those who are entering *) - likewise the catchwords in the exhortation of the Ephesians letter: "therefore, gird up your loins," and the exhortation of Luke: "let your loins be girded" **).

*) Gal 4:17 ἐκκληῖσαι ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν. 1 Thess 2:16 [corrected from 1:16] κωλύοντων. Luke 11:52 τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκωλύσατε.

**) Eph 6:14 στήτε οὖν περιζωσάμενοι τὴν ὀσφὺν ὑμῶν. Luke 12:35 ἔστωσαν ὑμῶν αἱ ὀσφύες περιεζωσμέναι

On the other hand, the one who composed the original version of the current Luke's Gospel, known as "Urlukas," already knew the first Corinthians letter - he could have taken the twisted wording of the saying of the Lord, according to which his followers should take up their cross daily,***) only from the naturally related expression of the same letter: "I die daily." He also used the category of the faithful steward in addition to that of the faithful servant in the parable of the wise servant †), only because of his dependence on the same letter. The addition to the interpretation of the parable of the sower (Luke 8:12), "so that they may not believe and be saved," which is patterned after the first section of the letter to the Romans, is just as unnecessary, since the fate of those who are like the seed that fell on the path is already sealed by the fact that the devil comes and takes the word from their heart, as the birds come and eat the seed along the path in the parable itself. *) Likewise, Urlukas, like the authors of the later letters, remained faithful **) to the supposed Pauline category of "the kingdom of God" (the abstraction and universalization of the kingdom of heaven, which is the standing category of the original gospel). The Apostle's phrase in the first Corinthians letter (15:9)

that he is the least of the apostles seems to me to be too natural and much too fully worked out, and the contrast to which the glory of the grace that has raised him above all other apostles forms (v. 10) seems to me to be too subtly elaborated and motivated for me to believe that the author had that saying in mind, which in the Luke's Gospel ***) is nothing more than a lost cause. The most I could agree to is that the gospel source material that Urlukas and the author of the first Corinthians letter used contained that saying in a more appropriate, more prominent position. However, it is certain that there was already a gospel document before Urlukas that took a reconciling view of the apostle to the Gentiles. The mechanical and inappropriate manner in which the saying about the foreign exorcist is inserted in Luke's Gospel (9:49-50), which represents the father who revealed this to the wise and understanding but hid it from the infants, leads us back to an original gospel source from which the author of the first Corinthians letter borrowed the material for his antithesis between the divine favor of the foolish and the humiliation of the wise (1:27) and for the hidden wisdom of God (2:7).

***) Luke 9:23 ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν 1 Cor 15:31 καθ' ἡμέραν ἀποθνήσκω.

†) Luke 12:43 is the name of this servant, the Matth. 24:45 [corrected from 24:25] ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος is also δοῦλος, against it V. 42 πιστὸς οἰκονόμος — compare 1 Cor 4:2.

*) Even in the redaction that Urlukas gave to the parable itself, it is an inappropriate exaggeration when that seed (v. 5) is also trampled.

**) Compare, for example, the natural wording of 1 Cor. 4:20 with the convoluted wording of Luke 17:20.

***) Luke 9:48 "Whoever is the least among you all is the greatest."

129

In short, my discovery that the author of the first Corinthians had access to that Gospel text from which Urlukas borrowed a great deal of his enrichments of the primitive Gospel has now also been secured from this perspective - as for the other letters, I believe I have done enough for the beginning if I founded the rational basis for research, even though the futility of the questioning corresponds to that of the most decisive answers - supported by this success, I therefore turn back to the Gospels to first determine their relationship to the ecclesiastical literature of the second century.

