Translated as a very rough first draft by Neil Godfrey with the assistance of ChatGPT and Google Translate: 24th July 2024

The Epistle to the Galatians

examined for its authenticity

along with critical remarks

on the

main Pauline letters

by

Rudolf Steck

Berlin

Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer

1888

Foreword

A book that concludes to assign the Epistle to the Galatians and the other main Pauline epistles to the second century requires, more than any other, a few words of introduction. Not that I believe that any preliminary remarks can remove the impression of bewilderment that such an undertaking must initially make on any theological reader, regardless of their direction. However, it is important to me to leave no doubt about the sincerity of my intention, and I hope to achieve this by explaining how I arrived at my view.

My theological and scientific thinking has led me from my university days to views on early Christianity that found their most corresponding expression in the works of the so-called Tübingen School. The Paulinism represented in the four main epistles was also for me the purest manifestation of original Christianity, insofar as it had detached itself from Jewish form, with the Epistle to the Galatians being the pivotal point of the entire movement and, in its relationship to the Acts of the Apostles, the eloquent witness of what is true and original.

Although I had heard doubts about the authenticity of these epistles, I only received the impression that there were also such oddballs among theologians who had to doubt even the sunniest clarity, and Bruno Bauer appeared to me as an unscientific tendentious writer whose audacity had not shied away from an attack on these most genuine monuments of early Christianity.

Therefore, when the *Quaestiones Paulinae* by Loman fell into my hands in 1882, I was surprised to see this dismissed matter taken up again by a serious scientific theologian. I read the essays with interest, as far as my insufficient knowledge of Dutch allowed, but I still had the impression that an untenable thesis was being defended with great means. I was not convinced at that time, as the argumentation mostly referred to external reasons, whereas the internal ones seemed decisive for the previous view.

In the meantime, I had the opportunity to repeatedly explain the Epistle to the Galatians in academic lectures. It became clear to me that the previous way of explanation left many questions unresolved that demanded a solution. Gradually, I became convinced that the difficulties required not just the help of exegesis but also that of criticism, not merely textual criticism. First, I firmly established the view that the Epistle to the Galatians could not possibly

be the earliest of the four main epistles; in its dogmatic part, I increasingly recognized it as dependent on the Epistle to the Romans and partially also on the Corinthian epistles. For a time, I believed that a simple redating of the epistle could solve the problem. Since the view that this epistle preceded the others had only become widespread about fifty years ago, while the early church and earlier commentators predominantly assumed the opposite, it could not be impossible to revert to the old view.

However, further reflection taught me that this correction would not suffice. The dependency on the other main epistles turned out to be such that it could not be explained merely by later composition; rather, a relationship needed to be established, similar to that between the main Pauline epistles and the smaller epistles declared inauthentic by criticism—a relationship of literary use that even made the unity of the author improbable. To my own dismay, this brought me to the assertion of inauthenticity, which logically extended to the other main Pauline epistles closely related to the Epistle to the Galatians. Thus, the stimulus received from Loman, though not immediately, worked through the years to the extent that I eventually adopted the previously rejected view as my own.

Only then did I turn to Bruno Bauer's critique of the Pauline epistles from 1852, which I had previously only known through references. Despite its facile argumentation and often offensive presentation to theological ears, I found in it much that was accurate and previously unnoticed, solidifying my view until it became a full conviction.

VII

Nevertheless, I approached its scientific presentation hesitantly and timidly. I have no joy in negative results as such and least of all in Herostratic fame. I could foresee that publicly presenting my view would not garner sympathy but would rather bring unpleasantness. I would have much preferred to present work that provided satisfaction and garnered approval from many. However, who can do anything for the truth! Concealing a recognized truth is least fitting for an academic teacher. Enough books are written year after year that do not move anything in the world, except perhaps the author's persona. Rather than such a book, I wanted to be responsible for one that attempted to present and substantiate a view of early Christianity, albeit a questionable one, important for the progress of science like no other. Hence, I undertook the writing of the present work.

VIII

Since my predecessor Loman particularly emphasized the reasons found in the history of the canon and external evidence, I primarily had to consider internal reasons to complement his investigations. For the other side, I refer, as far as they were also included in the scope of the investigation, to the already mentioned *Quaestiones Paulinae*. There, the evidence is emphasized, which lies in Luke's conspicuous silence about all and any Pauline letters and the even more striking silence of the Asia Minor church until Justin. Furthermore, reasons can be drawn from the relatively late reception of these letters into the canon and the remarkable accusations of Jewish Christian circles about the Apostle Paul, which differ so significantly from

those about his alleged letters. My path leads through a different course to the same goal, and therefore, only in the second part did I come closer to Loman and was able to engage with him, from whose views mine still deviate in many respects.

This second part indeed requires special justification. It was bold to include the other three large Pauline letters in the same judgment without presenting the detailed examination that led me to it, after having thoroughly examined the Epistle to the Galatians. Perhaps I should have waited until I could present the complete critique of the main Pauline epistles. However, that would have been a work of many years, and by publishing the first investigation, I hope to initiate a discussion and perhaps gain collaborators. It was inevitable to at least secure the result obtained in the Epistle to the Galatians through a preliminary foray into the other letters; otherwise, everyone would have argued that the Epistle to the Galatians could not be separated from the others, and since these were genuine, any doubt about it must be silenced. Therefore, I had to provide what I could without delving into all the details, and in this sense, I would like this second part to be understood.

IX

Although I am now convinced that my view is correct—otherwise, I would not have dared to present it publicly—I am far from imagining that I will immediately be proven right. I am prepared and armed for attacks of all kinds, both fine and coarse. However, even if the current state of Protestant theology, especially in Germany, only leads me to expect condemnation from all sides, there are still indications that a calmer assessment of the matter may take place in the not-too-distant future. Hints such as those given by Heinrici in his excellent commentaries on the Corinthian epistles and his latest work on the Pauline question suggest that the strong presence of Hellenistic elements in these epistles, as he mostly demonstrated, will increasingly prompt consideration of whether their composition is in an even more intimate relationship with this Hellenism than previously assumed. And Sieffert states not only in the latest edition of Meyer's handbook on the Epistle to the Galatians (introduction, p. 25) but also in a review of Heinrici's aforementioned work in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1888, no. 22): "I also believe that Loman is right in saying that it is impossible to place the still predominantly Jewish Jesus of the Baur school in such temporal proximity to the purely anti-Jewish Paul of the main epistles, as is required by maintaining the authenticity of these letters." While I draw the opposite conclusion from this very accurate statement, I am pleased to see the relative legitimacy of doubts about the main epistles recognized from a side that will not be dismissed.

Furthermore, the initially unsuccessful competition for the prize question issued by the Teyler Theological Society in Haarlem concerning the attacks on the authenticity and integrity of the Epistle to the Galatians shows that it must not be so easy to refute the raised doubts, although they have only been partially published by Bruno Bauer and Loman. Future researchers on the now reissued prize question will undoubtedly find the present work useful, and so I hope to have worked to the benefit of someone after all.

X

Moreover, I believe that the new position assigned here to the main Pauline epistles may recommend itself in many respects after overcoming the initial shock. Especially through Ritschl and his school, it has become increasingly common to seek the starting point of early Christian development not in an original apostolic doctrinal opposition but rather in an essentially unified apostolic early Christianity and to assign the struggle of extremes to a later time. This view can only be fully implemented if the main epistles no longer belong to the very earliest time; otherwise, the stark contrast between Acts 15 and Galatians 2 must be reconciled through the most hopeless interpretative feats. If this discord is shifted to post-apostolic times by redating the Epistle to the Galatians, there is hardly anything left to oppose this view. Therefore, the new view, when seriously considered, will lose much of the horror initially attached to it for the Christian consciousness. With it, the significance of the person of Jesus for the emergence of Christianity, which had almost become problematic according to the Tübingen view, reclaims its rightful place based on historical necessity.

XI

Therefore, I am not afraid of the consequences of this view for Christianity and the church. Just as it happened to me, it will likely happen to others. After initially thinking that the entire previous structure would be shaken by the removal of such a strong pillar, I found, upon closer inspection, that the matter was not half as dangerous. It was merely a shift in previous views on the formation process of the early church, which did not overthrow it but made its development appear simpler, more natural, and more comprehensible. Hence, I do not feel like a radical stormer, and after spending fifteen years in practical church service before entering academic work, I see nothing in this new view that would push my position beyond the bounds of ecclesiastical understanding. The final chapter, albeit only in sketchy outline, attempts to show how I have now arranged the development of the Christian church according to my results.

Therefore, I present this attempt for unbiased examination to my colleagues and am content if the honest opinion and sincere effort for the truth are acknowledged. I do not need to assure you that I have tried to use the literature on this richly cultivated field as fully as possible. I must ask for forgiveness for anything that may have escaped me, as my place of residence is not exactly in the center of literary activity. However, I fully take responsibility for my assertions, as I am not presenting them in the service of any church party, not even the one to which I belong. This gives me the courage to speak out on such matters, for the search for truth seems all the more unbiased the less it can achieve anything other than the truth itself. That this investigation has brought a step closer to understanding the mysterious and increasingly obscure field of early Christianity is a conviction I hope will also become that of others sooner or later.

Bern, mid-July 1888.

The Author

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

The Letter to the Galatians

Chapter One

The State of the Question

The letter to the Galatians is one of the four principal Pauline letters and thus belongs to those documents of early Christianity whose authenticity is almost universally accepted. The explicit attestation of this letter, i.e., its mention with title and the author's name, begins only with Irenaeus, i.e., with the time when the New Testament canon started to take shape in the last third of the second century. However, knowledge of this letter is found much earlier among church writers who reach back to the middle of the century and beyond. From then until the present, the letter has been regarded as an unquestionable document from the hand of the Apostle himself, simultaneously as one of the most original and lively testimonies of his spirit.

When, in the middle of our century, the Tübingen school questioned the authenticity of most New Testament writings and particularly denied a whole series of Pauline letters to the Apostle, their boldness stopped at the four principal letters. Indeed, these became the firm foundation for reconstructing the historical view of early Christianity. These letters, on the one hand, and the equally genuine Apocalypse on the other, formed the two cornerstones that should support the new structure. Paulinism, here still in its purest and sharpest form, stands in opposition to the untempered earliest Jewish Christianity of the Revelation of John. Only after these two opposites have settled can a mediating view emerge, to which most other New Testament writings are assigned until the work is crowned with the Johannine writings and the unity of the Church is completed in principle. Thus, the authenticity of the four principal Pauline letters was an essential prerequisite for this most advanced left-wing position of the Tübingen school. Naturally, Baur and his students did not think of a thorough refutation of the doubts raised at that time only from one side, as these doubts seemed to them wrong and foolish from their fundamental perspective.

It is also undeniable that these letters make an impression on any attentive reader that makes doubts about their apostolic origin extremely difficult to raise. Here, a living literary individuality appears before us, seeking its equal in freshness and peculiarity of thought and expression. Everywhere we have the feeling that flesh and bone of a real person stand before us. And if, in some of the later Pauline letters, the impression of a garment inadequately fitted to the body but originally foreign prevails, this is not the case with the principal letters. Here, the language garment fits the content like a glove; everything is concise and full without break or fold. Who could have managed to create such a living person as this Paul of the principal letters? Yes, if it were still the Paul of the Acts of the Apostles with his compliant, adaptable nature, his love of peace, and his conciliatoriness. But this book of Paul contrasts with that of the Apostle of the

principal letters as a whole and in detail. This strictly principled character, whose conscience tolerates not the slightest speck of inconsistency and half-heartedness, is not the agreeable Paul who easily gets along with both Jewish and Gentile Christians. His suffering history almost offers experiences and actions that the Acts of the Apostles either do not know or deliberately conceal or portray differently. Should the Paul of the principal letters be a copy of such an original? To assume this seems all the more absurd since, in what the Acts of the Apostles tell and do not tell about Paul, there is a system. The sharp party conflicts of early Christianity are to be blurred, and the gulf between Paul and the original apostles bridged. The later time throws a veiling cloak over the cracks and corners of the historical image of the early days; it wants to possess the ecclesiastical unity in teaching and practice achieved later as the legacy of the apostles of the Lord. Therefore, the Paul of the Acts of the Apostles appears as a product of this mediation tendency, and the sharp, angular features of the author of the principal letters must thus be those of the historical Paul. Thus, the first impression of the unbiased reader agrees with the conclusion of the investigating researcher, and the authenticity of these letters appears as an axiom, equally for common sense and the most advanced science.

3

Therefore, the history of the criticism of these letters is soon told. We do not have a long series of works for and against them, as with so many other New Testament writings. What is to be mentioned is limited to a few attacks by individual researchers, with only a few defenders on the other side, evidently because it did not seem worthwhile to refute such isolated expressions in detail, as the saying goes, "to shoot sparrows with cannons."

4

The last offshoot of English Deism, it seems, first brought doubt about these letters. Evanson's[1] attack on the authenticity of the canonical Gospels, especially the Gospel of John, culminated in the claim of the later origin of our entire New Testament, except perhaps the Gospel of Luke. But the challenge to the previously accepted views was so summary and so little supported by individual investigation that it did not create a deeper scientific movement, and the whole phenomenon in England disappeared as quickly as it came.

> 1) The dissonance of the four generally received evangelists and the evidence of their respective authenticity examined by Edward Evanson 1792. I have not yet been able to obtain this rather rare book, so I must take the above from the information given by Ersch and Gruber in the Encyclopedia, as well as in de Wette's introduction § 140 and Schölten, the Evg. according to Joh., German edition, p. 23.

In Germany, it was Hegelian philosophy that progressed in one of its youngest offshoots to the extreme of denying all previous ideas about the origin of Christianity. Baur and the Tübingen school, with their view of the emergence of general Christian consciousness from the reconciliation of the opposites of Paulinism and Judaism, had often given rise to the reproach that this construction of history relied less on historical data than on the law of logic established by Hegel, according to which synthesis arises from thesis and antithesis. Strauss, from the same philosophical premises, had reached a criticism of the evangelical history that showed its

content as largely mythical. Feuerbach, for his part, had declared the fundamental dogmatic assertion of Christianity and all religion of a real relationship between God and man as the ultimate self-deception of the subject, projecting itself into the absolute. Carrying out these views in the criticism of the traditional views of the origin of Christianity was reserved for Bruno Bauer, who looked back at the Tübingen standpoint as a childish attempt at mediation between faith and knowledge. While the latter depicted the different positions of the apostles towards Judaism as the driving force in the development of early Christianity, Bruno Bauer found the influence of Judaism on the emerging Christianity so negligible that it was hardly worth considering. If Strauss had seen the unconsciously myth-forming drive of the first community as the creative factor of the evangelical history, Bauer traced the evangelical history, along with its Christ image, to the creative stroke of a consciously poetizing evangelist, Mark, who had written the history of their God for Christianity by analogy with the Roman emperor biographies of Suetonius. The famous book of Jesus, which had agitated the world from Tübingen in 1835, indeed depicted the content of the evangelical narratives as mostly fictitious but still left the historicity of the person of Jesus, freed from mythical trappings, intact. The radical researcher's criticism of the evangelical history, however, questioned the very existence of the person of Jesus. According to this, Christianity was a product of Greek philosophy as it had developed at the court of the Roman Caesars in the time of the greatest syncretism. For the new religion, Judaism was less responsible than "Roman Hellenism," and Seneca and Philo appeared as the true fathers of the emerging Christianity, whose influence should be valued more highly than that of Peter and Paul.

5

It was natural that such a view presupposed the unauthenticity of all New Testament writings. If Christianity had originated as Bruno Bauer claimed, then the four principal Pauline letters could not be from an apostle but belonged to the second century, like most of the other New Testament writings. Proving this was the purpose of the "Critique of the Pauline Letters,"[1] published in three parts in 1852. We will examine the reasons with which the unauthenticity of these letters is attempted to be proven in the following sections; our investigation will review them in detail. However, it can already be said here that Bruno Bauer's work has done itself and its scientific consideration the most damage by the tone in which it is written. Everywhere in the presentation, an undisguised hostility to Christianity is evident, and a disdain not only for the previous explanation of the Pauline letters but also for their entire thought world. The criticism is often spiteful, aiming to show how clumsy, confused, and wrong almost everything is that we find in these letters. Thus, it is a continuous downgrading of the Pauline letters in form and content that is presented to us. No wonder, then, that these statements have found relatively little consideration in science. "Bruno Bauer is a man with whom one does not like to deal," says a recent editor of this field rightly. In theological and ecclesiastical respects, this boldest of all biblical critics had already been regarded as a fallen figure. Since the Prussian education minister had revoked his permission to hold theological lectures in 1843 due to his writings on the Gospels,[2] his position in theological science had become untenable. His further works turned more to historical and especially cultural-historical questions, alongside the continuation of his critical standpoint regarding the rest of the New Testament literature. However, these later

works did not cause nearly as much sensation as his earlier ones. The method of silent ignoring, so successful, was fully and completely carried out against them, and without much known refutation, the presumptuous challenger of all previous views on the history of early Christianity remained forgotten and buried for theology. Even when Bruno Bauer summarized the results of his investigations a few years before his death in 1882, now in a popular form and feuilletonistic-piquant presentation, and offered them to a wider public, the theological circles maintained the proven old silence. Thus, this peculiar and astute attempt to explain the origin of Christianity by abandoning all previous tradition initially failed due to its exaggerations and the lack of objectivity of its author. However, it is questionable whether it was right and proper to simply ignore this criticism and whether it did not at least deserve a more thorough refutation by specialized science. It would not be the first time that such a sin of omission would later take its revenge, and at least on the part of an honest science it should be possible to exercise the self-control that is part of the occupation with new ideas, even if these ideas fly in the face of all views that have hitherto been held dear and valuable.

1) Critique of the Pauline letters by Bruno Bauer, Berlin 1852. I. Section: The origin of the Epistle to the Galatians. 2. Section: Origin and composition of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. 3. Section: The second Epistle to the Corinthians, the Epistle to the Romans, the Pastoral Epistles, the "Epistle to the Thessalonians", Ephesians, Colossians and Philippians.

2) Critique of the evangelical history of John 1840. Critique of the evangelical history of the Synoptics, 1st, 2nd volume, Leipzig 1841, 3rd volume, 1842, cf. Schwegler, the post-apostolic age I, p. 17 and theological yearbook 1842, 2nd issue, p. 241, 1843, 1st issue, p. 59 ff.

In the meantime, however, research, while rejecting the path taken by young Hegelian radicalism, chose a less dangerous but equally difficult route, promising new insights. If the Pauline letters, in their broad outline, made the unmistakable impression of authenticity, various insertions had always been found in them, which the explanation had only laboriously overcome, leaving the doubt about the correctness of the solution as a thorn in the heart. The coherence, particularly, left much to be desired in many places. Should the apostle really have written in such a way that the meaning of his words must remain a bone of contention for all future times in numerous places? Could this not be due to the fact that the text of the letters no longer reached us in its original purity, having suffered additions and changes by later hands, darkening and distorting the coherence? If this were the case, the authenticity of the principal Pauline letters could be maintained, while much disturbing within them could be adequately explained. The task was then to separate the additions from the original through careful individual investigation and, if possible, to regain the apostolic text in its first purity and beauty. This would then bear witness to itself and thus remove the danger from the side of a negating criticism.

Christian Hermann Weisse[1] attempted such an approach, the same scholar whose "Evangelical History," published in 1838, had effectively opposed Strauss's "Life of Jesus" from 1835, and who now also tried to neutralize Bruno Bauer's treatment of the Pauline letters with a mediating hypothesis. This scholar, who was not a theologian by training but significantly advanced

theology both dogmatically and historically, believed that through intensive penetration into Paul's literary style, as presented purely in the first Corinthians letter, he had acquired the ability to separate the original from the later in the other letters of the apostle. His tool was the so-called style criticism, a method that, by comparing the now interpolated text with Paul's true writing style, was supposed to identify the original. Where there are ambiguities and awkwardness in the coherence, these result from the intrusion of foreign sentences and parts of sentences into the text, i.e., interpolations that an eye trained in the true Pauline style could recognize with certainty. Weisse carried out his view in most of the Pauline letters and was convinced he had found the correct solution. However, he found little recognition for this, but almost solely opposition, the latter mostly in the summary manner in which Bruno Bauer's views had been dismissed. His method appeared as the most subjective of all, and it was judged negatively from various sides.[1] In truth, the reader does not gain a firm conviction that the letters restored by Weisse are more original than those we now read, and so the whole view remained confined to the narrow circle of his special disciples.

1) Philosophical Dogmatics 1855—62. 1 p. 1441T. HI p. 263 and others. — Contributions to the Critique of the Pauline Epistles to the Galatians, Romans, Philippians and Colossians, edited by E. S ü l z e , Leipzig 1867.

1) Cf. e.g. Meyer-Sieffert in the Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, 7th ed. p. 26: “The numerous interpolations which, according to Weisse, the apostolic text is said to have undergone, are based solely on subjective style criticism with complete disregard of the British ones Witnesses" and Hilg e nfeld, introduction p. 192: "He left strange views on the Pauline letters that tear up and destroy the text in the contributions to the criticism of the Pauline letters, etc."

Even though this path to solving the existing difficulties was pursued without success, from the early 1850s to the present, the general Protestant theology remained with the old views regarding the principal Pauline letters. Both camps, the apologetic and the critical, were firmly convinced of their authenticity and used them as the surest historical monuments of early Christianity. The continuators of the Tübingen school, Schwegler, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, and others, based their work particularly on the letter to the Galatians in its contrast to the Acts of the Apostles and sought to understand better the tremendous oppositions of the apostolic age that divided Christianity to its foundations. Thus, Hilgenfeld[1] could rightly call the letter to the Galatians the Archimedean point from which alone the task of New Testament criticism could be solved, i.e., the traditional view of early Christianity could be uprooted. From this standpoint, doubt about this letter could not arise, and until recently, it held the position of the cornerstone on which the entire structure of the critical school's view of the development of early Christianity rested.

1) Journal of Historical Theology 1855 p. 484.

However, it was not within German theology that doubt about this letter first reawakened. Instead, the branch of theological research that grew out of Dutch Reformed theology and sometimes surpassed the growth of the main stem brought forth such a shoot. In Allard

Pierson's book[2] "The Sermon on the Mount and Other Synoptic Fragments," published in 1878, the question was raised without regard to predecessors like Evanson and Bruno Bauer, whether the authenticity of the letter to the Galatians was indeed the unquestionable axiom that criticism must accept unconditionally. It was believed on the critical side that this letter could not be dispensed with as a battering ram against the Acts of the Apostles, and perhaps this is why its authenticity had been too easily accepted so far. But the Paul presented to us in it is a very difficult personality to comprehend, a personality whose real existence one must indeed believe if it cannot be otherwise, but whose reality one should examine more closely before accepting it. This apostle, by the way he carefully avoids contact with those from whom he could have received information about Christianity and the person of its founder after his conversion, would appear as a mystic alienated from practical life, which the historical Paul was not. The letter might thus be interpolated, and as we have it, it is certainly not a monument of the oldest Christianity.

2) de bergrede en andere Synoptische Fragmenten, Amsterdam 1878, p. 99 ff.

Although this attack lacked nothing in sharpness, it was undertaken only incidentally and was too insufficiently founded to warrant more than a passing consideration.[1]

1) See the counter-writings of Prins, the letter from Paul to the Qala- tiers regarding the considerations of Dr. A. Pierson 1879 and Blom , theol. Journal 1879 p. 285ff.

However, it soon became clear that this first onslaught on the letter to the Galatians was only the precursor to a more comprehensive critical examination of the authenticity of the principal Pauline letters. In 1882, Professor A. D. Loman in Amsterdam, who had earned a respected name as a researcher in the spirit of the critical school, began publishing a series of studies[1] whose ultimate goal was the unauthenticity of all four principal Pauline letters. As far as the author has advanced with the publication of his work, it is evident that this time the critical question is to be examined comprehensively and with the application of all available aids. The main ideas developed by Loman can be sketched as follows. The previous explanation of the Pauline letters encounters strong improbabilities and even impossibilities at various points. It is not clear whether the letter to the Galatians is addressed to the churches of the region of Galatia or the province of Galatia, i.e., the churches of the second or the first missionary journey. The Corinthians letters presuppose one or more other journeys of Paul to Corinth, which are not mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. Moreover, these letters themselves mention or presuppose one or more other Corinthian letters, of which nothing else is known. The relationship of the first letter to the second and vice versa is difficult to determine, and the latter, in its three distinct sections, forms a riddle that one has so far unsuccessfully tried to solve with various hypotheses. Finally, the dispute over the Jewish-Christian or Gentile-Christian character of the readers in the letter to the Romans cannot come to rest, and both views find support in the letter itself.

1) Pauline Questions, theol. Journal 1882 p. 141 ff. 302ff. 462ff. 593ff. 1883 p. 14ff. 241 ff. 1886 p. 42ff. 387ff.

These unresolved questions, on which research has so far struggled without success, are a sign that the explanation of these letters has not yet reached its goal and perhaps never will on the path followed so far. Furthermore, if one consults the Acts of the Apostles, its complete silence about Pauline letters is particularly puzzling. To a Paulinist at the beginning of the second century, these letters, assuming their authenticity, could not have remained unknown. How, then, does it come about that the narrator not only passes over them in silence but lets his portrayal of Paul contradict them entirely? The intention to mediate the opposites could hardly have led so far. The usual assumption that the Paul of Luke is a faded repetition of the Paul of the principal letters cannot be accepted without question. The opposite relationship must also be considered, whether the Paul of the principal letters could be an idealization of the historical apostle, so that the two images in Acts and the principal letters would stand opposite each other like the synoptic and Johannine images of Christ. The criticism of Bruno Bauer has so far not been refuted by competent scholars, and although it is of such a nature that no one likes to deal with it, scientific necessity demands a closer examination, even if only to refute it thoroughly.

13

Just as the silence of Luke about Pauline letters is puzzling, this silence continues until Justin in the middle of the second century and becomes even more puzzling considering the memory of the apostle who founded those churches would be expected in the church of Asia Minor. But Justin is entirely silent about Paul and his letters, as if he had never heard of them.

Further consideration is given to the history of the canon, drawing from it, through the lack of external testimonies for the Pauline letters well into the second century, the conclusion that the principal letters do not stand much differently in this respect than the other Pauline letters. The first letter of Clement to the Corinthians presupposes the letter to the Romans and explicitly cites the first Pauline letter to the Corinthians, but its dating is uncertain. The Epistle of Barnabas also belongs to a later time than usually assumed, namely to the end of Hadrian's reign. The statements of the Church Fathers about Marcion and his collection of Pauline letters also require revision and thorough historical examination. The earlier history of the canon, especially concerning the Jewish-Christian parties, provides several instances against the traditional view of the critical school that the historical Paul was such a fierce opponent of law-abiding Jewish Christianity. Various expressions from these circles are reported, according to which the Jewish Christians were rather friendly towards the work of the Apostle to the Gentiles. Hostility was only towards the canonical Paul of the principal letters, while the historical Paul would have been closer to Jewish Christianity. This results in a historical view of early Christianity that opposes the traditional Tübingen view and partly aligns with the opposition raised by Ritschl and his school against the latter. The closest image to the historical Paul is the one we obtain from the so-called "We" section of the Acts of the Apostles. The related images we gain from the rest of Acts and finally from the principal Pauline letters are the progressive developmental stages of a Pauline legend that eventually ascends to the highest ideal of the anti-Jewish freedom hero of the letter to the Galatians.

14

As seen, the new view draws most of its arguments against the authenticity of the principal letters from the so-called external testimonies. However, Loman also considers proof through internal reasons possible, although a detailed execution of this is still awaited.

The views he put forward naturally aroused great astonishment, not least within the circles of the critical school itself, whose basic premise was thereby attacked. The opposition was not long in coming and naturally it first found expression within Dutch theology. What complicated and aggravated the situation was the fact that the attack on the main Pauline letters was connected, just as in Bruno Bauer's case, with the assertion that nothing certain could be said about the historical existence of Jesus himself, since his biography as presented in the Gospels was only the late expression of the messianic belief of the early church. The situation could also be such that the expectations of a Messiah or Savior, which were widespread at that time, gradually became more concentrated and finally assumed historical outlines. This so-called "symbolic" view of the life of Jesus was capable of deeply wounding Christian feeling and of giving the struggle a character other than the strictly scientific one. We leave it aside here as it is not relevant to our purpose, and believe that we can do so all the more readily since the connection between the historical setting of the main Pauline letters and the rejection of all historical evidence of the life of Jesus is only a very loose one, and the conclusion from the former to the latter seems to us to be quite problematic and by no means compelling.

15

But Loman's criticism was not suited to immediate, calm appreciation. The situation of critical theology was by no means conducive to such experiments. It had long been forced back onto the defensive, and had not succeeded in gaining acceptance in wider circles. Several of its main representatives had already greatly reduced the results of the Tübingen school and, in particular, had accepted a whole series of minor Pauline letters as genuine. These concessions were not accepted as sufficient by the opposing side either, and the broad middle of theology, following Ritschel's suggestions, had broken with the Tübingen view of the primal apostolic opposition altogether. Then came an innovator who surpassed all previous critics in audacity and extended his hand to Bruno Bauer, who was abhorred on all sides. Would this not have to completely break the thread of patience and discredit New Testament criticism, even in its most moderate assertions, for all time to come?

16

Nevertheless, the sense of truth coupled with freedom in Dutch theology did not tolerate this question being dismissed in silence, as had happened in Germany. A scientific counter-movement ensued, led by the grandmaster of free New Testament research, J. H. Schölten.[1] In his counter-writing to Loman, he first countered the claim that the older non-Christian sources were silent on the person of Jesus with the "testimony" of Josephus,

which was not completely falsified but only interpolated, and thus at least contained historical information about Jesus. As far as the main Pauline letters were concerned, he explained that the writings of the New Testament themselves necessarily presuppose the earlier existence of these letters. Without Paulinism in the sense of these letters, the Acts of the Apostles would be incomprehensible, as it, for example, shows in its depictions of the stories of Stephen and the centurion Cornelius, as well as in its accounts of the life of Paul himself, recognizing him as the foundation, which was then altered and further developed. The same is true of the Gospel of Luke and, to a lesser extent, that of Matthew, as well as of the first letter of Peter, the letters of James and Hebrews and the Apocalypse. In all cases, hidden or open connections to the main letters can be demonstrated. This makes the writing of the main letters impossible until the second century. As far as Justin's relationship to Paul is concerned, Schölten finds the relationships between the two writers assumed by other researchers uncertain, but Justin takes a different standpoint and his silence about Paul is intentional, as is that of Papias and Hegesippus. On the other hand, he clearly knows the Gospel of Luke and this in turn presupposes the main letters. Marcion's Pauline canon cannot be regarded as a mere fiction of the church fathers who polemicized against him. The fact that he accepted ten such letters, among them some which critics have declared to be inauthentic, proves the great antiquity of the main letters, which is also confirmed by another side by the first letter of Clement, which was written long before 150.

1) Historical-critical arguments for the introduction of the latest hypothesis about Jesus and Paul in the four main letters. Leiden 1882.

This work by Schölten was one of the last fruits of his busy and meritorious life; in the spring of 1885, death put an end to his work. But there was no lack of men who continued to oppose Loman's statements. The approval he had found in whole or in part from van Loon, Meyboom, and M a t t h e s was balanced by the negative attitude taken by Rovers and Prins, about which, as about the entire dispute in Dutch theology, van Manen reported to the German public in the Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie[1]. In Germany, little attention has been paid to the matter up to now; people have been content to express their indignation in the church newspapers about the "daring" critic and his "dead-born" hypothesis. This is understandable, because up to now no voice has been raised for the new view, even among the most left-wing theologians. Only an alleged layman, who nevertheless appears to be very knowledgeable in theology, has expressed similar views on the Pauline question in the Protestant church newspaper[2)], and in the book by Rabbi Joel[3], which examines the credibility of the reports of pagan writers on Christianity at that time, there is a sympathetic echo of the Dutch voice.

1) On the literary history of criticism and exegesis of the New Testament. Year 1884, pp. 269-315. 551-626. 1885. pp. 86-122. 4 5 4 - 4 9 6 . 1886. pp. 418-455.

2) Year 1886 No. 34 pp. 755—757 “Letter from a layman to a clergyman”.

3) Glimpses into the history of religion at the beginning of the 2nd Christian century, 2nd part: The conflict between paganism and Christianity and its consequences for Judaism, Breslau and Leipzig 1883. p. 81.

Meanwhile, the method by which Weisse once attempted to resolve the existing difficulties in the Pauline letters has been revived. Also originating from Dutch theology, this new attempt seeks to solve the question in a completely different way than Loman, and without any connection to Weisse's views being apparent, his interpolation hypothesis, in a slightly different form, is presented to us here in its most comprehensive application. It is the "Verisimilia", written by A. Pierson and S. A. Naber[1], who have made this new attempt. The fact that two researchers from different fields of knowledge have joined forces must first of all create a not unfavorable prejudice for the work. A. Pierson is the theologian we have already mentioned, whose work has made him known as an astute and fearless critic; if we are not mistaken, he is the same one whose work "Direction and Life"[2] has also made him valuable to many a practical clergyman. Of course, his standpoint has shifted more and more to the outermost limits of theology and even beyond it. S. A. Naber, on the other hand, is a philologist and thus offers a guarantee of complete impartiality. The work therefore also claims to have brought the truth to light along a path that has hitherto been almost untrodden. The motto taken from Galen, which compares ordinary exegetes with those quacks who triumphantly cure a sick patient suffering from dropsy, reveals the opinion that the authors have of the exegesis of the New Testament to date. Why are there so many obscure passages in the New Testament which, despite all attempts at explanation, have only become more and more incomprehensible and where the work of the exegetes, instead of removing the difficulties, has only piled up new ones? The answer to this question is: because the New Testament consists of writings which are not homogeneous in themselves, but represent a basic text which has been revised and interpolated many times. This basic text is not of Christian but of Jewish origin. It consists of writings that originate from the later Judaism, which became free-thinking and indifferent to circumcision and legal prescriptions, taking its position in monotheism and purer ethics, as the historian Josephus occasionally illustrates in individual representatives, for example, in that Ananias who converted King Izates of Adiabene to pure monotheism.[1] Such writings were welcome to the young Christianity, and it appropriated them by incorporating the specifically Christian beliefs into them through additions and changes. With regard to the Pauline letters, this work was undertaken by a certain Paulus Episkopus, i.e. probably a Christian writer of the episcopal period, whose hand can still be recognized everywhere and is betrayed by certain peculiarities. This system is carried out by the authors in detail in the letters to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Corinthians and Romans, in which with great acumen, which to others may have seemed arbitrary, they attempt to separate the original from the later. Moreover, the time of writing of the Pauline letters should not be pushed back too late. "Non credimus," explain the authors at the end (p. 294), "coinpositos esse libros Novi Testamenti post tempore, quibus hodie a peritis judicibus assignantur; sed haec ipsa causa est cur hester- nuin diem vix superent. Sit conscripta Epistula ad Romanos circa annum 60 post Christum; non tarnen erit vetustus fons ad Chris- tianae religionis historiam cognoscendam." For, this is the explanation of this striking assertion, the New Testament does not represent the first origins of Christianity, which go back further, but a later phase of its development. The opinion that the first beginnings of the Gospel are presented in the New Testament is the Carthago delenda [=Carthage to be destroyed] of new research, just as the opinion of inspiration once was for our fathers. The beginnings of Christianity itself, of course, elude discovery forever; we can only confirm the later development.

1) Verisimilia. Laceram conditionem novi Testamenti exemplis illuslrarunt et ab origine repetierunt A. Pierson et S. A. Naher. Amsterdam and Hague, 1880.
2) German edition by H. Lang, Herlin, G. Keimet' 1866.

1)Archäologie X X . 2. 4.

Although a fairly conservative position is apparently maintained with regard to the time of writing of the Pauline letters, no one can be deceived by the fact that in reality all previous foundations for the explanation of the New Testament have been shifted and made uncertain. On the one hand, in the "Verisimilia" the explanatory principle is extended to the entire New Testament, which Eberhard Vischel recently tried to do with success in the Apocalypse: a Jewish basis, revised by a Christian hand. On the other hand, Weiss's theory of interpolation is applied to the New Testament writings in an even more comprehensive manner. The judgment on the whole attempt can of course only be made by examining the individual parts. We will have the opportunity to ask the question in the Epistle to the Galatians whether the frequent disruptions in the connection force us to assume such an assumption, or whether they can be explained more simply by assuming the use of other Pauline letters. Dutch theology has already given its judgment on the whole of the "Verisimilia" through the mouths of some qualified representatives[1], and this judgment is not turned out precisely in their favor.

1) Kuenen, Verisimilia? theol. Journal 1886, pp. 491—536. — Prince, the letter to the Galatians in Tegenspraak met zieh zelven gebracht, ibid. 1887. pp. 05—91.

Another related phenomenon should be mentioned, which is, however, based on a much more conservative interpretation of the matter, namely the renewed attempt to produce the text of the Epistle to the Galatians as Marcion read it. The explanation of the letter has always taken this text of Marcion into account, for example Hilgenfeld[2)] in his commentary. But now we owe an almost complete reproduction of the letter that Marcion may have read thanks to the research diligence of the Dutchman W. C. van Manen [1)]. The editor judges that this Marcionite text should not be considered from the outset as being worse than the traditional ecclesiastical one, both forms have roughly equal right to our examination and it cannot be ruled out that Marcion's text deserves preference in some points or even in general. This would place the explanation of the letter on new ground and would resolve many of the difficulties of the current context. However, as tempting as this prospect may seem, as long as the letter remains only a torso, even in the most careful attempt to reconstruct it, and in some places the original context itself can no longer be determined by guesswork, but dotted lines must represent the text, the interpretation will still be directed to our church-handed text. And the analogy of the Gospel of Luke speaks overwhelmingly for the fact that Marcion did indeed reshape the text according to his principles, even if this procedure was not nearly as unheard of at that time and deserved the criticism that the Church Fathers heap upon it. For our task, it will be best if we start from the church-handed text and leave open the question for the time being whether the Marcionite text deserves special consideration in comparison to it. Our undertaking is directed at an examination of the letter as a whole and must start from the assumption of its literary unity and take this as a basis as long as no compelling reasons to the contrary arise.

2) Galatians 1852, pp. -218—234.
1) theol. Tijdschrift 1887: Marcion's Letter from Paul to the Galatians, pp. 382—404. 451—533.

The overview of the history of criticism of the main Pauline letters has shown that a renewed examination of the basic question is not superfluous. This is all the less so since even the most recent major summaries of the views currently represented by academic theology lack any detailed consideration of the question. W e i z - s ä c k e r ^ "Apostolic Age of the Christian Church" (1886) is a classic presentation of what can be said today about this great historical subject. But the authenticity of the four main Pauline letters is taken for granted without any investigation, and similarly to the Tübingen school, the full severity of the criticism is directed against the Acts of the Apostles in its contrast to the presentation of the main letters. The latest presentation of the apostolic and post-apostolic period, Pfleiderer's "Primitive Christianity, its writings and teachings, described in historical context" (1887), takes the same view of the matter. Here, too, the question of the authenticity of the main letters is not even touched upon. The point of view of the observation remains on the whole a similar one to that of Tübingen, except that the correction is adopted which Rittsehl had introduced at the time, namely, to no longer use the contrast between Paulinism and Jewish Christianity as a driving motive for the post-apostolic age. The Pauline proclamation of Christ on the one hand, and Hellenism on the other, are the two factors whose combination quite naturally explains the peculiarity of pagan Christianity from its origin.

22

We are convinced that it is the task of all scientific criticism, and not least of theological criticism, to examine every question objectively and without fear of its possible theoretical or practical consequences. Thus Protestant theology cannot simply content itself with a silent rejection of even the most improbable thing, such as the assertion that the main Pauline letters are inauthentic. It is understandable that this hypothesis seems so outrageous to most people at first glance that it is difficult to even examine it more closely. But it would not be the first time that the improbable turns out to be the truth.

23

The entire current situation of New Testament criticism makes it probable that the view of the Tübingen school needs correction on crucial points. Either the truth lies further to the right, as Rittsehl and his school believe, or it lies further to the left. The assumption that of the thirteen or fourteen Pauline letters only the four main letters are genuine is unlikely. Either Paul wrote more, or he wrote nothing at all that has survived. A literary production that would have been limited to these four major letters is unthinkable. Nevertheless, criticism cannot go back to the assumption that all of Paul's letters are genuine; the arguments against most of them are too strong. But if it cannot go back, it must see whether light is not beckoning it further forward.

According to the Tübingen school, only two large, solid pillars on which the edifice of historical opinion rests date back to the Christian prehistoric period: the Apocalypse and the four main Pauline letters. These are the only witnesses of the oldest Christian writings that have survived

to us. One of these pillars has been washed away by the floods. The idea that the Apocalypse was written by the Apostle John was abandoned within the school itself by Volkmar (1862). Then Voelter (1882. 85) disputed the unity of the book and let it grow out of various layers, the last of which belongs to the age of Antoninus Pius. Finally, Vischer (1886) even disputed the Christian character of the Scripture and declared it to be a Jewish apocalypse in Christian revision. No matter how much there is still debate about the legitimacy of one or the other solution, the old certainty is gone. One of the pillars supporting the building of the Tübingen school has begun to wobble; let us see whether the other one is still standing.

Chapter 2

24

The circumstances of the letter's composition.

When and where the apostle Paul wrote the letter to the Galatians cannot be determined with any certainty from the letter itself. The letter to the Romans and the two letters to the Corinthians determine themselves in this respect with all the clarity one could wish for, since they contain sufficient information about the time and place of their composition. Our letter lacks such information. Up to modern times, therefore, people have wavered as to the date of this letter, and this has been the case for a long time. The signature of the letter in some of the more recent majuscule manuscripts') points to Rome as the place of composition, and Jerome®) and some -aGreek fathers also identify the letter, while it is only in the case of the more recent Greek fathers*) that the letter is predominantly written in Ephesus. Therefore, the opinion has been maintained until recent times that the letter was actually written in Rome, and Schräder') has also stated that the Epistle to the Galatians is the latest of the Pauline letters and was written in Rome in the year 64, shortly before the apostle's martyrdom.

At present, however, there is a fair amount of agreement in both the critical and apologetic camps about the time when the letter was written. The passage 4:13 is used for this determination, where Paul reminds the Galatians: through infirmity of the flesh I did proclaim good news to you at the first. By taking the at the first strictly in the sense of a real comparative, as the earlier time of two, one obtains the statement that the apostle had been in Galatia twice, no more and no less, before he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians. This is combined with the statements in Acts 16:6 that Paul first passed through the Galatian land on his second missionary journey, and 18:23 that at the beginning of his third missionary journey he passed through this region again and strengthened the brothers there. When Paul then travelled on to Ephesus (19:1), he had therefore been in Galatia just twice, and according to this one almost generally places the writing of the Epistle to the Galatians at the beginning of the third missionary journey and says that it was written either on the way between Galatia and Ephesus, or soon after arriving at the latter place, where the apostle stayed for 2-3 years and at the end of his stay wrote the first Epistle to the Corinthians. This is the opinion of the vast majority of the new researchers in this field, from Kückert to Baur, Hilgenfeld and Holsten, from Neander to Guericke, Wieseler and Hofmann. In this case the Epistle to the Galatians takes first place among the four main epistles, it marks the first and most violent stage in Paul's struggle with the Judaizers, which already appears in the Epistles to be something familiar and familiar and in the Epistle to the Romans softens to a conciliatory approach. As Baur [1)] puts it, "there can be little doubt that the whole manner in which the apostle confronts the Judaists in the Epistle to the Galatians bears the character of the first conflict." The dogmatic statements in the letter also reveal a more clumsy, less practiced hand in comparison to the Epistle to the Romans. The presentation is short, sketchy, often almost abrupt, so that this letter seems to contain a first draft of the far more comprehensive and well-developed train of thought of the Epistle to the

Romans, and this is also reflected in the fundamental sharpness with which the law-free standpoint is asserted, and which is not in the least tainted by concessions.

1) Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, 2nd ed. I p. 286.

26

There is another external feature to this impression. The apostle begins his letter by expressing surprise that the Galatians had so soon turned away from the one who called them in Jesus Christ to another gospel (1:6). This so quickly indicates that only a short time had passed since their conversion by Paul, which made their apostasy all the more surprising.

For all these reasons, our letter is now almost unanimously placed before the other three main letters, and only the Thessalonians, or at least the first of them, if it is accepted as genuine, as is usually the case, precedes it. Thus, the Epistle to the Galatians is not only one of the first epistles of the great apostle to the Gentiles, but also one of the oldest, if not the oldest, of the written monuments of Christianity in general, written around the year 55 AD, long before the Apocalypse or one of the older Gospels came to light.

The vast majority of modern researchers are essentially in agreement with one another on this point, and this agreement creates a favorable prejudice for the historical certainty of the assumption in question. Furthermore, the fact that the letter can be relatively easily incorporated into the life of Paul known from the Acts of the Apostles also speaks in its favor. We know, for example, that in the case of the Pastoral Epistles, the infinite diversity of views on the way in which these letters should be reconciled with the information in the Acts of the Apostles about Paul's travels and fate is one of the main doubts about their authenticity. In the case of our letter, however, this difficulty is eliminated, and from the standpoint of the Acts of the Apostles there is no reason to object to Paul writing it at the beginning of his almost three-year stay in Ephesus. The historical situation can therefore be determined with great probability and without any pressure, and this seems entirely favorable to the assumption that the letter was written by Paul himself.

27

However, on closer inspection, the rare unanimity of researchers regarding our letter is not exceptionally favorable. The consensus of researchers breaks down as soon as one asks how the circumstances of the letter's composition should be described in more detail. One question on which no agreement has been reached to date concerns the addressees of the letter. Who are the Galatians to whom Paul is writing? According to the older assumption, which is still held by most people today, they are the inhabitants of the region of Galatia, which lay in the interior of Asia Minor in the area where the river Halys flows, i.e. the descendants of the Gauls who immigrated in the 3rd century BCE. According to another view, which was first put forward about

a hundred years ago and has recently been defended again by Renan and Hausrath, and also by Pfleiderer,[1] it would be the inhabitants of the Roman province of Galatia, as it was defined by Emperor Augustus, where, in addition to Galatia proper, parts of Lycaonia, Pisidia and Phrygia are also included under this collective name. This different definition of the geographical term Galatia is not just a matter of idle curiosity, but it has the consequence that, according to the former view, Paul could only have founded these communities on his second journey (Acts 16:6), because he only came to Galatia proper at that time. According to the latter view, however, there is nothing to prevent us from assuming that Paul is writing to the communities he founded on his first missionary journey (Acts 13 and 14), and that he then visited again for the second time on his second and for the third time on his third (Acts 16:6, 18:23). This apparently purely archaeological question is therefore of great importance for determining the circumstances of the composition of our letter, and even for the view that we form of the struggle between the apostle to the Gentiles and the Judaizers. In order that it does not appear as if this difference is only artificially exaggerated to a considerable extent and that the resulting difficulties for the historical understanding of our letter are merely fabricated, it is necessary to at least briefly address the discussions that took place on this issue.

1) The representatives of this view from Joh. Joach. Schmidt, Paulus, Mynster up to Hausrath, Weizsäcker and Wendt are listed in the New Testament introductions and the Coinmentaries to the Epistle to the Galatians, most recently in Holtzmann, Textbook of the Historical Critical Introduction to the New Testament, 2nd edition, 1886, p. 24*2. See also W e i z säcker, Das apostolische Alters, 1886, p. 236. Pfleiderer, Urchristenthum, p. 57ff.

The discussion about the question of who the Galatians are to whom Paul is writing has, in its most recent stage, been conducted particularly between Hausrath[1)] on the one hand and Holsten[2)] on the other. The most important reasons and counterarguments are as follows:

1) Neutest. Zeitgeschichte III. 2. S. 135 Aum. (1. Aufl. II. S. 528).

2) Das Evangelium des Paulus I. 1 S. 35 ff.

1. In his letters, Paul generally sticks to the official geographical designations of the Roman administration. When he speaks of his stay in Antioch and Tarsus, he writes: I went to Syria and Cilicia (Gal. 1:21); when he speaks of his stay in Hauran, he says: I went to A r a b i e (Gal. 1:17). When something bad happened to him in Ephesus, he tells of the great tribulation that he had encountered in Asia (II Cor. 1:8), and when he means Philippi or Corinth, he says Macedonia and Achaia (II Cor. 9:2, 11:10), and also Judaea when he means Jerusalem (Gal. 1:22). So if the names of countries in Paul's letters are always names of provinces, there is no reason to understand the name Galatia as anything other than the Roman province. — It is objected that this only proves the possibility, not the reality, of this meaning of the name Galatia, and that addressing the communities as "Galatians" (Gal. 3:1) would still be strange, since only

the actual Galatians had a claim to it, not all the other inhabitants of the province. Moreover, when the apostle described the area of the first missionary journey in Gal. 1:21 as the regions of Syria and of Cilicia, he would surely have added: και της Γαλατιας if he had really included the Galatian communities in the circle of those founded at that time. — To this it can now be replied that in the last-mentioned passage Paul does not want to speak at all of the area of his first missionary journey, which he does not mention there at all, but only to indicate, as Holsten himself says, where he was at that time, far from Jerusalem. The Ginwand then says that the The fact that Lycaonians, Pisidians, etc., who had been added to the province of Galatia and whom Paul converted on his first missionary journey, could hardly be addressed by the name "Galatians" has been asserted by H i l g e n f e l d [1)] in particular, who wittily remarks that this would be roughly the same as if someone today were to write "to the Prussians" and understand by this to mean Schleswig-Holsteiners, Hanoverians, Kurhessen, Nassau. However, the very reason for the letter that Paul wrote provides a reason that justifies this otherwise striking form of address, namely that Paul had to address the same admonitions to many communities that included different nationalities, where the collective name Galatians was the most obvious. In any case, the observation that Paul mostly uses the Roman provincial names in his letters is of great importance, although the fact that in the case of Galatia in particular the secular writers of that time still use the name in the old sense[2)] somewhat reduces the importance of this reason.

1) Introduction to the New Testament, p. 251.
2) See Meyer-Sieffert, Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. 7th edition, Introduction, p. 10ff.

29

2. The same broader meaning of the name Galatia as in Paul prevails elsewhere in the New Testament, for example in the first letter of Peter, written by a Pauline at the time of Trajan, whose address 1:1 to the churches of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia shows by the juxtaposition that Galatia is to be understood as the province. Even the Acts of the Apostles, according to some, such as Mynster and Renan, understands Galatia in the same sense, while Hausrat acknowledges that by Galatia it means the region. Now if the latter is indeed the case, then Holsten can rightly object that the language used in the Acts of the Apostles, which, like the first letter of Peter, comes from Pauline circles, confirms the different interpretation of the name Galatia in the New Testament.

30

3. When Paul wrote the Epistle to the Galatians, he had, according to his own statement, only been to Jerusalem twice since his conversion (1:18, 2:1). If we assume that the Epistle to the Galatians was only written when Paul had been to Galatia proper for the second time, i.e. on his third missionary journey to Ephesus, then according to the Acts of the Apostles Paul had already been to Jerusalem at least three times (Acts 9:26, 15:4, 18:22). This situation does not fit with the apostle's own statement in the Epistle to the Galatians, but the difficulty disappears as soon as one understands Galatia in a broader sense. For then Paul had already been there on his first missionary journey and could have written the letter on the second, which was then

only preceded by the two journeys to Jerusalem mentioned in Acts 9:26, 15:4. But if one wanted to delete the journey in Acts 18:22, as some do in order to avoid this consequence, says Haust r a t h, that would be sheer arbitrariness. And it would be just as arbitrary to transfer the founding of the Galatian churches to the second journey, where the Acts of the Apostles themselves expressly say that Paul only passed through Phrygion and Galatia at that time (SiijMov Acts 16:6) without stopping. The churches must rather have been founded on the first journey, where the Acts of the Apostles reports in detail about Paul's missionary activity in those regions. - To this H o l s t e n replies that the appeal to the Acts of the Apostles is misleading and deceptive. It cannot be denied that the information in the Epistle to the Galatians about Paul's journeys to Jerusalem do not agree with that in the Acts of the Apostles. The journey there immediately after the conversion (9:26) falls three years later according to Gal. 1:18. In any case, Hausrath's assumption is incorrect, as he completely ignores the journey because of the Collecte (Acts 11:30). Here, however, the appeal to the Acts of the Apostles will not be successful as long as the obvious differences between its presentation and that of the Epistle to the Galatians cannot be eliminated. If, in any case, one does not rate the credibility of the Acts of the Apostles highly, one should not appeal to it here as an exception. It does not, however, state explicitly that Paul founded churches in the Galatian region on his second journey, but it does make this clear as a prerequisite when it has the apostle travel through the same regions on his third journey and strengthen the brothers (18:23). On this point, the weight of the reasons is likely to be on the side of the older view as long as the canon is established that the Epistle to the Galatians, as an authentic testimony to Paul's journeys, deserves preference over the secondary account of the Acts of the Apostles.

31

4. In the report that Paul gives in Galatians about his negotiations with the original apostles in Jerusalem, he says (2:5) that he did not give in that the truth of the good news might remain to you.. That means that the Galatians were already converted at that time and the truth of the gospel should remain with them. Before the apostolic convention in Jerusalem, however, only the Galatians of the province, to whom Paul came on his first journey, were converted. So it is precisely these people that he is talking about in this passage. But the passage must be understood differently, to/with you, towards you, the truth of the gospel should remain, for if Paul had given in at that time, those who were converted later would no longer have received the pure gospel but one that was clouded by Judaism. This interpretation can certainly be accepted and no decision will be found here.

32

5. However, the entire content of the Epistle to the Galatians, with its fierce struggle between Paul and his Judaistic opponents, indicates that the Galatians were converted before the Apostolic Convention. What is more natural than the assumption that Paul's successes on his first missionary journey gave the Judaizers urgent reason to win over those new converts to the full Jewish-Christian view? If the dispute actually broke out after the first missionary journey and was then just settled in Jerusalem, and we hear about this dispute from beginning to end in the

Epistle to the Galatians, it is more likely that it refers to those who were involved in it at that time than to others to whom it was only brought later. But here too the interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles seems to cloud the judgment. However, it presents the matter as if after the negotiations in Jerusalem (chapter 15) the fighting had calmed down everywhere, the emissaries proclaimed the apostolic decree in Antioch (15:30) and Paul himself did the same in the areas of Derbe and Lystra when he returned there on his second missionary journey (16:4), so that the point of dispute about the position of the Gentile Christians towards the Mosaic law was no longer an issue anywhere. But according to the Epistle to the Galatians, the dispute broke out again soon after the negotiations in Jerusalem, when Peter came to Antioch and was persuaded by James's emissaries to denounce the fellowship of the Gentile Christians (Gal. 2:11 IT). From then on, the dispute raged more fiercely than ever, and Paul had to fight the same opponents in Corinth and even in Rome, as is clear from the relevant letters. Accordingly, the Galatian churches may well have been drawn into this struggle, even if they were only founded after the negotiations in Jerusalem.

6. Furthermore, H a u s r a t h finds that Paul would hardly have mentioned Barnabas in Galatians (2:1,13) if he had not been known to the Galatians. But he only had him as a companion on his first missionary journey, not on the second (Acts 13:2 cf. 15:39). — However, it is too much of a conclusion, replies H o l s t e n, to assume that Paul only had occasion to mention Barnabas as a personal acquaintance of the Galatians. He also mentions him in the first Epistle to the Corinthians (9:G), although Barnabas hardly ever came to Corinth. — Here, however, the mention of Barnabas does not necessarily mean that the Galatians knew him personally. But the mention is more natural in this case, and the passage 1 Cor. 9:6 is different, since Paul mentions himself and Barnabas as examples of how ministers of the gospel do not live from the gospel but through their own work. Paul also mentions the marital status of the apostles, the brothers of the Lord, and of Cephas, and thus speaks without regard to whether the Corinthians know these people or not.

7. The Epistle to the Galatians presupposes that Judaizers' emissaries penetrated the Galatian communities from Jerusalem. Galatia itself lay so far in the interior of Asia Minor that it is unlikely that people from Jerusalem could have reached it so easily. The southern regions of the province of Galatia, on the other hand, were easier to reach. However, even if there was no regular traffic between Jerusalem and the Galatian region, agitators could have reached it just as easily as Paul himself did.

8. As the most general argument for his view, Hausnit.li finally puts forward the statement that it is not advisable to relate a historical document of such fundamental importance as the Epistle to the Galatians to a merely unknown entity. Congregations in which the conflict between legal compulsion and Pauline freedom, so important for the whole Church, was fought out, could not have been completely forgotten by the Church, as was the case with the congregations in Galatia proper, whose existence is barely mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. But this reason is based on mere probability. Since we know so much about the congregations in Antioch

Pisidia, Derbe, and Lystra from the Acts of the Apostles, we would also like to be able to relate an important Pauline letter to them. But that cannot decide. Perhaps the Acts of the Apostles even intentionally remained almost entirely silent about the Galatians proper, because the memory of the battles fought out there was not pleasant for their mediating standpoint.

34

Thus, against Hausrath's view, something can be argued at every point, and Holsten has indeed said everything that can be said against it. Nevertheless, the impression remains that it possesses many advantages over the other, even if only probability can be gained at first. For example, Volkmar has judged [1] that it should not be too difficult to victoriously reclaim the old position against the six (expanded by us to eight) bastions of Holsten. Indeed, some of Hausrath's reasons make the impression that they are difficult to answer, especially the first one, the appeal to the otherwise general usage of the principal letters concerning the names of the countries. However, Holsten adds an attack to his defense that threatens to decisively settle the battle in his favor. The entire content of the Epistle to the Galatians, he says, is incomprehensible if it refers to congregations from the first missionary journey, before the negotiations in Jerusalem. It was precisely about these congregations that Paul had to contend with the old apostles, and Paul would have necessarily had to communicate the result of his appearance in Jerusalem to these congregations. The fact that he only recounts these things much later in the Epistle to the Galatians proves that the Galatians had not yet heard this from him. Therefore, they must have been converted after the agreement in Jerusalem. This argument has been found particularly compelling, yet upon closer examination, it does not hold up. While it is hard to make it plausible that Paul did not need to communicate the result of the negotiations in Jerusalem to the affected congregations of the province of Galatia because he did not want to unnecessarily disturb them and possibly endanger his authority among them, Holsten himself slightly falls into the accusation that he often makes against his opponents: that they have been misled by the Acts of the Apostles. Indeed, if a negotiation like that described in Acts 15 had taken place, if a solemn resolution had been made and a decree on the observance of the fundamental commandments of Judaism had been published, then Paul, as well as his opponents, would not have been able to omit communicating this decision to the relevant congregations. But there is no mention of this in the Epistle to the Galatians. Paul enforces the recognition of his preaching of the gospel with the original apostles, and nothing is imposed on him, only the wish is expressed that he should remember the poor.

1) Theological Journal from Switzerland 18 pages, "A Journey through the Acts of the Apostles", p. 70. — Paul of Omamascus to the Epistle to the Galatians, p. 77.

35

Paul then had complete freedom in his territories; according to the principle t^eT; ei; eftvr,, ototoi 61 efi ttjv TCptTo,ur(v he was his own master in his communities and it was not necessary for him to announce that he was now also recognized as such in Jerusalem, until later the invasion of his territory by his opponents forced him to do so. So this concern falls away and we are not

prevented from assuming that the Galatians were converted before the Apostles' Convention. But if one wanted to take into account the account in the Acts of the Apostles insofar as it concerned the question of the circumcision of the Gentile Christians, which was also discussed in Jerusalem at that time according to the Epistle to the Galatians (2:2-5), then it would have to be said that Paul should have communicated the previous negotiations on this point to the Galatians immediately, even if he only converted them after the Apostles' Convention, and not wait until the threat of their apostasy forced him to do so. When he was in Galatia he would have spoken to people about such things and told them what was necessary for the future life of the community, and the question of the validity of the Jewish law for Christians was certainly one of those that was primarily taken into consideration. Indeed, if such agreements were at all involved in Jerusalem, then it is difficult to understand how communities of such importance as the Galatian ones, whether they were those of the first or second missionary journey, could have been left in the dark about it until the Epistle to the Galatians was addressed to them. But we will have to deal with this later; for now we will stop at the fact that Holsten's seemingly obvious objection draws its strength more from the Acts of the Apostles than from the Epistle to the Galatians. Volkm a r [1)] also finds the matter as impossible with this interpretation as with the other when he says: "If one wants to bring the conversion of the inhabitants of the tractus Galaticus after the Apostolic Council "to chapter 11" in such a way that Paul, for political reasons, in order not to endanger his authority, did not say a word to the Galatians about all that the letter first tells them, then the utmost has certainly been done to convince everyone that this path can no longer be followed."

1) Paul of Damascus to the Epistle to the Galatians p. 78.

Incidentally, Holsten ultimately finds a way to resolve the "contradiction" of the Epistle to the Galatians against the assumption that the Lycaonian and Pisidian congregations are meant alongside the Galatians, namely by completely disregarding the account of the Acts of the Apostles. According to the Epistle to the Galatians, Paul's first missionary journey did not go to Pisidia and Lycaonia, but to the regions of Syria and Cilicia (1:21). Therefore, the route described in Acts, which is seen as the first missionary journey, could instead be the second one, which means that Paul would have come to the province of Galatia only on the second journey, that is, after the Apostolic Council. Acts also suggests that the decree from Jerusalem was only directed to the congregations in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia (15:23). This indeed changes the matter significantly, but it is clear that then the Acts of the Apostles would not deserve the slightest credence even in such external matters as the travel routes of the Apostle Paul, and then the question arises as to how we would even have any knowledge of it at all. In short, one can see that this question concerning the geographical meaning of the address "to the Galatians" leads to ever greater complications, from which it is hardly possible to emerge in the end.

If we want to follow the general historical probability, the assumption put forward by Hausrath et al. deserves preference. The region of the Galatians proper, with their capitals Ancyra, Pessinus, Tavium, is so far inland in Asia Minor that Paul could only have reached it with endless effort and difficulty. Since his goal was in any case the west coast and Ephesus, it is difficult to understand what could have prompted him to make this enormous detour, unless he had some connection with the Galatians that we do not know. Exegetes generally imagine the matter to be far too easy. One could certainly have the apostle travel over hill and dale, over rivers and through steppes with and without a passable path - in his study, but the question is whether this actually works so well.

Thoughts easily coexist,
But things collide in space,

says Schiller's Wallenstein, and so the travels of the Apostle Paul are easy to construct on the infinitely patient paper, but in reality many a colorful line on a map leads to an impossible path. Just compare one of the many maps on which biblical geographers have recorded the travels of the Apostle Paul, for example those in Menken's Bible Atlas or in Tischendorf's editions with the one found in Renan's St. Paul. The former follow the usual view and take Paul to Galatia proper as far as Ancyra, the latter supports the view that Galatia is to be understood as the province and that Paul therefore did not actually come to Galatia. How naturally and easily the lines of the second and third journeys appear on Renan's map, from Antiochia Pisidia westwards to Phrygia and down the coast! How unnaturally and strangely, on the other hand, the older maps draw these lines; on the second journey from Antiochia Pisidia sharply north-eastwards through a wide steppe to Ancyra, and from there again at a sharp angle back to Phrygia and down to the coast. On the third journey the route even goes from the inner corner of the southern coast of Asia Minor directly northwards through Cappadocia to the same Ancyra, and from there straight across to Antiochia Pisidia and down to Ephesus. And all this just for the sake of the beautiful eyes of those who want to find the old Celtic land in Paul's Galatia.

Could it really be that Paul, a traveling tradesman, undertook such adventurous zigzag journeys across all of Asia Minor, probably just so that he could later write to the actual Galatians and not just the figurative ones? The significant change in the travel route from the second to the third journey, which interpreters and mapmakers feel compelled to make, is solely based on the fact that the first time (Acts 16:6) it says they passed through Phrygia and the Galatian region, and the second time (18:23) it is reversed, stating he traveled through the Galatian region and Phrygia in sequence. It is a commendable sign of conscientiousness that interpreters make the apostle take such immense detours due to this reordering, though they use Paul’s soles, not their own. However, this conscientiousness is misplaced considering our author’s habit. In his Gospel (Luke 17:11), he also says Jesus went to Jerusalem through the middle of Samaria and Galilee, where the context clearly indicates the reverse order is meant. Thus, it does not matter whether Luke says Phrygia and Galatia one time and Galatia and Phrygia the other; he could very well mean the same route both times. If the later passage in Acts (18:23) supports the view

that Galatia as a comprehensive term includes the regions of Lycaonia, Pisidia, etc., then the earlier passage (16:6) is only seemingly contrary to this view. διήλθον δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν can be understood in reverse, just as in the aforementioned passage of the Gospel of Luke διὰ μέσον Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας or as in Mark 10:1 εἰς τὰ ὅρια Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. Indeed, διήλθον is more favorable to the other view, as the journey had already led to Derbe and Lystra (16:1), suggesting a new segment of the route. But the Textus Receptus reads διελθόντες, "after they had gone through Phrygia and Galatia," and nothing prevents understanding Galatia as the previous part of the journey, which Luke would have mentioned last in the enumeration here as often. Certainly, the reading διήλθον is more externally attested, but internal reasons support the Textus Receptus, which de Wette and Overbeck also maintain here. It was more likely to dissolve one of the many participles διελθόντες — κωλυθέντες — ἐλθόντες — παρελθόντες than to establish it. Thus, Acts would not be such an insurmountable obstacle to the view of Hausrath and others. But even if it were, it is almost universally recognized that its historical value is quite limited, and it could very well have understood Galatia as the region, thereby reversing the situation. In any case, according to the entire previous account, the question of the meaning of the name Galatia in Paul's writings has not yet reached completely certain results. Instead, both views are still opposed, each with strong arguments in its favor.

1') See also Renan St. Paul p. 52: this is what happens (chap. XIV) in detail, as in Acts XVI. 6, XVIII. 23 the procedure is carried out in large quantities.
2) NABCDE min. syr. sah. cop. poor. aeth. Fathers against ÎILP and many later works. Ohrys.; Vulgate also has transeúntes.
3) in the commentaries on Acts 16:6.

That would be of no great consequence if the question of the residence of the Galatians could be left to the acumen of specialist researchers as a purely archaeological matter. But this is not just a harmless scholarly dispute; depending on each viewpoint, there also arises a different dating of the composition of the Epistle to the Galatians. According to the common view, the letter probably falls at the beginning of the apostle's stay in Ephesus (Acts 19:1), and then the year 55 or 56 can be calculated with reasonable certainty. But Hausrath[1)] sets the letter already in the year 53, so that it precedes the Thessalonian letters. He can well do this since Paul had already been in the province of Galatia for the second time on his second missionary journey (Acts 16:6), thus preserving the right of το πρότερον in Gal. 4:13. Then the letter would have been written on the onward journey, before crossing over to Macedonia, possibly in Troas. Naturally, then the conflict of the Judaizers against Paul in the Galatian congregations would have erupted three years earlier. Furthermore, Paul must have revisited the Galatians on his third journey after writing the letter, which would otherwise be omitted. Volkmar [2)] has proposed yet another dating and location for the composition. According to him, the letter was written in Antioch, but in the year 55. He arrives at this conclusion by dismissing Acts 15 from beginning to end as unhistorical. Thus, the Apostolic Council of Gal. 2 would parallel Acts 18:22, as Wieseler [1)], following numerous older predecessors, has recently tried to prove again, and Luke

inserted the Apostolic Council in Acts 15 only to preoccupy the unpleasant discussion of Gal. 2 at an earlier point and then move on. According to this, the Galatians would have been converted before the Apostolic Council, and the letter to them would fall into Paul's two-year stay in Antioch, where Acts 18:23 says, "and having spent some time there, he departed." Such a result, which Volkmar believes to be the only satisfactory one, is vastly different from all previous ones. As strange as this proposition may seem, it can be justified just as well as many others if one completely abandons the historicity of Acts 15 and the parallelization of this piece with Gal. 2, although this is a bold step that only a few would dare to take. It would be less bold to strike out the end of the second and the beginning of the third journey in Acts 18:20-23, as Zeller [2] has done. The exceedingly summary report that takes Paul from Ephesus to Caesarea, Jerusalem, Antioch, Galatia, Phrygia, and back to Ephesus in four verses practically invites this, and the motive of the festival journey in verse 21 [3] clearly reveals the reporter's intent. If this journey through Galatia is omitted and one adheres to the interpretation of το πρότερον in Gal. 4:13, where Paul means two previous presences in Galatia, then the conclusion to the province of Galatia is inescapable, for only there was Paul on his first and second missionary journeys. At the same time, sufficient time now elapses between the apostle's last presence in Galatia and the composition of the letter. Then Paul had turned from Corinth at the end of the second journey to Ephesus and simply stayed there. He had not been in the Galatian congregations for several years, making it easier for the opponents to gain a following, and when the explosion occurred and this was reported to Paul in Ephesus, his astonishment (θαυμάζω 1:6) was all the more justified, as he was not prepared for such a defection. The οὕτως ταχέως in the same verse is not opposed to this, as it is evidently foolish to understand it as denoting only a period of weeks or months. Even if the Galatians had turned from the Pauline gospel to another twenty years after their conversion, it would still have been οὕτως ταχέως, far too early for the apostle's sentiment, let alone if only 2-3 years had passed since he last visited them and rejoiced in their faith. This would be a new view on the dating of the Epistle to the Galatians, and it would be difficult to oppose it more than any other, showing how easy it is, with a little cunning and force, to find a place in Paul's life where the Galatians could have been written. Adding the view of Bleek [1], supported by a significant name, which moves the Epistle to the Galatians closer to the Romans due to its great affinity and suggests it was written in Macedonia or Corinth, then around 59, we get a colorful array of opinions even from recent research on this subject. The appearance of a seemingly unanimous and securely achieved result of previous criticism begins to dissolve, giving way to a darkness only found in disputed Pauline letters.

1) Neutest. Zeitgesch. 1st ed. II. p. 574, 2nd ed. III. p. 13G. Paulus p. 267. — Similarly also Pfleiderer, Urchristenthuro p. 63. — Schenkel has the letter written in Philippi, R e n a n between the 2nd and 3rd journey, cf. Holtzmann, Introduction p. 245.
2) Theol. Zeitschrift aus der Schweiz 1885 p. Ctisq. — Now also Paulus from Damaseus to the Epistle to the Galatians p. 32 IT. See also a review in the above-mentioned journal 1887 p. 279 f.

1) Galatians, p. 553ff. The other representatives of this view are listed in Jleyer's Commentary on Gal. 2, 1.
2) Acts of the Apostles p. 30;$.
3) Tischendorf and the newer editors have of course removed this again, based on NABE vulg. sah. cop. arm. aeth. against DHLP vulg. riemid., syr., but definitely wrongly, since otherwise the motive for the departure from Ephesus is completely missing and the deletion of the reason, which sounds too Jewish, was obvious, cf. Overbeck, Acts p. 299.

1) Introduction to the New Testament 1875 p. 487.

But if one were not to accept this, but to regard the usual setting of the letter as certain and to regard all differing views as the private opinions of individual stubborn people not worth refuting, then one must ask whether there is really so much external and internal probability on the side of this view? As far as the external setting is concerned, it is known that the early church unanimously supported a completely different setting of the letter. As Rückert1) states in his commentary, the opinion that the Epistle to the Galatians was written by Paul in Rome was quite general in the early church, and only much later did the hypothesis emerge which places it in Ephesus and which is now considered the usual one, although it has only gained predominance in the last fifty years or so, primarily through Rückert. But it is precisely in the area of New Testament criticism that such a hypothesis, if not firmly founded, tends to falter after a certain time, and it is a significant sign that researchers from such different directions as Bleek, Hausrath, and Volkmar have again become confused by it and have attempted a new solution, albeit in very different ways.

1) Commentary on Galatians 1833. p. 316.

But as far as the inner quality of the previous view is concerned, it does seem to agree well with the most important facts that are important here. But to the sharper eye it is by no means as solid as it looks. According to this, the process that led to the writing of the letter can be imagined as follows: Paul founded the churches on his second missionary journey[2)] and was received by the Galatians like an angel of the Lord. Even "a physical illness which struck him again at that time and forced him to stay in Galatia did not prevent the Galatians from calling him blessed; indeed, they would have given him all the goods of the earth, except their eyes, willingly and joyfully, if it had been possible."[1)] So beautiful and promising were the early days of these newly founded communities. Then Paul went on to Macedonia and Greece and stayed in Corinth for over a year and a half, from where, after a quick journey via Rphesus to Jerusalem and Antioch, he visited the communities of Asia Minor again and returned to Galatia.[2)] But by then the former beautiful life had already been eaten away by worms. The 2-3 years since the apostle's departure had been used by his opponents to sow weeds among the wheat. The peace treaty at the Apostles' Convention in Jerusalem, which took place before the foundation of the Galatian churches, soon fell apart again when the dormant conflict between Paul and Peter in Antioch resurfaced, which the James party had managed to make acute once again.[3)] Since then, the Judaizers in the Pauline churches had not stopped casting suspicion on the apostle's gospel through appointed and unappointed agitators. And in Galatia they had also succeeded in confusing the churches and turning them against Paul. But the personal presence of the apostle was able to stir up the storm once again and the former good relationship between him and the churches apparently returned. But when Paul left again and his presence was no longer an obstacle, the Judaizers raised their heads even more boldly, and this time with greater success. The Galatians became anxious about their salvation, they also began to fear that only those who observed the Jewish law, as the early apostles in Jerusalem did, would actually share in the Messiah. They began to celebrate the Jewish holidays and Sabbaths[1)], and

they had already reached the point where the demand for circumcision no longer seemed too risky.[2] Then Paul received news of these events on his onward journey to Ephesus or soon after his arrival there, and now he hurled his appeal to the Galatians against these enemies, a missile of such force and effect that the opponents had to give way and the congregations returned to obedience to the Pauline gospel. From then on they remained on the right path and Paul continued to count them among his faithful followers and was also able to arrange for the regular collection of the collection money from them[3], which he was accustomed to collect for Jerusalem in his congregations, according to the agreement he had once made with the original apostles.[4]

2) Acts 16, 6.

1) Gal 4,13-15
2) Act. 18, 23.
3) Gal. 2, 11 ff.

1) Gal. 4, 10.
2) Gal. 5, 2. 3. 6, 12.
3) I Cor. 16, 1.
4) Gal. 2, 10.

That is how things went, if recent research is on the right track. But even if such a description, especially when it is well told and presented in vivid colors, has a lot to offer, the unbiased eye soon sees the gaping joints in the apparently well-built wall. First of all, what is said about the founding of the Galatian churches is more than doubtful. The Acts of the Apostles, no matter how hard one presses its words, actually says nothing about such a church being founded on the second missionary journey. Rather, passage 16:1-8 shows us the apostle on a renewed visit to the churches founded on the first journey in Derbe and Lystra, then he makes various attempts to descend to the province of Asia, i.e. Ephesus, to begin his work there, but the Spirit does not allow him to do so. For the Spirit wants him to go over to Macedonia, and therefore he forbids him from staying any longer in Asia Minor and calls him, through the face of the Macedonian man, to cross over to Europe, which Paul then does. So nothing is actually said about the founding of Galatian communities, and even if at the beginning of the third journey (18:23) Paul travels through Galatia and Phrygia and strengthens the brothers there, we have seen earlier that this is more likely to be understood as referring to the communities of the Galatian province, the founding of which Luke reported in such detail during the first missionary journey. One must actually suspect that the Acts of the Apostles had malicious intent in order to overcome this gap in the story, as the modern critical school assumes that the mediator Luke glided over the volcanic soil of Galatia, which witnessed the mighty struggles of the apostolic prehistoric times, as quickly and quietly as possible. But can one find confirmation of what the Acts of the Apostles reports here in Paul's words in the Epistle to the Galatians (4:13) οιδατε δέ δτι δι' ασ&ενειαν τής σαρχδς εύηγγελισάαην όμΐν τδ πρότερον, you know that I preached the

gospel to you the previous time because of illness. That is to say, Paul actually did not want to stay in Galatia, as the Acts of the Apostles reports, but then he was compelled to stay because of an attack of his peculiar physical ailment, which is often explained from this passage as a type of epilepsy, and he then used this involuntary stay to convert the countryside. Certainly a very remarkable consequence of an attack of illness!

What otherwise requires the highest physical and mental energy—namely, the initial conversion of a foreign people to Christianity in an extensive region with several main cities but no common center—Paul is said to have undertaken and completed casually and due to illness. That would indeed be a striking illustration of his words: "When I am weak, then I am strong,"[1)] if it were even conceivable in itself. And then this does not even align with the Acts of the Apostles. The "Spirit" prevented Paul from preaching there—was this the spirit of illness? Perhaps the angel of Satan that struck him with his fists?[1)] Rather, it is the Spirit of Jesus, as explicitly stated in verse 7, who directed him, as often, through a vision, to Troas and Macedonia and did not want him to stay longer in Asia Minor. The whole notion of the improvised conversion of the Galatians is such that one can only shake one's head at it. Moreover, the phrase δι᾽ ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν τὸ πρότερον is so brief and unclear that it is a true art to read into it what one seeks. If he at least said, "Because of illness, I was forced to stay with you, and then I preached to you." But "because of illness I preached to you" is such a brachylogy that no one can understand it, except the Galatians themselves, if indeed the situation was so and was easily remembered by them. Therefore, a whole series of interpreters from Chrysostom, Luther, and Calvin to Rückert, Olshausen, and Ewald have not shied away from the philological heresy of translating it as "under bodily weakness," as the Vulgate also has: per infirmitatem, which definitely gives a better sense and is not so grammatically impossible if one considers the worn-down character of later Greek, the influence of Latin, and analogies like διὰ νύκτα, διὰ χειμῶνα,[2)] meaning "through the night," "through the winter." If, however, grammar absolutely opposes it, then the conjecture δι᾽ ἀσθενείας would be more plausible than exegetical nonsense. If the passage is understood this way, the strange reason for Paul's stay in Galatia disappears, and everything becomes more comprehensible. In the passage of the Acts of the Apostles, we then have just a recapitulation of what was previously said: Paul and his companions, having traversed Galatia and Phrygia, wanted to speak the word in Asia, but the Spirit prevented them, and after experiencing the same in Bithynia, they went down to Troas, bypassing Mysia.

1) II Cor. 12, 10.
1) II Cor. 12, 7.
2) S. Meyer-Sieffert in his Commentary 7.11 4, 13. The example for 8(4 yc(|xwva, which he quotes from Xenophon Anal. I, 7. 0, however, does not fit here, as it says: because of the winter cold. The correct answer is given by W i n e r in the Commentary, namely Aristot. mirab. auscult. 68.

No, things are better on one point that is far more important, namely the idea of the agitation in Galatia and the reason for the letter. So when Paul came for the second time, he found the ground already undermined, but he still managed to prevent the apostasy. But he had hardly left when the movement broke out. It is almost reminiscent of a schoolroom full of naughty boys who still pull themselves together to some extent as long as the teacher is there, but as soon as he has closed the door, the spectacle begins. But the Galatian churches are not schoolrooms and Paul is not a schoolmaster of Bakel, despite 1 Cor. 4:21. And if that is wonderful, then what follows is even more so, namely that Paul is said to have achieved through a letter what he could not have achieved had he been there himself, namely to bring the movement to a standstill and to bring the Galatians to repentance. This reminds us of a case which recent criticism has not failed to exploit to the full, namely the circumstances of the composition of the First Epistle to Timothy. It is found to be extremely strange that, according to 1:3, Paul went from Ephesus to Macedonia and left Timothy behind in order to write to him what he could have better told him beforehand himself.1) Well, exactly the same case is made, without even thinking about it, in the Epistle to the Galatians. If Paul personally was so unable to overcome his opponents in Galatia that apostasy broke out immediately after his departure, he could not do it by means of a letter either, even if it were as energetic and powerful as our Epistle to the Galatians. One could indeed appeal to the word αί έπιστυλαΐ μέν βαρεΐαι xal Ισ/υραΙ, ή δε παρουσία τοΰ σώματος ασθενή» χαΐ ό λόγος έξουΟενημενος[1)], which would then receive a completely unexpected and strange illumination. But let us stick to what is naturally conceivable. The man who with his person and his word opened up half the world to Christianity may well have been a good letter writer, but he must have possessed in person and orally a far greater power than any written word possesses. Otherwise he would not have achieved what he did. The words quoted refer rather only to the impression of the physical appearance and the outward appearance of the speech. Either Paul achieved nothing with his oral warnings among the Old Testament people at that time, and in that case his letter was even less successful in reversing the seduction of the Judaists, or if the letter was able to do that, then Paul himself was certainly able to do it much better. But the fact that he personally found everything calm and then, after his departure, the fire broke out in a blazing blaze, but that he extinguished it with a letter "while still on the journey to Ephesus or soon after his arrival there", is something that one can only find unbelievable.

1) See Holtzinann, Umleitung 188(5 p. 316.
1) II Cor. 10, 10.

The more one examines the circumstances of the writing of the Epistle to the Galatians, the more incomprehensible they become. According to the critics, everything is in perfect order. But appearances are deceptive; deep cracks are hidden beneath the smooth surface, and it only takes a gentle tap to make them gape. The question then arises: does the letter even belong in the situation in which it has been placed so far, or, if it cannot be explained by this, in which other should it be placed? Would a mere correction of the usual view perhaps suffice? Setting the letter in Troas and in the second journey, as Hausrath suggests, would not change the matter, for the period between the apostle's second visit to Galatia and the writing of the letter is

just as short. It would seem more helpful if the letter had been written in Macedonia with de W e t t e or in Corinth with B l e e k. The deletion of the beginning of the third journey, as suggested above, would also improve the situation somewhat, as the period between Acts 16:1 IT and 19:1 would then remain open, in which many things may have happened. But it is not just a question of this point and the discovery of a palliative. It is not just the circumstances of the composition that must be taken into account, but also the entire content of the letter, and this requires a further examination, particularly of the relationship to the Epistle to the Romans.

Third Chapter,

The doctrinal part of the letter: the relationship to the Epistle to the Romans.

Dogmatic explanations can be found in the Epistle to the Galatians in several places, but especially in a connected section 3, 1-4,7. This will first have to be subjected to careful consideration.

It is recognized and cannot be doubted that the core of the teaching in the Epistle to the Galatians is the same as in the other main letters of the apostle. The discussion of the possession, of the flesh and the effect of the commandment on it, of sin and redemption through the grace of God in the death of Christ, of the reception of the Spirit, as well as everything connected with these key points of Pauline theology, bears the unmistakable character of the most pronounced Paulinism, which is contained in this fundamental sharpness only in the main epistles. Indeed, the expression of the doctrine in the Epistle to the Galatians is explained by some as being relatively purer and more original than the more mild and irenic one in the Epistle to the Romans, or also, which is related to this, as being even rougher and less mature compared to the internally more developed and perfected doctrine of the latter epistle.1) The Epistle to the Galatians would then present us with the first, still completely untouched and fresh appearance of this dogmatic system, the purest source from which it can be drawn.

1) Vgl. Ludemann,, Anthropologie des Paulus, S. 17111'. 19-S.

Now, according to general opinion, the dogmatic explanation in the Epistle to the Galatians is most similar to that in the Epistle to the Romans. In the two Epistles to the Corinthians, dogmatic passages are only occasionally found and none that, as here, explain the basis of the doctrine in principle and in context. The question therefore arises as to how the relevant part of the Epistle to the Galatians relates to that of the Epistle to the Romans. According to the usual view, the relationship between the former and the latter would be that of outline to implementation. There is no doubt that the same ideas are presented in more detail and in more detail in the Epistle to the Romans than in the Epistle to the Galatians, but the question of whether the latter contains a shorter first draft of the more fully developed system of the former, or whether the relationship is somehow different, has not yet been decided. A shorter piece that has more or less the same content as a longer piece can relate to it like a draft to the execution, but also like an excerpt to a more detailed original. Which of the two relationships applies in our case will have to be determined by investigation. The main thing to look for is whether all the main ideas in the shorter original are really closely and firmly connected, and indeed in a sharp brevity, but still flowing from one piece. A sign of the opposite relationship would be if the connection in the Galatians sometimes appeared to be broken, if the train of thought made unexpected leaps, if

turns of phrase and expressions suddenly appeared that were not quite firmly integrated into the success, but could only be explained by certain parts of the original. These signs should therefore be observed.

52

Now, according to general opinion, the dogmatic presentation in the Epistle to the Galatians is most similar to that in the Epistle to the Romans. In the two Epistles to the Corinthians, dogmatic passages are only occasionally found and none that, as here, explain the basis of the doctrine in principle and in context. The question therefore arises as to how the relevant part of the Epistle to the Galatians relates to that of the Epistle to the Romans. According to the usual view, the relationship between the former and the latter would be that of outline to implementation. There is no doubt that the same ideas are presented in more detail and in more detail in the Epistle to the Romans than in the Epistle to the Galatians, but the question of whether the latter contains a shorter first draft of the more fully developed system of the former, or whether the relationship is somehow different, has not yet been decided. A shorter piece that has more or less the same content as a longer piece can relate to it like a draft to the execution, but also like an excerpt to a more detailed original. Which of the two relationships applies in our case will have to be determined by investigation. The main thing to look for is whether all the main ideas in the shorter original are really closely and firmly connected, and indeed in a sharp brevity, but still flowing from one piece. A sign of the opposite relationship would be if the connection in the Galatians sometimes appeared to be broken, if the train of thought made unexpected leaps, if turns of phrase and expressions suddenly appeared that were not quite firmly integrated into the success, but could only be explained by certain parts of the original. These signs should therefore be observed.

The validity of this Scripture is now demonstrated by further reasons which dispel the foreseeable objection as to what the law, which was also given by God, is all about. First of all, the law is not the original law of God. Rather, the promises were made to Abraham and his seed, i.e. Christ. A decree of the will which has been legally issued by God cannot be rendered ineffective by something which has come later, much less than a legally valid decree of the will of a human being can be subsequently revoked or supplemented. Likewise, God's decree of the will to Abraham could not have been revoked by the law which came 430 years later, so that the promise would have been void. Otherwise the right to inherit would come from the law, not from the promise. But God gave Abraham a promise (vv. 15-18). The law must therefore have a different meaning; it was only added provisionally because of transgressions until the seed to whom the promise applies came. For this reason it is communicated differently than the promise, not directly by God, but by angels with the help of an intermediary. An intermediary is the representative of a majority. But God is one, so the law did not come directly from God (vv. 10, 20). On the other hand, the law is not contrary to God's promises, because righteousness could in and of itself come from the law, if only the law had the power to create life. But according to Scripture, everything should be locked under sin, so that the promise is given to believers through faith. The law was therefore our barrier until faith should be revealed. At that time we were like a child under a guardian, but now faith has come, the atonement, as an adult,

is no longer under the guard. You are all now sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus. All who are baptized into Christ have put on Christ, and thereby all distinctions among people are abolished. You are all one in Christ Jesus. And if you are Christ's, then you are also Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise (vv. 21-20). But this also ensures the possession of full salvation. As long as the heir is still a child, he is no different from a slave in terms of possession, but "divides between guardians and caretakers," for as long as the father determines. 8o We too, when we were still in the religious childlike state, were slaves of the heavenly spirits of the world. When the time was full, God sent his Son, born of consecration and subject to the law, so that he might redeem those who were under the law and we might be made sons. Since we are sons, God sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, who calls, Abba, Father. So that you are no longer a slave, but a son, and as such also an heir because of God (4:1-7).

54

If we look at this long section of doctrinal discussion, we will not say that it suffers from incoherence. Rather, there is a basic idea that runs through the whole and that all individual turns of argument serve, the internal justification of the law-free Pauline gospel in contrast to the gospel of the Judaists, which appeals to the Old Testament. The position that the law has in God's plan of salvation is investigated according to Scripture and the result is that according to this highest authority of Jewish Christianity itself, the role of the law has now been played out and new powers of God are to complete the work of salvation. Insofar as the section develops this and related ideas, there is nothing to be said against its Pauline character; the very similarity of the actual ideas with what is otherwise contained in the main letters unmistakably testifies to the same line of thought. But it is another question whether this piece is really original or just a copy, whether the ideas here are carried out by the hand of the author or by that of someone else who, while he has the same view, is based on an existing model. If the latter is the case, then cracks in the structure of thought will inevitably appear in some places, which will be obvious to the attentive reader, but which are immediately explained when the more complete version is held up next to it.

55

A first such gap is found between 3.5 and 6. At the beginning of the discussion, the reception of the Spirit with its wonderful miraculous powers is cited as proof for the truth of the Pauline gospel of faith1). How then does the example of Abraham suddenly come in here, introduced without any preparation with a καθὼς, whose connection to the preceding must first be sought? One could say that following the proof by actions now comes the complementary proof by scripture. However, the manner of linkage is too abrupt, as is evident from the fact that interpreters go to great lengths to establish a proper connection here. Meyer-Sieffert establishes the connection thus: to the question 'by works of the law or by hearing of faith' (v. 5), the self-evident answer is 'by hearing of faith.' Paul links to this assumed answer the words known to the readers from Gen. 15:6 about Abraham's righteousness through faith. The logical justification for this connection does not rest on (as Meyer wanted) the fact that Paul has just

cited the effects of the Spirit caused by the preaching of faith as the moment proving the justifying power of faith, for justification (as Sieffert rightly notes) is not mentioned at all in the preceding, but rather that Paul in the following considers justification by faith only as a prerequisite for the reception of the Spirit grounded in faith (v. 14). However, in the following, it is only occasionally about the reception of the Spirit, but primarily about the significance of the law, which is closely related to the justification that Abraham received through faith. We search in vain in Sieffert's argument for an explanation for the abrupt appearance of Abraham's example. The assumption that this was known to the Galatians is only presupposed; Paul had no reason to use this example more frequently in his oral proclamation before the rise of the Judaistic agitation. Conversely, when Holsten determines the connection such that Paul, with v. 5, has brought the Galatians' self-experience into a form that he can equate with Abraham's experience, that key figure through whom God's will for salvation was first realized for all time, it gives a rough connection of the two thoughts, but it is still not quite clear how the second thought can so abruptly follow the first. Therefore, others, like Hilgenfeld, have preferred to relate the καθὼς to the following, and to think that the Apostle meant to write: just as Abraham's faith was credited as righteousness, so too are the believers his sons. But this makes v. 6 an anacoluthon, and the connection with v. 7 is then even more difficult. It is better to acknowledge with de Wette that here not only a rapid transition but also a jump occurs, as the previous passage speaks of receiving the Spirit, and here of justification. But whence this jump, given that the calm tone of discussion prevailing here provides no basis for it? The difficulty is resolved when we look at the Epistle to the Romans. There, the exposition of the scriptural proof for justification by faith begins with the example of Abraham in 4:1, where what is said sporadically and abruptly in the Epistle to the Galatians is presented in a broader and more careful exposition, and the scripture from Gen. 15:6 is properly interpreted and used. Assuming the Epistle to the Romans was written before the Epistle to the Galatians, there would be no doubt that the passage in the Epistle to the Galatians derives its light from it. This is only denied because the relationship is usually thought of in reverse, but this habit is not a valid counterargument.

> 1) ἑ; τλοή; πίστεως I summarize uueh Ui.ilogy of Rinn. 10. 10. 17. 1 Thess. 2, 13 as faith preached (gen. obj.). I can't hear of a "πνεύμα εκ πιανεως" and nothing else.

Also, the connection between verses 6 and 7 is difficult to understand. That a person is justified by faith is shown by the example of Abraham, so (ἄρα) those who are justified by faith are sons of Abraham. It is obviously a side thought that intervenes here and leads away from the main idea. This is not uncommon in Paul's writings, and here the side thought indirectly serves the main idea. Nevertheless, one cannot ignore the observation that Romans 4:11-25 might also be in the background, where the connection is once again better and clearer. In this section of the Epistle to the Romans, the complete train of thought is given, of which only fragments are hinted at here, although each of the two expositions has its own particularities. Thus, here in the Epistle to the Galatians, verse 8 uses the passage from Genesis 12:3, "in you all the nations will be blessed," which is not used in the Epistle to the Romans. However, Romans 4:16, where

Abraham is called the father of us all, not only of those who follow the law but also of those who follow faith, contains the same idea in a slightly different form.

57

ζατάραν είσίν in verse 10. The proof that all those who are under the law are under the curse is drawn from Deuteronomy 27:26. However, the fact that no one follows the law is merely assumed here, while the evidence for this can be read extensively in the Epistle to the Romans. For this is indeed the content of Romans chapter 2 and is summarized in the words of Romans 3:20: by the works of the law, no flesh will be justified before Him. Here in the Epistle to the Galatians, the proof for this in verse 11 is only referenced from Habakkuk 2:4, "the righteous will live by faith," which is used in a much more natural context in Romans 1:17. Similarly, the next sentence in verse 12: "the law is not of faith, but 'the one who does them shall live by them,'" is used in Romans 10:5, both times quoting from Leviticus 18:5, only this time the inappropriate plural αυτά — έν αυτοίς is also taken from the source text.

Without transition, verse 13 returns to the idea that Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law. According to Sieffert, the connection should be: no one is justified by the law, Christ has redeemed us from the curse, and the asyndeton makes the contrast more forceful. However, verse 13 is much more connected to verse 10, where it is said that those under the law are under the curse. And here, the curse that Christ took upon Himself on the cross nullifies this curse of the law, forming the progression of thought. The proof that the crucified one bore the curse is provided through the citation of Deuteronomy 21:23. This is another form of the thought in Romans 3:25, where Christ is presented as the atoning sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins. The debate among commentators (Sieffert against Rückert) about whether verse 13 should be connected with verse 12 or verse 10 again proves that the structure must be rather loose. However, in verse 14, the line of thought returns to the example of Abraham and his blessing, which is inherited by the Gentiles, thus connecting with verse 9. Furthermore, by resuming the promise of the Spirit, it also reconnects with the opening section, verses 1-5, allowing the argumentation to progress further.

58

Now follows the discussion about the role of the law in the divine plan of salvation. Just as Paul speaks in a human manner in Romans 3:5 to make his thoughts clearer, so he also uses a human analogy here, κατά ἄνθρωπον, to make the following understandable to his readers. A person's legally binding will remains unalterable over time. Shouldn't God's decree be just as binding? God gave promises to Abraham, meaning He already revealed to him the salvation that would later be revealed in Christ and declared him righteous because of his faith. Here, another side thought comes in: the promise was given to Abraham and his seed. The singular σπέρμα refers to Christ (v. 16). This is a unique use of this scripture; not only is the seed simply referred to the descendants of Abraham in Romans 4:13-14, but also in our section itself in verse 29, the same more natural interpretation returns, άρα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ σπέρμα ἐστέ, where no plural σπέρματα is required. Thus, it is clear that this in verse 16 is to be recognized as a side thought that forcefully intrudes upon the author and is used by him because it serves the main

purpose of the argumentation. The progression of our section will bring more such peculiarities. Verse 17 then gives the application of the analogy started in verse 15: the law appeared 430 years after the promise given by God to Abraham, and thus cannot annul or amend it. It would indeed be such a change if the inheritance of salvation were connected with the law; then the promise would be nullified (v. 18), the same thought expressed in Romans 4:14: "If those who depend on the law are heirs, faith means nothing and the promise is worthless." But if the law cannot be given to annul or amend the promise, what is its purpose, why was it added? Verse 19 answers first with the phrase τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη, which in its brevity has given interpreters much trouble. One can indeed read quite the opposite out of it. A whole series of exegetes, from Jerome and Chrysostom to Rückert, Baur, de Wette, Ewald, and others, understand the phrase to mean that the law was supposed to temporarily restrain transgressions. Others, like Augustine and Calvin, interpret it to mean that it was supposed to bring transgressions to recognition. On the other hand, most modern scholars, Meyer, Sieffert, Holmann, as well as Pfleiderer and Holsten, understand the phrase to mean the opposite: the law was given to increase sin into conscious transgression, thus "for the sake of transgressions," if one translates literally. Pfleiderer,1) for instance, calls the other interpretation a "serious misunderstanding" that is neither compatible with the overall Pauline teaching nor with the linguistic expression here. These interpreters are certainly on the right track, but while agreeing with them, the other interpretation is also understandable. Who could indeed understand this Pauline thought here, which is not prepared for in the rest of the context and is only briefly mentioned, if one did not know the corresponding view of the Apostle from the Epistle to the Romans? There, indeed, sufficient clarity is found about this Pauline thought; in Romans 4:15, the interplay of law and transgression is expressed with the words: "where there is no law, there is no transgression," and in Romans 5:20, the addition of the law to the revealed will of God is described with the words: "the law was brought in so that the trespass might increase." There it can be understood because it is clearly and unambiguously expressed. But since the Galatians could not use the aid of the Epistle to the Romans to understand the letter sent to them, Paul should have explained the matter more clearly to them, or one is led to assume that the Epistle to the Galatians is modeled after the Epistle to the Romans.

1) Paulinism p. 80 note.

The discussed sentence once again finds its origins in the Epistle to the Romans. In contrast, the subsequent argumentation is unique to the Epistle to the Galatians: the law was ordained through angels, by the hand of a mediator, etc. Nowhere else in Paul's writings is there any trace that angels were involved in the enactment of the law. However, our passage aligns with Acts 7:53 and Hebrews 2:2, where the mediation of the law by angels is also testified. Equally unique is the argumentation with the μεσίτης (mediator) in verse 20. We do not need to survey the endless array of interpretations of this passage; we accept the interpretation that it is meant to say something that lowers the status of the law, formally attributing it a lesser dignity compared to the revelation of the promises, which came directly from God. The simplest explanation, put forth by Klöpper1), clarifies the thought and expression: a mediator is not

required by one, but by a plurality; the law was communicated through a mediator, Moses, indicating that behind the law is not a unity, God, but a plurality, the angels. Thus, this peculiar thought serves the same purpose as the mention of the angels: to present the law as not equal to the promise. However, to prevent this inferiority from becoming a complete opposition, the question "is the law then contrary to the promises of God?" is negated (v. 21), and it is stated that the law could indeed produce righteousness if it only had the power to give life, a thought more clearly developed in Romans 7:12ff. Suddenly, the argument transitions again to the contrast: according to the scripture, everything had to be confined under sin so that the promise might be given to believers through faith in Jesus Christ. Here, two different thoughts seem to be combined into a new unity. The first clause, "everything was confined under sin," requires a concluding clause like the one found in Romans 11:32: "God has bound everyone over to disobedience so that he may have mercy on them all." The second clause, "that the promise might be given to those who believe," resumes the thought previously developed in verses 9 and 14, that the promise to Abraham was intended for and fulfilled in those who seek salvation through faith.

1) Already initiated by Schultlhess, Caspari, Vogel, see Meyer in the Commentar.

61

The law is now assigned its position in the divine economy of salvation, as it is compared to a παιδαγωγός (tutor), a household servant who guards and protects the growing son of the house from harm. This idea is not foreign to the Epistle to the Romans, as the law is a commandment unto life (Romans 7:10), and the Jew has from the law a guidance that fills him with the belief that he is a guide of the blind (Romans 2:19). The analogy is also similar to the one in Romans 7:1-6, where the annulment of the law is illustrated by the ending of the marital law with the death of the husband. Specifically, 1 Corinthians 4:15 can also be compared, where Paul calls out to the Corinthians, "even though you have ten thousand guardians in Christ, you do not have many fathers." The image of the παιδαγωγός immediately has an unexpected consequence in our section. Since it suggests that Christians are now sons of God, this is explicitly stated, and further, the equality of Christians among each other is connected to this, which has essentially abolished all former distinctions (verses 26-28). This idea has only an external and incidental connection with the rest; it is not clear why Paul comes to this idea here unless external reasons lead to it. Verse 27 seems to be composed directly from two verses of the Epistle to the Romans. The first clause, "For all of you who were baptized into Christ," corresponds to Romans 6:3, "all of us who were baptized into Christ Jesus," and the main clause, "have clothed yourselves with Christ," has its parallel in Romans 13:14, "clothe yourselves with the Lord Jesus Christ." Verse 28 is similarly closely related to 1 Corinthians 12:13: "For we were all baptized by one Spirit so as to form one body—whether Jews or Gentiles, slave or free." This parallel also shows the connection of this thought with the other, being baptized into Christ. The apostle could well have used similar expressions and sentences in different places, each time in a different context. But when, as in this case, the structure of such a passage is loose and lacks the internal necessity that required these individual thoughts here, suspicion arises that the passage is a combination of elements borrowed from elsewhere into a new whole, which then only loosely fits together. It cannot be denied that the connection

of these individual thoughts here is far less intimate than in the respective places in the other letters. In Romans 6:3, being baptized into Christ is well developed: whoever is baptized into Christ is baptized into his death and should consider themselves dead to sin. The image of immersion fits the burial of Christ. Similarly, in Romans 13:14, the "clothe yourselves" is motivated by the context, where the phrase "put on the armor of light" (verse 12) leads to the all-encompassing exhortation: "clothe yourselves with the Lord Jesus Christ." In our passage, however, baptism and putting on Christ are equated, but the image remains forced and does not fully materialize. The statement about the equality of people in Christ is much better placed in 1 Corinthians 12:13, in the context of the explanation that the body is a unity of many parts, and so is Christ. In our passage in Galatians, it is a rather unnecessary side thought since the context deals with the significance of the law, not the differences within Christianity. Verse 29 returns to this by showing that being in Christ implies being Abraham's seed and thus the heirs of the promise. This is the same thought already mentioned in verses 9 and 14. But here again, it is the Epistle to the Romans (9:7ff) that provides the full explanation of this thought, distinguishing between Abraham's descendants by the flesh and those by the promise.

63

The concept of κληρονόμος (heir) that is introduced here gives rise to a new illustration of the contrast between the time under the law and the present time, similar to the analogy of the irrevocable testament (v. 15) and the παιδαγωγός (v. 24), which highlights the turning point that occurred with Christ. As long as the heir is a child, he is indeed the lord of all the goods, but he does not exercise this power and is under guardians and managers, so in terms of freedom, he does not differ from a slave (4:1-2). This analogy is particularly faulty. Firstly, it is an unfortunate thought that man is God's "heir," like someone whose father has died and who is temporarily under guardians and managers, inheriting his father's estate. This has led to long disputes among interpreters about whether Paul envisions the father as dead or still alive. In this dispute, the former view is likely preferable, as the terms ἐπίτροποι and οἰκονόμοι correspond exactly to the expressions of Roman law in such a case. But with the phrase "until the time set by his father," the author falls out of the analogy, as adulthood occurred at a certain age and not by the father's decree. This is because the interpretation shines through the analogy, as it can be well said of God that He prescribed a specific time for humanity until their maturity, which began with the appearance of Christ. However, a somewhat imperfect analogy on its own would not be striking. But the whole analogy of the immature heir transitions into another one: that Christ redeemed those under the law so that they might receive adoption as sons (v. 5). This redemption fits only with the state of bondage, while at the beginning the state of childhood was presupposed, which, however, in the age of immaturity, had no advantage over the state of bondage. Thus, a mixing of two different comparisons occurs, and this is again most easily explained from the Epistle to the Romans. In Romans 8:14-17, the difference between the state of childhood and bondage is clearly and consistently developed. It says, "You have not received a spirit of bondage again to fear, but a Spirit of adoption, by whom we cry out, 'Abba, Father.'" The proof that this section of the Epistle to the Romans is in view here is provided by the literal correspondence of v. 6, "we cry, 'Abba, Father,'" with Romans 8:15, "by whom we cry out, 'Abba, Father,'" and further by what follows: the transition from slave to son and heir, as in Romans 8:14 "sons of God," v. 15 "spirit of bondage" and "adoption," v. 17 "if children, then heirs." And if

Galatians 4:7, "and since you are a son, then an heir through God," as read by modern editors, suffers from obscurity, the parallel in the same verse of the Epistle to the Romans is all the clearer: "heirs of God and co-heirs with Christ." What remains of our section, namely v. 4: "God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under the law," at least has a factual parallel in Romans 1:3, "concerning his Son, who was descended from David according to the flesh."

65

This entire lengthy section of dogmatic exposition shows that its content is based on the same ideas that are elaborated in the Epistle to the Romans. However, in form, the structure is often strange, and the connections are interrupted by jumps. Whenever there is such a gap, which interpreters bridge with much skill and effort, a glance at the Epistle to the Romans provides the desired clarification. Shouldn't this be a sign that the author, whether Paul or another, already had the coherent presentation of the Epistle to the Romans available and that he leaned on it? Yet, there are other passages in our letter where the same observation can be made. This includes the famous passage 2:11-21, the so-called speech of Paul to Peter in Antioch. It has its great, undeniable difficulties, and interpreters are still divided over its interpretation. First, there is the difficulty of whether this entire section is still considered as Paul's speech to Peter, or as an independent dogmatic exposition. According to one view (recently represented again by Hofmann and Wieseler), only verse 14 is directed at Peter, while the following verses are addressed to the Galatians. The other view, which currently holds the majority, sees everything up to verse 21 as spoken to Peter. A third, mediating view has Paul turning to the Galatians at various points: some say with verse 16, others with verse 17, and yet others with verse 18. This great variety of opinions on such a seemingly simple matter is thought-provoking. On one hand, the section is indeed a dogmatic program, to which the following from 3:1 onwards relates as the elaboration, and it is hard to think that Paul should have actually spoken these words to Peter. The historical situation is entirely abandoned, and we receive no report on how Peter received this rebuke and what followed. On the other hand, verse 14 is undoubtedly addressed to Peter, and there is no formula in the subsequent text that excludes this notion until the address in 3:1, "O foolish Galatians." With some goodwill, one can also see in verses 18 and especially in verse 19 a specific reference to the starting point, the conflict in Antioch, and relate "I make myself a transgressor" to Peter, who indeed did what is mentioned before: "If I rebuild what I tore down," as he first lived without the law but then reestablished the legal barrier. In this approximate balance of reasons and counter-reasons, the middle way taken by Usteri[1)] still seems the most satisfying: that Paul, "through the theoretical discussion of the principles that completely filled him, in his liveliness, was led away from the historical starting point and seems to have completely forgotten it by the end." However, this also admits that the whole section is not properly and precisely connected with the previous text, that we do not have work from a single mold, nor consistent development from a historical situation. The question arises whether a more complete and better explanation for this phenomenon can be found than simply saying that Paul forgot himself here.

1) In the Pauline teaching and from this in the commentary on 2, 15.

66

The echoes of the Epistle to the Romans are numerous enough here as well. The designation of Jews as righteous and Gentiles as sinners corresponds to the extensive depiction in Romans 1 and 2. The great principle (v. 16) "a person is not justified by works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ" is almost expressed in the same words in Romans 3:20-22 and 28, only there the more detailed exposition of both elements of the contrast makes the principle unmistakably and clearly stand out. Here, the unfortunate phrase with the ἐάν μή makes the thought doubtful again. According to Holsten, Lipsius, Pfleiderer, and others, this means that a person is not justified by works if they are not justified by faith. Paul is said to express this in the sense of Peter and initially attributes a contributory role to works for salvation, only to then carry Peter along to the full height of the principle of faith alone through masterful dialectics. However, most interpreters take the ἐάν μή here much more simply, by thinking, instead of completing the second clause with ἐξ ἔργων νόμου δικαιοῦται, merely to repeat the verbal concept δικαιοῦται, so that the meaning becomes the same as in 3:11 and Romans 3:28: a person is not justified by works, but only by faith. A similar ἐάν μή is found in 1:7, where the meaning is also: only that some are, etc. Thus understood, the parallel to the Epistle to the Romans is unmistakable.

67

The thought that now enters in verse 17:εί δέ ζητούντες δικαιωθήναι έν Χριστφ εύρέθημεν καί αύτοί άμαρτωλοΐ άρα[1)] Χριστές άμαρ-τιάς δια'κονος; μή γένοιτο, [= "But if, while seeking to be justified in Christ, we ourselves have also been found to be sinners, is Christ then a minister of sin? May it never be!"] can indeed be somewhat related to the incident in Antioch if translated, as most modern interpreters (see Meyer) do: "But if, while we sought to be justified in Christ, we ourselves were also found to be sinners, is Christ then a servant of sin? May it never be!" Then, the "being found as sinners" is the expression of the Jewish Christians for the freedom from observing the law, which they had observed in Paul and, to their dismay, also in Peter. But it does not quite fit. What does the "also" (καί) mean? It does not fit at all. It is better to take the sentence generally, in the manner of conditional sentences that describe a condition as unreal.[1)] When Meyer-Sieffert objects that it is arbitrary to supplement the clause with dv ήν instead of έστίν, this is not valid. In 1 Corinthians 12:19, there is a similarly constructed conditional sentence where the αv of the subordinate clause is absorbed in the question: "If they were all one member, where would the body be?" which no one has translated otherwise than: "But if all were one member, where would the body be?" Thus, here too, it should be translated: "But if, while we seek to be justified in Christ, we ourselves were found to be sinners[2)], is Christ then a minister of sin? May it never be!" Here we have nothing other than the thought Paul expresses in the Epistle to the Romans, only clearer and more complete, namely Romans 6:1, 15: "Shall we continue in sin so that grace may increase? Shall we sin because we are not under the law but under grace?" Both times, as in our passage, this possibility is indignantly rejected: "May it never be!" Thus, the sentence here is one of the elements in Paul's argument about sin, grace, and the law, which reappears in the Epistle to the Galatians, adapted to the situation but actually only expressing a general thought and not necessarily related to the specific incident.

1) I read with Lachmann ἀρα not ἀρα, but retaining the question (see Buttmann, N. T. Grammatik p. 213).

mit Lachmann ἄρα nicht ἀρα,

1) See Winer, Grammar §41. 2d.
2) As with others, Winer also translates, Grammar § G5. 8.

68

It is similar with verse 18: "If I rebuild what I have torn down, I prove myself to be a transgressor." What is the object of κατέλυσα (torn down)? For most, it is the law; for Holsten and others, however, it is justification in Christ; for Wieseler, even sin. The context here is so unclear. Given the expressions χαταλύειν (to tear down) and οίχοδομεῖν (to build up), it certainly points to nothing other than the law, the obstructive wall that the free Christian has dismantled, and by rebuilding it, he would declare this act of his to be a desecration of the sacred. But one can only understand this from the entire context of Pauline thoughts as they appear in the Epistle to the Romans, and how, following Romans chapters 6 and 7, these thoughts are taken up more clearly, with the results of the detailed discussion there summarized here in a few sentences. "For through the law, I died to the law, so that I might live to God" (v. 19), this is the summary of the statements: "We died to sin; how can we live in it any longer?" (Romans 6:2), "I was once alive apart from the law, but when the commandment came, sin sprang to life and I died, and the commandment that was intended to bring life actually brought death" (Romans 7:9-10), "you also died to the law through the body of Christ" (Romans 7:4). Furthermore: "I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me" (v. 20) corresponds to the statements: "Our old self was crucified with him" (Romans 6:6), "if we died with Christ, we believe that we will also live with him" (Romans 6:8). And the conclusion: "the life I now live in the body, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me" (v. 20), has its counterpart in 2 Corinthians 5:15, "he died for all, that those who live should no longer live for themselves but for him who died for them and was raised again." Thus, the dogmatic exposition arrives at the conclusion, which is now extensively explained to the Galatians in the following argument: "I do not nullify the grace of God, for if righteousness were through the law, then Christ died for no purpose," with the bitter δωρεάν (for nothing) providing a sharp contrast to the other δωρεάν (freely) in Romans 3:24, which denotes God's grace: "and all are justified freely by his grace through the redemption that came by Christ Jesus."

70

If these two main sections of dogmatic discussion, Galatians 3:1-4:7 and 2:15-21, are hardly understandable without constant reference to the Epistle to the Romans and partially also the Corinthian letters, the same is true for the last part of the letter. In the section that transitions from the dogmatic to the paranetical part (4:8-5:12), we only highlight the detailed comparison between Abraham's two sons from the mothers Sarah and Hagar (4:21-31). There are many

peculiarities contained therein, but the basis of the imagery itself is also found in the Epistle to the Romans, namely in the distinction between the descendants of Abraham according to the flesh and according to the promise, as given in Romans 9:7-9. The statement in Galatians 4:28, "Now you, brothers and sisters, like Isaac, are children of promise," corresponds to the one in Romans 9:8, "It is the children of the promise who are regarded as Abraham's offspring. However, the further development in the Epistle to the Galatians is indeed quite unique, but also such that interpreters have found plenty of work. Verse 25 reads, according to the usual text: "Now Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia," a statement for which there is no further analogy in all antiquity. It is also unknown that the Arabic hagar, meaning rock or stone, was used as the name for Mount Sinai. Tischendorf reads, according to N and some other manuscripts: "For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia," and Holsten wants to remove the entire verse as a gloss. But the text: "Now Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia," is sufficiently attested by ABD, and the omission of 'Hagar' is very understandable, as people simply despaired of understanding. The verse is a peculiarity more attributable to a later writer than to the Apostle. The imagery of the Epistle to the Romans of the two sons of Abraham is meant to be further exploited, and therefore some indirect paths must also help to achieve the goal. The distinction between the upper Jerusalem and the lower Jerusalem, i.e., the ideal city of God in heaven from the capital of Judaism on earth, strongly reminds one of the Apocalypse, where this imagery is used in 3:12 and 21:2ff., only that in the Epistle to the Galatians, the contrast between freedom and bondage appears, which extends from the imagery of Sarah and Hagar. What hint about the time of the letter's composition lies in the phrase "for she is in slavery with her children" in verse 25 will be shown later. The further use of the imagery of the two sons of Abraham concerning the persecution Isaac had to endure from Ishmael is unique to our letter and is not even based on the text of the Old Testament but on Jewish tradition as it appears, for example, in the Midrash Bereshit Rabbah. Thus, the entire piece has a seed lying in the Epistle to the Romans, but here it reaches a very unique and, in individual aspects, strange development.

71

There are even stronger proofs of dependence on the Epistle to the Romans in the paranetical part, which can be considered to begin with Galatians 5:13. The warning not to use freedom as an opportunity for the flesh leads to the recommendation of love, in which the whole law is fulfilled. This latter thought also has its place in the Epistle to the Romans, Romans 13:8-10, where the justification is given in detail. The phrase: "but if you bite and devour one another" (v. 15) is all the more unexpected here, as the Epistle to the Galatians does not mention party struggles as in the Corinthian letters, but rather presents the whole congregation as being threatened and already deceived. However, this is only mentioned in passing; the main exhortation now is to walk by the Spirit, which naturally prevents the desires of the flesh from being fulfilled (v. 16). This desire is then explained in verse 17 with the statement: "the flesh desires what is contrary to the Spirit, and the Spirit what is contrary to the flesh. They are in conflict with each other, so that you are not to do whatever you want." This statement is well known to the reader of the Epistle to the Romans, summarizing the entire discussion of Romans 7, with the result that the flesh prevents the Spirit from fulfilling its better will: "For I do not do the good I want to do, but the evil I do not want to do—this I keep on doing" (Romans 7:19). How can one understand this deep and hidden truth without the necessary investigations into σάρξ

(flesh) and πνεῦμα (spirit), the effect of the commandment, the outer and inner man, the law in the members, and the law in the mind, as given in the profound seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans? As the result is abruptly thrown out in our passage in Galatians, one cannot properly and thoroughly understand it. And the explanation that this line of thought was familiar to the Galatians from the oral teachings of the Apostle helps to alleviate the perplexity for a moment but, upon closer examination, is not sufficient. For in our passage, only the thought that flesh and Spirit are in conflict fits the context, whereas the other thought—that because of this conflict, people do not do what they want—only belongs in the context of the Epistle to the Romans; here, it is evidently inappropriate. When the exhortation goes, "walk by the Spirit, and you will not gratify the desires of the flesh," it attributes to the Spirit the power to overcome the flesh. However, this does not fit with the saying, "so that you do not do whatever you want," which excludes the possibility just set up. The issue is that πνεῦμα here is used in a specific sense, denoting the Spirit of new life, the Christian spirit. In Romans 7, the term is ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος (the inner man); the expression πνεῦμα is not actually used, but it is hinted at in the phrase νόμος πνευματικός (spiritual law) in verse 14 and in the contrast in verse 18: "I know that nothing good lives in me, that is, in my flesh." It seems to be avoided because πνεῦμα could have a double meaning, hence instead νόμος τοῦ νοός μου (law of my mind) in verse 23 and τῷ νοΐ (with my mind) in verse 25. It is thus unfortunate that in our passage in Galatians, πνεῦμα is first mentioned and then in verse 17 taken simply as synonymous with the inner man of Romans 7. This creates a thought that lacks proper coherence in itself but seeks support from the great exposition of the Epistle to the Romans. The conclusion of the argument in verse 18 also shows how dependent our passage is: "But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the law." The law has not yet been mentioned again here; the question of the relation to the law is dealt with in the main part 3:1ff. Here, it is only said in verse 14 that the law is fulfilled in the commandment of love for one's neighbor, which has only a distant connection with the bondage or freedom of Christians concerning the law. The thought is rather taken from Romans 8:14 and 6:14: from the former the phrase "for those who are led by the Spirit of God," and from the latter the phrase "you are not under the law but under grace." This small section, Galatians 5:13-18, is so thoroughly based on the larger contexts of the Epistle to the Romans, from which the most essential keywords are assembled into a new, though still somewhat loosely connected, whole that any remaining doubt must disappear, and the dependence of the Epistle to the Galatians on the Epistle to the Romans can be considered proven.

73

What follows also leans on this and other models. The dependence on the Corinthians letters now becomes evident, of which we have already encountered some traces earlier. The listing of the works of the flesh, contrasted with the fruit of the Spirit, has its parallels in Romans 1:29ff., but also in 1 Corinthians 6:9-10. Such lists are, of course, not repeated word for word, but essentially the same concepts and partly the same expressions recur everywhere. More importantly, in our passage, verse 21, the Apostle says: "I warn you, as I warned you before (ὡς προεῖπον), that those who do such things will not inherit the kingdom of God." Where has Paul said this before? Nowhere in our letter. The interpreters again refer to the oral teaching of the Apostle, the stock answer that is always ready when an explanation fails. The words to which

our reference points are found rather in 1 Corinthians 6:9-10, where the list of various kinds of sins is introduced with the question: "Or do you not know that wrongdoers will not inherit the kingdom of God?" and closed with the repetition: "nor thieves, etc., will inherit the kingdom of God."

But this will be enough for now. The observation made by all interpreters that the Epistle to the Romans and the Epistle to the Galatians are closely related in certain parts of their content has been further clarified in our closer investigation. It shows that the Epistle to the Galatians presupposes the Epistle to the Romans and likewise the two Epistles to the Corinthians, thus it was certainly written later. This alone would not lead to anything other than the conclusion that the commonly accepted sequence of Galatians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Romans should be reversed, as was the prevailing view in the early Church. However, it would be self-deception to be satisfied with the idea that Paul did not write the Epistle to the Galatians, as is now generally assumed, in 55 or 56 in Ephesus, but in 59 in Corinth. The relationship is such that the same man who outlined the detailed system of the Epistle to the Romans could not have also authored the shorter summary of the Epistle to the Galatians. Instead, there is a literary dependence in the full sense of the word. Where gaps and deficiencies appear in the context of the Epistle to the Galatians, the context of the Epistle to the Romans steps in to help and explain. In the Epistle to the Romans, we have the system from the first hand; in the Epistle to the Galatians, the same thoughts and words are often only externally assembled. It is not an organic new creation that has grown from root to crown by itself, but a structure whose hewn stones are taken from another and arranged according to a new plan. Therefore, the explanation that the Apostle had his system already fixed in writing and that both the Epistle to the Galatians and the Epistle to the Romans come from such a foundation is also insufficient[1]. It is arbitrary to suppose such a foundation when it already lies before our eyes in the Epistle to the Romans. One would have to assume[1] that the Apostle had already completed the Epistle to the Romans long before and used it multiple times in his earlier writings before finally sending it to Rome. But that would be a historically impossible combination. Nevertheless, the Epistle to the Galatians has many peculiarities and should not be regarded as merely a compilation from the Epistle to the Romans and the Corinthian letters. But the ideas that particularly characterize it lie not further back but further forward in the line of Pauline doctrinal development than the type of the Epistle to the Romans. These are notably two main ideas belonging to the longer dogmatic discussion in 3:1-4:7: the arrangement of the law by angels and the relationship of the gospel to Judaism and Gentilism. In the former regard, we have already seen that the involvement of angels in the enactment of the Mosaic law is foreign to the other Pauline letters, but familiar to the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Hebrews. This belongs to the elements that diminish the significance of the law. The author wants to say that there was something subordinate to the promise in the manner of its promulgation. This is a step from the type of the Epistle to the Romans towards Marcion. The doctrine of the law in the Epistle to the Romans, in summary, is: The law once was but is no longer the will of God. Marcion taught, as is well known, that the law was never the will of God; it does not come from the good God but only from the just God, a secondary divine principle. The view of the Epistle to the Galatians

stands in the middle: the law still comes from God, but no longer directly. Not only did Moses, as a human mediator, receive it, but another intermediary, the angels, comes between him and God. From there, it was only a step to Marcion's view.

1) For example, see Mangold in Bleek's Introduction, 3rd edition, p. 487, note 3. Similarly, see Weizsäcker, Apostol. Age, p. 113.

1) Something like this is contained, for example, in Renan's view that the Epistle to the Romans is a dogmatic exposition of a more general nature, which was sent to various churches, including the Roman one. St. Paul p. 461.

This is connected to the position that the Gospel, according to our letter, takes towards what had previously been considered religious salvation for humanity: Judaism and Paganism. It has long been noted that in this respect the Epistle to the Galatians takes a unique position, in that both Judaism and Paganism are placed on the same level, both being categorized as inadequate and elementary. This is evident in Galatians 4:3, where the much-discussed στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου characterize the religious state before the appearance of Christ. The Galatians want to return to these στοιχεία in 4:9 by beginning to observe Jewish festival days. According to the investigation conducted by Hilgenfeld[1], these στοιχεία are nothing other than the celestial bodies, which are perceived as manifestations of heavenly, animated beings. These powers were once served by the Galatians when they were pagans, and now they want to voluntarily return to their bondage by observing the Jewish festival cycle, which, according to Genesis 1:14, the celestial bodies govern. Thus, Paganism and Judaism are essentially equivalent, and both are equally distant from Christianity. This does not prevent the scriptures of the Old Testament, insofar as they point to the Gospel, from being fully and completely recognized as God's word, for they do not essentially belong to Judaism, which has rather neglected and transgressed them. This position of the two pre-Christian religious forms is certainly striking and contrasts with the position assigned to Judaism in the Epistle to the Romans, especially in Romans 9:1-5. Here too, a further step away from Judaism has been taken, and the view of it has already become much more radical.

1) The Epistle to the Galatians, p. 66ff.

It is strange that this has been so little noticed, or rather, that the obvious conclusion has not been drawn from it. How can the Epistle to the Galatians precede the Epistle to the Romans in the development of Pauline thought if it is decidedly further removed from the Jewish standpoint than the latter? The relationship is such that an irenic turn of the Apostle, as is assumed for the Epistle to the Romans, does not explain the matter. These are not questions of conciliation and reconciliation, but questions of principal stance and perspective, and these suggest for the Epistle to the Galatians a freer conception, which can only form the conclusion of the development, not the beginning. Paul began as a Jew and developed from there to a freer Christian view. The Epistle to the Galatians is, as Marcion already recognized, the principal letter against Judaism. It belongs to a time and intellectual sphere where the progressive, highly

educated part of Christianity already looked down on Judaism as a weak and meager preliminary stage, which did not surpass Paganism in value, and where it consciously protested against the followers of the tendencies and institutions derived from it. However, this is not the place to draw further conclusions from the investigation. The initial concern was only the relationship of our letter to the Epistle to the Romans, and we believe we have established that we must place the Epistle to the Galatians after the Epistle to the Romans, on which it largely depends.

77

Already 30 years ago, Bruno Bauer[1)] found this result and laid it out with thorough reasoning. Since then, no one has thought to examine this investigation in detail, even if only to scientifically refute it once and for all, rather than merely dismissing it on practical-church grounds. It is true, the impression of this work is decidedly unpleasant; the tone is too bitter, sometimes even scornful, and not everything presented is compelling. I, too, would not want to adopt everything said in it. But the main point, the dependency on the Epistle to the Romans, seems to me to be proven successfully and with good reasons in this work. Without paying attention to it, the masters of exegesis have continued to explain the Epistle to the Galatians as before, and there is no end in sight. But one must ask whether the countless difficulties that exegesis encounters here really lie in the matter itself and not rather in a literary relationship to another scripture, namely the Epistle to the Romans, which has been misinterpreted and therefore not used for interpretation. Should Paul, a man of practical life who knew how to interact so well with common people on two continents, really have written so incomprehensibly that the most learned and astute German professors have struggled in vain to understand his meaning for more than eighteen hundred years? The torments of modern exegesis, which so often appear even in the otherwise excellent studies of Holsten, are clear signs that the right path has not yet been found. As the saying goes: Simplex sigillum veri (Simplicity is the seal of truth).

1) Critique of the Pauline Epistles, first section, pp. 27—74.

Chapter 4

The historical part of the letter. Relationship to Acts.

78

The first main part of the letter (1. 11 - 2. 21) contains, after the introduction, an apology for the Pauline gospel and its author, which essentially operates with historical explanations. Paul tells the story of his conversion and his apostolic activity with the intention of demonstrating the independence of his gospel from human reputation and human authority. And indeed his gospel is not according to human nature already in its origin (1:11-17), in that he received it through the revelation of Jesus himself; further in its preservation (1:18-24), in that he did not feel the need to supplement it with the instruction of the early apostles in Jerusalem; and finally also in its assertion, in that he victoriously defended it against the apostles and the community in Jerusalem (2:1-10) and finally asserted its truth even against Peter in Antioch (2:11-21).

79

What Paul tells us here about the origin and further representation of his gospel is usually regarded as the most original report on these things, coming from the apostle himself, and research into the historical course of the events in question is primarily directed to this section of the Epistle to the Galatians, as the only truly authentic representation of the matter. Since the Acts of the Apostles reports a number of things about the same events, a secondary source is added to the primary source, and previous scholarly work has primarily dealt with the relationship between these two sources. In an effort to ascertain the facts from the Epistle to the Galatians as accurately and completely as possible, the result is compared with the account in the Acts of the Apostles and the two reports are compared with each other. However, opinions differ as to the result of this comparison. Some believe that both reports are perfectly compatible with each other, others find that they contradict each other on essential points. In the latter case, preference is naturally given to the presentation of the Epistle to the Galatians and efforts are made to find the reasons which may have caused the deviations from the report of the Acts of the Apostles. They are found either in a lesser knowledge of the facts or even in a deliberate transformation of them according to the ecclesiastical tendency which guided the author of the Acts of the Apostles.

It cannot be denied that the Acts of the Apostles does not in fact proceed from a purely historical point of view. Its author is clearly already quite far removed from the facts and what he knows he draws from sources that we are no longer able to control. Likewise, standing on Pauline ground, he pursues an apologetic and ironic tendency; he brings Jewish Christianity and Paulinism into essential agreement with one another, he softens the contradictions and tries to combine the old with the new; he generally serves the peace of the church. The Acts of the Apostles must therefore first be examined for its historical use and its content sifted through, just as one has to do with other historical accounts of antiquity. Only after the things that influenced the account for the sake of the leading point of view have been eliminated as carefully as

possible can the rest be recognized and used in its value for history. But there is no doubt that such historical source value remains, even if so much has to be deducted, and in the absence of other sources, the Acts of the Apostles will always be at the forefront of our knowledge of the apostolic age. One may be mistaken about this for a time and think that the material can also be taken from the carefully researched Pauline letters. But in no case can one owe more than occasional information to them, since they are not historical accounts, but rather letters whose content is more dogmatic than historical. If we did not have the Acts of the Apostles, it would be impossible to form any coherent idea of the early development of the Christian church. We always take from it the entire framework of the historical structure, and only in what it has filled out the architectural basic lines do we allow criticism and examine the quality of its material. Without them we would know nothing more about Paul's missionary journeys, and the life of the apostle, especially its beginning and end, would be completely obscure. The Acts of the Apostles is and remains an invaluable book, the value of which cannot be diminished by the unhistorical elements of the presentation.

Now that the canon has been valid for so long: where the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline letters contradict each other, the latter are to be considered right, and in this way the most varied representations of Pauline life and teachings have come about, it is time to examine this canon itself and ask whether the representation derived from the letters, especially from the Galatian letter, is so self-contained and historically sound that it must be preferred unconditionally and in all respects to that of the Acts of the Apostles. This question is encouraged by the realization that among those who have so far proceeded according to this canon there are the greatest differences regarding the interpretation of Pauline life and work as a whole and in detail. A consensus among researchers has by no means been reached in this area; What some consider possible, others dispute entirely, and where some find everything in perfect order, others declare that all previous views are untenable. This will become clear when we examine the individual points in question in more detail.

1. The conversion of Paul.

We have information on this in Galatians 1:11-16, which must be compared with the three reports in Acts about this event, Acts 9:1-9, 22:3-16, 26:12-20. It is true that the latter reports differ somewhat from one another, but the differences are not significant and the core of the story is the same everywhere. What is said about this in Galatians cannot in any way give an idea of what really happened. The persecution of the church because of Jewish zeal for the law is described in a few general terms, but Galatians does not tell us how and under what circumstances the sudden change occurred. The words 1:16 ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ contain no indication of external circumstances and do not even necessarily suggest the idea of an appearance of Christ. The ἀποκαλύψαι ἐν ἐμοὶ could well be understood in the sense of an inner awakening of the correct knowledge of Jesus. When it says in Gal. 2:2 that Paul went up

to Jerusalem κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, one does not think of a formal vision at all, especially not one that takes place during the day and in the open air, but rather of a dream vision similar to that of the Macedonian man Acts 16:9, if not simply of a sudden decision inspired by an inner urge, and purely from the Galatians letter there would be no need to understand the δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ 1, 12 differently. Those who everywhere want to adjust the Acts of the Apostles according to the Epistle to the Galatians would have reason here to note a new difference to their disadvantage and, following the example of the former, to imagine the conversion of the apostle as a slowly maturing and finally breaking through inner change of conviction.[1)] But our report in the Epistle to the Galatians is supplemented by the other I Cor. 15,8, where in the ὤφθη κἀμοί an appearance of Christ is clearly attested which is connected with the conversion of Paul. There is also the question ουχι Ἰησουν τον κυριον ημων εορακα; I Cor. 9, 1, which says the same thing. Furthermore, in the ὑπέστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκόν Gal. 1, 17 there is also information about the place where the conversion must have taken place. There is therefore no doubt that with regard to this event the reports in the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline letters essentially agree. The isolated details in the letters would, however, not be sufficient for us to form any clear idea of the course of events leading to Paul's conversion. We learn from them that Paul had previously persecuted the Christian community, that God, when it pleased him, revealed his Son in him, that this revelation consisted more closely of an appearance of Christ analogous to that which Petras and the other disciples had previously had, and that the event finally took place in or near Damascus. We must take the rest of the vivid and vivid description of the event from the Acts of the Apostles. Now, of course, Paul had no reason to recount the event of his conversion in detail in his Epistle to the Galatians; he may have previously told the communities about it in detail and is only reminding them of it here. But why does he say in 1:13 ἠκούσατε γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφήν ποτε ἐν τῷ ἰουδαϊσμῷ, [="I have heard of my former conduct in Judaism], and indeed, as one says, you have heard it from others, you have learned it by hearsay?[1)] If Paul wanted to remind them that he had once told them this story, he would use other expressions, as he usually does in such cases in our letter, for example καθως προειπον (5:21) or οιδατε δε (4:13) or ως προειρηκαμεν (1:9) (as at least some interpreters understand it). Instead he talks about how he could not speak differently if they had only heard it from others. This ηκοθσατε [2)] is very similar to the in Ephesians 3:2, from which it is rightly concluded that the writer of the letter and the community do not know each other personally, and this has long been used by critics as a reason for doubting the authenticity of the Epistle to the Ephesians. So let us also place our ηκουσατε here under the same point of view. The only thing that can weaken this impression is the observation that the ηκουσατε refers first of all to Paul's earlier rage against Christianity and that this could certainly have been known to the Galatians by hearsay. But if he informed them of his conversion, he also informed them of what preceded it, and the ηκουσατε refers to the latter, and then also to the former. The way in which he speaks of these things here is striking, and it is not enough to simply remind them in a few words of what he had already told them in detail before. In short, what we learn about the conversion of the Apostle Paul from the Epistle to the Galatians does not go beyond what we know about it from the Acts of the Apostles, or in other words, whoever wrote it could have simply got his information from the latter.

1) This is the opinion of F. Langhans, Christianity and its Mission in the Light of World History, p. 163.

1) This point is also brought up in the section of the Verisimilia by "Pierson and Naber on Galatians pp. 26-49, p. 28.
2) See Holtzmann, Introduction, 2nd ed., p. 285.

84

2. The first journey to Jerusalem.

Things now seem to be different with what the Epistle to the Galatians further reports about Paul's journey to Jerusalem. After God had revealed his Son in me, the apostle says, I did not consult with flesh and blood, nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me, but went away to Arabia and returned to Damascus. Then, after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to meet Cephas and stayed with him for fifteen days. But I did not see any other of the apostles, except James, the Lord's brother. Then I went to the regions of Syria and Cilicia. But I was unknown to the Christian communities of Judaea, they only knew by hearsay that he who once persecuted us now proclaims the faith that he once destroyed, and they glorified God over me (Gal. 1: 16-24).

Let us compare this report with the parallel one in the Acts of the Apostles (9:19-30). After Paul was baptized by Ananias, he stayed with the disciples in Damascus for a few days and soon began to preach Jesus as the Son of God in the synagogues. Everyone was astonished and said, isn't this the one who in Jerusalem perturbed those who called on this name and who also came here to lead them bound before the chief priests? Saul did not let himself be deterred, but instead became ever more determined in his support of Jesus' Messiahship. After a long time the Jews decided to kill him, Saul learned of the plot, and while the Jews were guarding the gates day and night, he was lowered over the wall in a basket by the disciples and came to Jerusalem. There he wanted to join the disciples, but was met with mistrust. Barnabas took him under his wing and told the church how he had been converted and how he had openly proclaimed the name of Jesus in Damascus. They put aside their suspicions, and he went with them in and out of Jerusalem, openly proclaiming the name of the Lord, and speaking and rebuking the Hellenists. They plotted to kill him, but when the brothers found out, they took him down to Caesarea and sent him from there to Tarsus.

85

These two accounts agree on some points, but differ on others. The main points are basically the same in both cases. After his conversion, Paul is in Damascus, then after some time he leaves for Jerusalem and finally returns to his home in Cilician. The fact that Paul left Damascus under certain dangers is not only mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, but also in the Pauline letters. Not in our Epistle to the Galatians, to be sure, but in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, in the remarkable passage where the various dangers and temptations that the apostle endured are mentioned. There it says (II Cor. 11:32): In Damascus the ethnarch of King Aretas guarded the city of the Damascenes in order to capture me, and I was let down over the wall in a basket through a window and escaped from his hands. The procession with the basket

is so peculiar that one will not be mistaken in finding here the same incident as that narrated in the Acts of the Apostles, and thus considering the event as the end of the stay which Paul made in Damascus after his conversion, as is usually the case.

86

However, several differences remain. According to the Acts of the Apostles, Paul stays in Damascus for an indefinite but presumably rather short period, specifically "some days" (9:19) and then again for "many days" (v. 23). Even though Luke's use of ἱκανός can signify a fairly long time, the three years mentioned in the Epistle to the Galatians cannot be reconciled with this. When Acts refers to such periods, they are calculated in years and months, such as "a year and six months" for the stay in Corinth (Acts 18:11) and "two years" for the stay in Ephesus (19:10). Therefore, it is unlikely to extend beyond a few weeks or at most months. The mistrust Paul encounters in Jerusalem also indicates that his conversion was still something new, and not much time had passed. Thus, there remains a time discrepancy between the two accounts, along with a discrepancy in locations, as Paul, according to Galatians, makes a journey to Arabia, while according to Acts, he stays in Damascus and goes directly from there to Jerusalem. Furthermore, the descriptions of the relationship between the newly converted Paul and the community in Jerusalem are not consistent. According to Galatians, Paul goes up to Jerusalem only after three years, merely to make the personal acquaintance of Peter; he sees only James besides him and stays for only 15 days, so the communities of Judea do not get to know him. According to Acts, he goes up immediately, is introduced into the community by Barnabas, interacts with it daily, and preaches the gospel until Jewish opposition threatens him again, leading the brothers to ensure his safety by sending him to his homeland Tarsus, the capital of Cilicia, which is also mentioned as his last destination in Galatians. Here, too, there is a clear disharmony between the two accounts. Acts presupposes a longer stay in Jerusalem than merely 15 days and portrays Paul in close relationship with the entire community, not just in superficial contact with two of its prominent leaders.

87

The critical school's1) opinion on these differences is that Paul's own words are of course to be believed more than the later and intentionally dominated account of the Acts of the Apostles. Apologetic exegesis does not dispute this canon either, but seeks to mitigate the differences by other explanations or at least assumes that Luke has inaccurate information here and knows nothing about the Arab journey2) and also presents the situation in Jerusalem differently. As daring as it may seem, a sense of fairness demands that the opposite be attempted at least once and that it be asked whether there is not much that speaks for the account of the Acts of the Apostles in contrast to that of the Epistle to the Galatians. That the latter is a completely authentic source is, after all, only a prerequisite. Anyone who denies so many other Pauline letters, which in the early church were always considered to be the writings of the apostle, has no right to dismiss any doubt about one of the four main letters without hearing it. So let us try it out without deciding in advance for one or the other.

We first ask: is the presentation of the Epistle to the Galatians so consistent in itself that nothing can be criticized about it, and then: is it historically probable in and of itself?

In the first respect, there is one point that can be used against it, namely the statement at the end that Paul was unknown to the communities of Judaea by face. What is to be understood by these communities of Judaea?

1) E.g. Baur, Zeller, Overbeck on Acts 9:28.
2) So Meyer-Wendt, Commentary on Acts 9:26.

Only those in the Jewish country or also those in the capital? The decision is usually made for the former. But in all other Pauline letters, Judaea is understood to mean the Jewish country including the capital, as in II Cor. 1:16, where the apostle describes his travel plans as follows: "I wanted to travel through you to Macedonia and then from Macedonia to come to you and be sent away by you to Judaea." There is no doubt that Judaea here means Jerusalem, since the talk is of the same journey that is to be undertaken in Rom. 15:25, and it says directly: "I am now going to Jerusalem." It is therefore most likely that we should at least include Jerusalem in our place.1) But then the difficulty arises of reconciling the rest of the report with this. Indeed, what Gal. What is said in 1:19 is still in some way compatible with this, because the matter is clearly presented as if Paul had seen no Christians in Jerusalem other than Peter and James. The very contact with the church that Acts allows to occur at this point is denied. In that respect, it fits together. But if verse 13 is based on the persecution that Paul started against the church of God, it is impossible to exclude Jerusalem from this, even if one wants to give even the slightest credence to Acts. Paul must have persecuted the church in this city first and foremost. And yet he was unknown to them by face2)? If that is to be true, then there is nothing left but to return to the usual explanation that Paul here does not understand Jerusalem to be included under Judaea. But it is not much more likely that he was unknown to the other Christian communities that existed in the countryside in Judaea and Samaria at that time, since these communities were founded in Jerusalem, and according to Acts 8:1, by stragglers from the persecution that Sani had started. Since the continuation of his persecutory rage is testified to there in v. 3, it seems to be assumed that Saul also persecuted the Christians in the countryside, just as he mentions in the story of his conversion before Agrippa in Acts 26:11 that he persecuted the Christians in the land. According to this view, the reason for him going to Damascus was that he had done what had to be done in Judaea and now wanted to put an end to the matter abroad. The note Gral fits in with all this. 1, 22 as badly as possible, but if one reads the Epistle to the Galatians alone without considering the Acts of the Apostles, the contradiction between 1, 13 and 22 is still there, but so obscured that one does not notice it immediately, since attention is first drawn to 1, 18, 19, where in fact ignorance of the community in Jerusalem can be assumed. It may therefore be the case that the intention to present Paul as completely independent of Jerusalem is hidden behind this statement, and what was previously said about his persecution of Christians is not properly aligned with it, a case which the critical school, which always

assumes in the Acts of the Apostles, has no qualms about, except that in the Acts of the Apostles the opposite motive is assumed, namely that it wants to bring Paul into as close a connection as possible with Jerusalem in an unhistorical way.

1) So Uilgenfeld (Galatians p. 125): it is pure arbitrariness if Meyer still wants to think of the Jewish communities outside of Jerusalem, as if Jerusalem did not also belong to Judaea!

2) This contradiction is also highlighted in the “Verisimilia”, p. 28.

89

Apart from this point, there is another that gives cause for concern. The journey to Arabia (1:17) is only reported in the Epistle to the Galatians; Acts not only does not know it, but actually excludes it. In and of itself, there is nothing to object to, especially if one understands Hauran by Arabia, since it is only a detour to the vicinity of Damascus. The assumption of a journey far to the south could only be prompted by the strange note in Galatians 4:25 that in Arabia Mount Sinai is called Hagar (see above p. 70), which Paul could have heard there at that time - if one could ever hear that anywhere. The motive for the journey can be imagined as being that, after the profound shock to his whole being by the appearance of Christ, Paul felt the need to seek solitude in order to reconstruct the building of his theological system, which lay in ruins, on the new foundation stone of Christ, undisturbed. Others, however, think that this was the first fervent attempt at missionary work1), but there is no other trace of it. The note from the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (II Cor. 11:32, 33) which intervenes here does not make the whole matter any clearer. According to it, Damascus was guarded at that time, namely after Paul's return there (Gal. 1:17), by the ethnarch of the Arabian king Aretas, who wanted to seize Paul, whereupon the flight in a basket over the wall took place, which is also reported in Acts. This seems to be a statement of great historical value, which is all the more interesting because we read nothing else in the New Testament about this King Aretas, known from Josephus because of his war with Herod Antipas. But the statement itself is and remains a mystery. The expression ἐφρούρει την πόλιν Δαμασκηνών is to be understood as meaning that the Ethnarch was master of the city and had its gates guarded by military forces. But there is no other historical record attesting that Aretas had even temporarily in his power at that time, Damascus, which had been Roman since the time of Pompey, 64 B.C. The possibilities that have been considered to be able to assume a temporary occupation of Damascus2) are all so vague that no clarity can be reached. Nor is it known why the Ethnarch pursued Paulus, whether he did it on his own initiative or to please the Jews. In the former case, Paulus must have provoked him and then it would certainly be assumed that he was carrying out missionary work for the Arabian journey, perhaps even as far as Arabia Nabataea. In the latter case, one again fails to understand the Arab prince's condescension to the Jews, who, according to all historical evidence, were not treated by him as friends. The whole account of the Arabian journey is thus only complicated by the apparently precise detail of the intervention of the Ethnarch of Aretas, and if it were not Paul himself who said this, we would doubt the matter just as one has doubted and must doubt many other statements in Neo-Testament writings.

1) So Meyer (not Sieffert) on Gal. 1,17: similar Rückert, Wieseler, also Hausrath, Zeitgesch. 2nd ed. II p. 455. Godet, epitre aux Romains p. 29.

2) See the article Aretas by Keim in Schenkel's Bible Lexicon and especially Anger, ratio temporum p. 174sq. Renan, les apotres, p. 125 refers to the interruption of the Roman coins of Damascus under Caligula and Claudius and to a coin of Aretas Philhellen. The latter ruled c. 85-50 BC. See Schürer, N.T. Zeitgesch. 1st ed. p. 234 note.

91

But let us leave this journey to Arabia and everything connected with it alone and ask whether the account in the Epistle to the Galatians is more likely to recommend itself than that in Acts. The longer period during which Paul remains away from Jerusalem could speak in its favour. It was a natural sensitivity that prevented him from immediately approaching the community which he had previously persecuted. But the Epistle to the Galatians is certainly not thinking of such sensitivity; rather, it wants to emphasise the apostle's absolute independence from Jerusalem. The matter is presented differently in Acts. Paul finds comfort and encouragement in Damascus from a disciple, Ananias. There he begins to make himself useful to the community by preaching messianic messages. He can then venture all the more to approach the Christians in Jerusalem, even if they initially mistrust him. The report in Acts has nothing against it in and of itself, even if the incident with Ananias is embellished in the manner of Luke, particularly through the motif of the double vision familiar to him (cf. 10:3, 9), it is still going too far to suspect this personality of being an invention of Luke, even because of his loyalty to the law (22:12). The name of the guest with whom Paul stayed, Judas, the name of the street where his house was, which is still called the straight one and near which the Jewish quarter is still located, do point to some certain information. On the whole, Paul's condition after the appearance of Christ, as described there, is so understandable and his correction by a Christian in Damascus so natural that one would hardly forego all of this in order to follow exclusively the bare note in the Epistle to the Galatians. The flight from Damascus is in any case presented in the main features in the same way in the Pauline letters as in Acts. And if the guarding of the city by the ethnarch of Aretas remains a mystery, the lying in wait of the Jews at the gates is all the more easily explained. The mistrust of the community in Jerusalem is certainly very natural, as is its overcoming through the mediation of Barnabas, who as a Levite from Cyprus may have been known to the native Tarser. The renewed hostility of the Jews in Jerusalem is no less understandable when one considers how Saul had previously rendered them the best services against the Christians, and in the departure or removal of the new convert to Syria and to his homeland, both reports are pretty much in agreement. This is not to say that the report in Acts is therefore completely faithful in all respects; a certain coloring of the facts can certainly be admitted, since Luke never reports completely objectively. But it is quite another thing to dispute the entire story in order to replace it with one that is hardly more plausible than it.

92

For what the Epistle to the Galatians reports about these things is indeed calculated to arouse astonishment. Paul, the fierce persecutor of the Christian community, was converted by the direct intervention of God. He has no need to join those who are the originators of the new faith; he leaves them aside in order to work out his own Christianity; instead of being guided by those who were Christians before him, he prefers to develop his Christian faith from within himself. He is busy with this for three years, far from all human influences, then his religious system is complete once and for all and no longer needs any additions from human communication. He then goes up to Jerusalem, but it is only a very short visit, more just a courtesy call on the two most prominent personalities of the Jerusalem community, Peter and James. He has so little contact with the other Christians there that they do not even know his face, then he returns to Cilicia via Syria and stays there for many years without further concern for Jerusalem and his Christian community. That may be noble if you like, but it is not entirely understandable. If, for example, Holsten finds in this behavior of Paul the peculiar genesis of his Gospel, which developed without any historical connection merely from the most intense reflection on the Messiah's death on the cross, then one can certainly imagine such an ingenious procedure, but that does not make it any more probable. Even the critical exponents of Paulinism cannot completely resist this feeling. Hausrath1), for example, judges this: "Precisely because Paul was converted through the vision, should we expect him all the more to return immediately to the scene of Jesus' life to find out who he actually believed in? If we were to proceed in our way, he would have had to investigate the story of Jesus in his dealings with Jesus' disciples and not rest until he had investigated his living conditions in the greatest detail. Instead, he declares, on the contrary: I make known to you that I did not receive my gospel from men, nor was I taught it by men, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ, etc. Such a statement could of course frighten us from a historical point of view, and we may be tempted to say: it would have been much better if the apostle had spoken to flesh and blood and asked those who could know who the Jesus was who had revealed himself to him as the Messiah." This is the sound, uncorrupted judgment, but the Epistle to the Galatians forbids the critic from giving in to it once and for all, and so he seeks reasons to find Paul's approach understandable, and indeed to explain it as the only correct one. He had to take a completely different path from all the others because of his nature and the nature of his conversion, and it was precisely in this way that he became the great dogmatist of the Messiah's cross. We will have to believe this if the Epistle to the Galatians is an authentic source, but the fact that we find it unbelievable makes us ask whether this assumption is as certain as is usually assumed.

1) New Testament Contemporary History, 1st edition, II p. 452.

That our contrary impression is not a purely individual one, but has also been felt by others before, we will let the judgment of a Dutchman, A. Pierson1), speak for himself, who says the following: "The information provided by the writer of our letter is extremely improbable, and if it is from the apostle himself, then it must stamp him as a completely unreliable witness, the representative of a bottomless mysticism. That someone who wants to proclaim his own gospel to the world and who has previously been able to curse anyone who contradicts him, should

spurn existing sources of enlightenment and expect wisdom from inner enlightenment alone, is strange enough. But that someone can boast of this neglect of the usual means of arriving at a well-established conviction and testify before God that he has done nothing of the things by which one can hope to inspire some confidence in serious seekers of truth, is certainly something that we cannot assume without having examined every other possibility in relation to one of the earliest preachers of Christianity. And then the hypothesis that a person who behaves as strangely as Paul of Galatians is certainly a fiction of an ultra-Pauline Christian and not a reality is certainly at first obvious. Accustomed to the content of this letter from our youth, and because modern criticism has already told us for thirty years that this letter is actually the most correct thing one can imagine, we run the risk of finding the most strange here of course."

1) the Sermon on the Mount and Other Synoptic Fragments 1878, S. 103 ff.

We also believe that the picture that the Epistle to the Galatians gives us of Paul's behavior after his conversion has only seemed inoffensive to us for so long because the question of whether this letter does not perhaps also offer an artificial historical representation, as has long been assumed of the Acts of the Apostles, has not yet been seriously asked. But once it is asked, it has already been answered.

3. The Apostles' Convention in Jerusalem.

There is no doubt that the content of Galatians 2:1-10 applies to the same event that Acts 15 deals with, and even if some people today judge differently, this judgement can have little weight, because it is obviously based only on the desire not to allow the contradictory features of the two accounts to be regarded as real contradictions.1) For in fact, despite all the agreement, there are also strong differences, as is immediately apparent when the two accounts are compared in their main features.

1) The similar position on the question taken for opposite reasons by Volkmar, from Paul of Damascus to the Epistle to the Galatians, has already been discussed in Chapter 2, see p. 40.

According to the Epistle to the Galatians, fourteen years after his first visit to the holy city, Paul again went to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Titus. He went there in response to a revelation and explained to them the gospel he had preached among the Gentiles, whether he was running or had run in vain. But not even Titus, his companion, was forced to be circumcised, a demand that was indeed looming in the distance, but was only made by false brothers who did not agree with Paul's freedom. Paul did not give in to them for an hour. But the leading figures did not add anything to him, but after seeing the gift of mission to the Gentiles given to him by God and its success, which placed him alongside Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, they, namely James, Ephas and John, the pillars of the church, gave him and Barnabas the right hand of

fellowship and agreed with them that they should go to the Gentiles, but they themselves should go to the Jews. He was to remember only the poor, and this was precisely what Paul always strove to do.

96

According to the Acts of the Apostles, the situation is as follows. The church in Antioch, where Paul and Barnabas were working, was agitated by some who had come down from Judaea, who claimed that Gentile Christians must be circumcised, otherwise they cannot be saved. Paul and Barnabas opposed them, and by a resolution of the church they were commissioned to go up to Jerusalem with a few others and bring this dispute before the apostles and elders for settlement. When they arrived in Jerusalem, they were received favorably and were allowed to tell how God had done great things for the Gentiles through them. But some former Pharisees again brought forward the demand that Gentile Christians must accept circumcision and the Mosaic Law. A church meeting was then called, and various views were expressed. But Peter speaks in favor of the Gentile Christians, and after the Antiochian envoys have once again described what wonderful things God has done for the Gentiles through them, James also gives a speech in which he justifies the Gentile calling with Scripture, finds that keeping the entire law is not necessary, but that abstention from the pagan abominations, idol sacrifices, fornication, eating strangled meat and blood is. Accordingly, the community decides and issues a decree in which only these four requirements are imposed on the Gentiles as generally binding. The decree is brought down to Antioch by its own envoys, and there is great joy over this conciliatory decision. Soon afterwards, Paul sets out on his second great missionary journey and announces the decisions made to the communities founded on the first journey in Derbe, Lystra and Iconium and instructs them to comply with them.

97

The two accounts agree on the following essential points: 1. The people negotiating, on the one hand Paul and Barnabas, on the other the early apostles, namely Peter and James. 2. The subject of the negotiations, the position of the Gentile Christians towards the Mosaic Law. 3. The result, the amicable settlement of the dispute without the Gentile Christians being required to observe the Law. In addition to these main points, which are immediately apparent, a few minor points can be gained through closer consideration, namely: 4. The dispute breaks out in Antioch. The Epistle to the Galatians does not say from where Paul went up to Jerusalem, but in 2:11 Peter later comes down to Paul in Antioch and the way this city is mentioned shows that Paul was already there beforehand. 5. Initially, Judaistic zealots made the demand that Gentile Christians should be circumcised. For when Paul says in Galatians 2:3 that not even Titus was forced to be circumcised, he must have taken care of this. The xotTaaxoKTjaat TTjV ¿Xsodepiav ijfiüjv that the ratpeiaaxTot ^euSaSeXtpot carried out can only have taken place in Antioch, where this freedom was practiced. Therefore, such false brothers must have come down to Antioch beforehand and made the demand there, which is entirely consistent with the report in the Acts of the Apostles.

However, this agreement is offset by a great and strong difference. 1. According to the Epistle to the Galatians, Paul goes up to Jerusalem xatd dmxdhrliv, i.e. of his own accord; according to Acts, he receives the order from the community. This difference runs through both reports, and it is connected with the fact that according to the first account the whole thing appears to be a private undertaking by Paul and a private negotiation with the original apostles, while according to the latter source a formal official negotiation takes place about the position of the Gentile Christian communities, where on both sides not private individuals but corporations appear. 2. Therefore the matter cannot be concluded with a mere discussion between Paul and the original apostles, but specific demands are formulated by the Jewish Christian side, namely the observance of the four abstinences, from idol sacrifices, blood, strangled animals and fornication. There is no trace of these points in the Epistle to the Galatians, but there is an agreement that Paul should go to the Gentiles, the early apostles to the circumcision, and the request for support for the poor, which Paul was happy to fulfill, but again Acts does not say a word about this at this point. The fact that, according to Acts, the decisions of Jerusalem are finally communicated to the Pauline communities, while according to Galatians this is neither necessary nor possible, turns out to be a further consequence of the fundamentally different interpretation of the event in the two reports.

The suggestions that have been made to balance out these differences are very varied in detail, but on the whole they all come down to the fact that the two reports go side by side, with one presenting this side of the actual event, the other that. It is also possible to make this somewhat probable with the first point. When Paul says in Galatians: ¿vr^öov xaxa airoxaXutJdv, he is stating the subjective moment quite correctly. Here too, as so often in his life, he is acting on divine instructions. But there is also the possibility, indeed the probability, that the objective moment, which Acts states, also existed, namely a commission from the Antiochene community. There is even a hint in the presentation of the Epistle to the Galatians itself that something like this was not lacking, as we have already indicated above in the list of the points of agreement under No. 5, namely that both the oöx ^VCRPTAA&IJ IREPIT(»]D^VAT and the xaiaaxoirijaat TTJV iXauftepiav Tj|x«>v presuppose those events in the Antiochene community which, according to Acts, had previously taken place there. It is more difficult to assume that the parallel events existed alongside one another for the negotiations in Jerusalem. That there was an official negotiation before the entire community and, in addition, a private conversation between Paul and the original apostles could in and of itself be admitted, but that the two negotiations concerned a different subject, namely the former the requirement of circumcision, the latter the personal position and apostolic authority of Paul, lies in the none of the reports really exist. The one in Acts knows nothing of the latter, the one in Galatians of the former. For even if it says in 2:2 dve&ejiijv AÖTOIC T I EÖcqfiXiov 5 XTJPOOKJU» ¿v TOI? ¿ftveaiv, xa-r iStav 6k tot; Boxoüsiv, this can in no way mean that the subject of the private negotiation was any different from that of the public negotiation. What Paul presents to the church in Jerusalem, that and nothing else, he also presents to the reputable people, and the fact that he presents it to them in particular is simply because of their influence, which it must of course have been important for him to win over for himself. If this already gives rise to the theory that the report in

Acts and Gal. If the argument that the two sides of the same story go side by side does not really prove itself, it fails completely in its presentation of the outcome of the matter. Both reports are so precise and concrete that no amount of interpretation or twisting can conceal the contradiction. According to Galatians, nothing was imposed on Paul; the pillar apostles gave him the rights to fellowship and agreed with him that from now on he would be an apostle to the Gentiles and they to the Jews. According to Acts, very specific conditions were set for the admission of Gentile Christians, and from then on they were followed. These conditions are concrete, factual points, and it is impossible to assume that the Epistle to the Galatians could simply have ignored them without this creating an exclusive contradiction with the presentation in Acts. But not only are the Pauline letters completely silent about these conditions, which were to regulate the behavior of Gentile Christians from then on, but with regard to one point, namely meat sacrificed to idols, the First Epistle to the Corinthians puts forward views that would be completely incomprehensible if such a regulation existed. For if the question of the consumption of such meat is treated as an open one (chapter 8) and the decision is not made dependent on external criteria but only on the conscience of the individual and consideration for that of fellow Christians, then it is clear that this cannot be combined with a definite, once and for all prohibition. If the Epistle to the Galatians does indeed make an analogy to these four points, but one with a completely different content, namely the voluntary care for the poor in Jerusalem, then it becomes even clearer that the description offered by Acts simply cannot be reconciled with this.

It is therefore a completely correct judgment when the critical school has stated and recorded the incompatibility of the two accounts on essential points. But what follows from this? The usual opinion is, of course, that Acts misrepresented the facts either through ignorance or intentionally. This must be accepted if there is no other option. But it is difficult to say whether Acts knew the account of the Epistle to the Galatians or not. In the latter case, their differing account is certainly easier to explain, but could a Pauline towards the end of the first or beginning of the second century, to which period Luke belongs according to all indications, really not have known his master's letters? Recently, such an assumption has rightly been found more and more striking, and it is considered that Luke's acquaintance with these letters can be assumed. This is the opinion of not only Jacobson1), but also Weizsäcker2). If this is the case, however, then Acts has not yet been misrepresented. In fact, the whole presentation has been altered to such an extent that the original has been completely suppressed. It has transferred the four abstinences imposed on Gentile Christians, which are in practice almost everywhere in the second century, from the post-apostolic age to that of the apostles. This is the conclusion that has been reached3) by critics and that it was inevitable to reach.

1) Die Quellen der Apg., Gymnasialprogramm Ostern 1885.
2) Das apostolische Zeitalter S. 182.
3) Z. B. Overbeck, Apostelgeschichte, zu 15,19 S. 229.

However, historical impartiality requires that we also consider the matter from the other side. Is the account in the Epistle to the Galatians really so beyond all doubt that the account in Acts should be sacrificed to it unconditionally? Initially, it seems that without Acts, we would not get a complete picture of the entire event. We know nothing from the Epistle to the Galatians about the preparatory events in Antioch, nor do we even learn that Paul was in Antioch at that time. One has to decipher this from scattered hints, which naturally lead back to the account in Acts. Only from it can we gather why Paul was concerned, μήπως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον, that it also involved circumcision, and that people had come down from Jerusalem and made this demand, precisely the κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν, which, taken alone in Gal. 2:4, is almost unintelligible. The entire account in the Epistle to the Galatians is particularly difficult in its early parts in terms of expression, so much so that interpreters have always struggled with it. In verse 2, Paul goes to Jerusalem; in verse 3, Titus is not compelled to be circumcised, which could only have happened in Jerusalem. In contrast, verse 4 introduces the παρεισάκτοι ψευδάδελφοι, who spied out Paul's freedom, which, as Holsten1) correctly notes, refers back to the Pauline communities, thus also back to Antioch. Why this note appears only here and not in verse 2 is understandable only from Acts 15:5, where the Judaizers again raise the demand for circumcision, already made in Antioch (v. 1), in Jerusalem. The continuation of the account in the Epistle to the Galatians in verse 5 then shows again that this demand was also made in Jerusalem but was rejected by Paul. The well-known syntactical difficulties of this entire section, the anacoluthon in verses 4 and 5, followed by another in verse 6, the question of what verb to supply for verse 4, whether ἠναγκάσθη or ἀνέβην or something else, and the οὐδέ πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ, where an ancient witness like Tertullian outright claims that this reading is a falsification by Marcion and it should read οὐ πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν, as the Latin Irenaeus, Codex D, and other witnesses have—this all makes it seem unlikely that a clear, simple meaning can be obtained by exegetical means. This explains Renan's 2) judgment of the passage: "this transaction cost Paul greatly, and the sentence in which he speaks of it is one of the most original he has written. The word that costs him seems unable to flow from his pen."

1. Das Evangelium des Paulus, p. 147.
2. St. Paul, p. 89. Renan also omits οὐδέ and has Titus circumcised, p. 88.

One is almost inevitably driven to emendations, such as one, and not the worst, proposed by Sülze3), who wants to place v. 3 before v. 6, so that we still remain in Antioch in v. 4 and 5. In short, "the sentence is a monster" 1), and the whole exegetical torture of this passage is a testimony to the fact that we have here no original representation growing out of its own roots, but one that looks back to another, more detailed and actually historical one, and this we find precisely in Acts.

3. In Weisse, Beiträge zur Kritik der paulinischen Briefe, p. 17, note.

1) Bruno Bauer, Critique of the Pauline Letters, p. 21.

103

However, this naturally only applies to the element of agreement. The element of contradiction can only be judged as meaning that the later report deliberately opposed the earlier one and wanted to introduce a more acceptable interpretation of the event. But which report is the earlier one? It is assumed that it was that of the Epistle to the Galatians, and then Acts wanted to replace it with another one which was written in the spirit of reconciliation between Paulinism and Jewish Christianity. But what guarantee do we have that this was the case? Here too we must ask which of the two reports in and of itself has the greater degree of historical probability. Up to this point the judgement on this has not been entirely impartial, and could not be, since the authenticity of the Epistle to the Galatians was beyond all doubt. Otherwise we would have to say that the account in Acts is the same. Although it does not cast Paul's apostolic dignity and self-importance in such a brilliant light as is the case with the Epistle to the Galatians, it is nevertheless coherent in and of itself and gives a historically possible picture at the beginning and end, apart of course from the speeches of Peter and James, which, like all speeches in Acts, are essentially free compositions by the author. When Weizsäcker, op. cit., p. 182, judges that "the story in Acts... a specific picture in all the features that it has in common with the Epistle to the Galatians, but in everything that goes beyond that, it partly keeps to the general, partly only tries to illustrate what is common in the manner of an explanatory writer" - we have rather the opposite impression. Into the confused account of Galatians 2:1-5, only Acts brings some clarity, and what follows from verse 6 onward is such that one must ask if it could really have happened that way. Paul negotiates with the original apostles on equal footing; he does not yield an inch but demands full independence for himself. He makes a division agreement with them regarding the mission field, "we to the Gentiles, they to the circumcision," and only at the end, magnanimously and condescendingly, does he promise material support. The question of the circumcision of Gentile Christians is raised only by the false brothers, immediately and uncompromisingly rejected by Paul. The original apostles, the so-called pillars, had nothing to do with it at all. The victory is entirely and completely on Paul's side; he made no concessions and did not need to show any accommodation—he came, he saw, he conquered.

104

But what does his victory consist of? In the fact that, without worrying about the original apostles, he can continue to go to the Gentiles as before and convert them without imposing the law on them. The original apostles, on the other hand, are to go to the Jews, to whom they can then impose the law. This division of the mission area corresponds very well to the principle of amicable, peaceful, but in the real world it is in fact hardly conceivable, let alone carried out. Should this be understood to mean that the original apostles only have to do missionary work in Jewish land and Paul only abroad? Firstly, the original apostles would hardly have accepted such a restriction and in fact they did not adhere to it. The fact that Acts ascribes the actual work

of missionary work to the Gentiles to Peter and has him convert Samaritans and pure Gentiles (chapters 8 and 10) is of less importance here. But we not only find Jesus' commission to the eleven to go on mission throughout the world in Matthew 28:19 in the writings of a Jewish Christian, but we also hear from Paul himself in I Cor. 9:4 that the apostles and the brothers of the Lord and Eephas undertook missionary journeys. A limitation of the original apostolic mission to the area of the Jewish land contradicts all later testimonies so completely that it cannot be seriously asserted.

105

It only remains to assume that the treaty was not intended as a geographical division, but as an ethnographic one. Paul was to address the Gentiles, the original apostles to the Jews, wherever they lived. This would have given them an extended sphere of influence in the Jewish diaspora, which was so numerous and religiously inspired. But then Paul and the original apostles could sometimes have appeared in the same city, the former founding a community among the Gentiles, the latter among the Jews. But two separate Christian communities in one and the same place are a contradiction. "Has Christ then been divided?" Paul would have exclaimed (I Cor. 1:13). The two communities would have had to unite again into one, and the division treaty had not made any provision whatsoever for the coexistence of Gentile and Jewish Christians. That this was indeed bound to happen is already shown by the incident in Antioch, which the Epistle to the Galatians immediately follows. There, Jewish and Gentile Christians actually lived together, and there was also a rift between Peter and Paul. The Treaty of Jerusalem therefore immediately fell apart again, even according to those who see it as the correct solution to Acts. "The issue was more postponed than resolved by it," says Holtzmann1) with full justification, "the power of the actual circumstances quickly grew beyond the Jerusalem compromise." But should Paul, or the original apostles, really have been so blind that they did not consider these obvious Con-sequences and, while they agreed on things that had to happen of their own accord, completely overlooked others that urgently needed a solution? The cases in which Christian communities united Jewish and pagan elements in their midst were not just the exception outside Jerusalem, but the rule. According to everything we know, the entire Christian movement had its guiding thread in the Jewish diaspora, and in particular it was the proselytes of the gate, the σεβόμενοι of Acts, who everywhere presented themselves as the natural and grateful ground for missionary activity. But these had always been in communion with Judaism, and their coexistence with the Jews was undoubtedly already regulated by certain norms for them, as Lipsius 1) also assumes, and indeed probably the same ones that Acts gives here as the decision of the Jerusalem assembly. Without such regulations, the coexistence of Gentile and Jewish Christians was unthinkable, and neither Paul nor the original apostles could have had any doubt about it for a moment. Negotiations without addressing this question, as the Epistle to the Galatians describes it, would have been the most foolish thing that could have been done at that time, unless one had to think of something even worse, namely that Paul and the original apostles had deliberately deceived each other.

1) Introduction to the N.T. 2nd ed. p. 414.
1) Article Apostle Convention, in Schenkel'« Bibell. S.204.

106

And now the whole thing stands like this: In Acts we have a negotiation that really gives a solution to this question, and indeed one that we see in force everywhere at least in the post-apostolic age, since the four abstentions mentioned here actually later regulate Christian customs with a few exceptions. It is a real contract that assigns rights and duties to each party, which makes sense and corresponds to the existing need. In the Epistle to the Galatians we have a compromise on a question that only concerns the mission area of the apostles, but no instructions at all for the further coexistence of the Gentile and Jade Christians, which was in question even after the beginning of the report. As heroic as the role assigned to Paul is, it is also completely impractical, and we must ask ourselves whether the story in Acts is not just a question of the future. but is somewhat closer to the historical truth. If we decide for the latter, then Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians is simply an idealization by a later hand and then it becomes clear why he fits so little into the rest of history.

107

In this case, the relationship between the two accounts will have to be reversed. It is not Acts that presupposes the Epistle to the Galatians, but rather the latter presupposes the former, as the possibility that they do not know each other can then be more certainly excluded. As we have already seen in the first part of the report, the relationship is shaped accordingly. Here, attention should be paid to the sentence in verse 6: ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο. We translate this as: "they added nothing to me." Holsten1) explains it as: "they have communicated nothing to me," which could be understood as his gospel not having received any addition. This interpretation is supported by the preceding phrase in 1:16: οὐ προσανεθέμην σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι, which indeed means, "I did not consult with flesh and blood." However, the word here is more closely related to verse 2: ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, etc., and will be explained by this, as well as by the contrast mentioned in verse 7. The meaning "to communicate" is a derived one; the medium initially means "to impose oneself on someone," "to concern someone." Here, according to usage2) and context, it must be explained as "to add something of one's own," which here can only mean that the original apostles did not impose any further demands on Paul, whose fulfillment would have been required for his gospel to be acknowledged by them.1) Then, however, we have here a negation of what Acts reports, that Gentile Christians were obliged to certain observances. These are formally excluded and rejected here, which presupposes that they are known. The only condition conceded by Paul, not as a condition but as a request, is alms for the poor of the Jerusalem community, and regarding this wish, Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians says: ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι ("the very thing I was eager to do").

1. Das Evangelium des Paulus, p. 149.
2. See Grimm in the dictionary.

1) So also Zeller, Apostelgesch. p. 235.

108

Here the interpreters cannot help noting that we have no historical evidence for the truth of this statement2), namely, that Paul brought or sent a collection to Jerusalem between the Apostolic Convention and the Epistle to the Galatians. For everything else we hear on this matter comes after our letter, at least if we consider it the first of the main letters, as is usually done. In 1 Cor. 16:1 it is first mentioned that Paul ordered the collection in the churches of Galatia, in 2 Cor. 8-9 only the collection is mentioned, and in Rom. 16:25ff. the collection is only finished and Paul is about to bring its proceeds up to Jerusalem. Thus nothing is known from the other Pauline letters about the fulfillment of this promise within the time period given here. That the apostle's assurance is not to be doubted, despite this, that he might have sent support money to Jerusalem who knows how often - this explanation of the exegetes (see Meyer) is an empty assumption that lacks foundation. According to Acts, Paul had already brought a collection to Jerusalem at that time, namely the one mentioned in 11:29, 30. But if the collection of the Pauline letters comes too late, then this one comes too early, since the apostolic convention took place only afterwards. Wieseler3) borrows from the circumstances in which this agreement is mentioned here a reason to put Gal. 2:1-11 together with Acts 18:2*2, and Volkmar1) even wants to move the collection Acts 11:29, 30 to the time shortly before the Galatians letter. Both attempts to help only prove that there is no help."

2) S. Meyer-Sieffert on Gal. 2,10.
3) Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians p.5G9ff.
1) Paul of Damascus to the Epistle to the Galatians. P. 56 ff.

109

It was more correct when Schräder2) used this point to support his view that the Epistle to the Galatians is not the first but the last of Paul's main letters. But the matter is much simpler. The author of the Epistle to the Galatians, who knows the other main letters of Paul, knows from them about the collection and its delivery to Jerusalem, and he also knows what Acts reports in a similar way about Paul's concern for the saints in Jerusalem (11:25, 26, 12:25, 24, 17), and from this he forms this sentence, which now appears to be a prolepsis at this point, if at least the Epistle to the Galatians is placed before the other main letters. In this way, the riddle that is presented to the reader here is solved in the most natural way and the solution provides another contribution to the observations that we have made about the artificial and unhistorical nature of this section.

2) Der Apostel Paulus I. S. 219.

Finally, two points must be considered before we go any further, namely two specific statements that we find in our section and that do not seem to have any parallel in Acts. One is the statement in 2:1 that Paul's second journey to Jerusalem took place 14 years after the first, for

this is how the statement is now most correctly understood, and not from Paul's conversion, as some previously assumed. The Acts 2:1 obviously looks back to the Acts 1:18 and for this reason the 14 years are to be counted from then on. The statement is very specific, but striking. What Paul did in these long 14 years, which make up almost half of his entire career, remains completely obscure. He went to the regions of Syria and Cilicia, it says in 1:21, but whether he went on missionary work or to stay quietly at home is not known. For both, the period is unduly long, and it is understandable that the interpreters have often read it as adverbial, that is, to simply delete 10 years, as Eusebius had already suggested. A less violent method is the other, which has also been popular with many interpreters1), to count the terminus a quo from Paul's conversion, which gives permission to subtract the 3 years 1:18. But neither is justifiable; it remains a long, empty period, the use of which is not even hinted at. If we consult Acts, the matter is again much more natural. After his first visit to Jerusalem, Paul is sent to Tarsus, 9:30, and we do not hear of him again until 11:25, where Barnabas needs a worker in the Lord's work for the newly founded church in Antioch and Paul fetches him from Tarsus. In between lies Peter's missionary activity and the founding of numerous Christian communities outside Jerusalem, which took place as a result of the scattering of the mother community and ultimately led to the formation of the community in Antioch. How much time this might take is not indicated, but in any case it is a few years at most, and definitely not 14. Even if we take into account that the first missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas falls within the 14-year period of the Epistle to the Galatians (Acts 13, 14), we still fall considerably short of this time measure. For Paul's first activity in Antioch is given by Acts itself as having lasted one year (11:26), and what follows after the missionary journey cannot even fill a decade. Since Acts 12 reports the death of Herod Agrippa, according to Acts 12 it is estimated that Herod Agrippa was a Christian. Paul's arrival in Antioch must have been before 44, about 10 years before the apostolic convention, and his conversion a little earlier, so that 17 years do not come out.

1) See the names in Meyer-Sieffert's commentary on 2, 1 and the note.

If the Epistle to the Galatians is as fixed as one usually thinks, then Acts must have pushed the time periods together considerably. But it is also possible that the "14 years" is an artificial number, with which the author of the Epistle to the Galatians wants to protest against the portrayal in Acts of the apostle's constant contact with Jerusalem, by deliberately giving a very long period of time for which he was absent from this city. This assumption could be accepted without the chronology of Paul's activity being thrown out of whack. The second half of this is based on the information in the Acts of the Apostles, namely, on the one hand, the change of office between Felix and Festus (Acts 24:27), which can only be placed in the year 60 or 61, and on the other hand, on the arrival of the married couple Aquila and Priscilla, who had been expelled from Rome by Claudius (Acts 18:2), in Corinth (Acts 18:2), which can only have taken place before the death of this emperor in 54, and the mention there in v. 12 of the proconsul Gallio, whose Assumption of office in Corinth can probably be placed around 54 [1)]. According to this, the apostolic convention in Jerusalem can always be assigned with great probability to the year 52. The first half of Paul's activity then loses its previous support, however, since the

calculation of 14 and 3 years back from the apostolic convention is no longer certain, and the Acts of the Apostles do not allow such a long period to be expected. But there is also nothing to prevent Paul's conversion from being placed several years later than is usually done, not 35 or 37 but perhaps not until the 40s [2)]. It is striking that no one has yet taken exception to the usual early date. If Saul travels to Damascus to persecute Christians there, how long must have passed to make the spread of Christianity to this city conceivable?

1) S. Anger, account of the times of S. 119.
2) Paschal Chronicle 42/43 S. die Tabelle in Anger's system of seasons.

The second point concerns Titus, who is emphasized in the Epistle to the Galatians as not being compelled to be circumcised. This information is entirely missing in Acts, and since Acts is supposed to know the Epistle to the Galatians, it is believed that this omission is deliberate, to avoid recalling this contentious dispute. As a counterpart, immediately after this, Acts 16:1-3 describes the circumcision of Timothy. This is the view of the critical school and recently also of Weizsäcker1). It is conceded that the two passages are related, but it is unclear why the account of Timothy should be the counterpart to that of Titus and not the other way around. The circumcision of Timothy is historically justified by the mention of his Jewish mother and the Jews living in those regions where Paul intended to travel. The non-circumcision of Titus is merely reported as a fact, and in Gal. 2:4 it is so strangely and incomprehensibly explained that, as mentioned above, it is not even clear whether he was circumcised or not. This confusion in the sentences of the Epistle to the Galatians is most easily explained if the parallel incident in Acts influenced it, and the expression itself indicates that this relationship indeed existed. When Gal. 2:4 begins with διά δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους, it corresponds to 2) Acts 16:3: διά τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς ὄντας ἐν τοῖς τόποις ἐκείνοις. While this sentence in Acts is clear and fluent, the one in the Epistle to the Galatians is cumbersome and unintelligible. The question of what verb to supplement is most easily resolved by assuming that the original meaning was that, according to the source, περιετμήθη ("he was circumcised") was to be written, but this could not be done due to the different context, so the sentence was broken off and the appropriate thought was added in the relative clause οἷς οὐδέ πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν ("to whom we did not yield in submission even for a moment") to fit the changed circumstances. The Jews had now become false brothers, and they could no longer be conceded to, although the beginning of the sentence would more likely lead to the deletion of οὐδέ. Thus, this confusion is explained. The change of name from Timothy to Titus is appropriate. Titus was well known from the Corinthian letters as a companion of Paul. The rather superfluous addition in the Galatians passage, Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοί, Ἕλλην ὤν ("Titus, who was with me, being a Greek"), is best understood in contrast to the statement in Acts that Timothy was the son of a Hellenistic father and a Jewish mother. Otherwise, there is no need to say, when someone is to be circumcised, that he was not a Jew, as no one can be circumcised twice.

1) The Apostolic Age p. 185.
2) As Bruno Bauer first saw, Critique of the Pauline Epistles p. 122.

4. The conflict in Antioch.

After the Epistle to the Galatians has reported on the course of the meeting in Jerusalem, it follows it with a postlude, 2:11-14. Peter comes to Antioch and there he first joins the Gentile Christian community in the table fellowship. But then some come from James and Peter withdraws out of fear of those of the circumcision. The other Jews also share his hypocritical behavior, so that even Barnabas is drawn into their hypocrisy. Then Paul confronted Peter in front of the whole community and rebuked him: If you, as a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how do you force the Gentiles to act like Jews? There is no parallel to this characteristic and momentous event in Acts. Nowhere is there any mention of a conflict between Paul and Peter. After the Council of the Apostles, Paul and Barnabas return to Antioch, and people from Jerusalem go with them, but not Peter, but Judas and Silas as bearers of the Apostles' decree, and we hear no word about such incidents as those reported in the Epistle to the Galatians. Peter disappears from Acts from the Council of the Apostles onwards, we hear nothing more of him, the story turns exclusively to Paul.

How is this silence to be judged? The critics say very clearly: merely as an example of the system of cover-up that runs through the whole of Acts. The book, which places the two great apostles side by side and glorifies both, cannot possibly report such a scene that so directly contradicts its entire presentation. So Luke passed over the matter in silence. Yes, we know of even more. In order to provide some kind of substitute and at the same time to divert attention from the offensive apostolic dispute, Acts relates a similar incident in this context, namely the conflict between Paul and Barnabas over Mark (Acts 15:35-39), which also takes place in Antioch, but is comparatively much less serious. So everything seems to be in order, and the clash between Paul and Peter in Antioch is all the more an irrefutable fact, as it becomes fatal for the time to come, since from then on the compromise of Jerusalem appears to have been eliminated and the Judaistic agitation against Paul continues its course. The echoes of the dispute in early Christian literature, in the Clementine Homilies 1) etc., also prove that there is a firm fact here, and this is to be assumed, because no later person would ever have dared to introduce such disharmony into the original apostolic work through his own invention. Where inventions have been made, they have been made in the interest of ecclesiastical peace and apostolic doctrinal unity.

> 1) See especially XVII. 19, where the phrase κατεγνωσμένον με λέγεις undoubtedly refers back to the κατεγνωσμένος in Gal. 2:11.

This argument is, as I have said, very plausible, and it may seem the height of audacity if we nevertheless allow ourselves to express some modest doubts about it. Above all, the description of this incident in the Epistle to the Galatians is no different from the rest; it is not really clear, and there is no historical detail that would make the matter clear. We do not even know when the incident occurred. It simply says: ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν, and it is left to the reader to orient

themselves regarding this ὅτε, for which they have no means. This is partly due to the epistolary form, which does not aim to provide a historical narrative ex officio, but rather mentions only what is necessary for the present purpose. However, since Paul writes this to the Galatians and has previously given exact dates in 1:18 and 2:1, he could have been a bit more precise here. Thus, one can indeed doubt whether Peter came to Antioch immediately after the Apostolic Council, as if to practically demonstrate the newly established reconciliation, or much later, perhaps after the return from the second missionary journey (Acts 18:22), as suggested by Neander, Baumgarten, Lange, Wieseler, Renan1), and Godet2). We, however, find the former more likely, for a reason that will become evident shortly. Regarding the dispute itself, the same unfortunate presentation prevails here, which has already given exegetes so much trouble in the preceding section. How can Paul say to Peter: "If you, being a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how can you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?" He was not living like a Gentile at that time but had begun to follow Jewish customs again, and if he had done so previously, he had disavowed this free behavior. The present tense ζῇς is always difficult to justify, and the explanation by Baur, Holsten, and Sieffert that the present tense in a logical sense means "you can live" has scarcely any analogy in common usage. We would rather expect Paul to say: "If you, being a Jew, lived like a Gentile, it has already been proven that it was not against your conscience, and thus no compulsion could arise to change it." Also, the second clause, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαΐζειν, is not quite normal. The compulsion must be thought of as indirect, through the influence of example, and Peter had not gone so far as to want to impose the law on Gentile Christians. Regarding the possibility of the entire event, it must be admitted that, based on the assumptions in the Epistle to the Galatians, it could have occurred as described, since the letter knows nothing of the decree and its four abstentions. According to Acts, however, this decision would have made the coexistence and communal meals of Jewish and Gentile Christians possible, as it is inconceivable that, for example, during the celebration of the Lord's Supper and the preceding communal meal, such coexistence did not take place. Thus, the Epistle to the Galatians immediately tests the practical applicability of its view of the Apostolic Council, and this test turns out unfavorably for it, as could not have been otherwise. But the Epistle to the Galatians did not envisage any coexistence of Jewish and Gentile Christians. Its principle—"we to the Gentiles, you to the Jews"—directly leads to a complete separation, and with this in mind, it is incomprehensible why Peter would come to Antioch, where he had no business. Or, if one assumes that this community was mixed, the arrangement from Jerusalem lacks any norm for the life of such a community, and Paul would have overstepped his bounds by simply demanding that Peter follow his views and completely ignore his own, as if only Paul had authority here. In reality, the Epistle to the Galatians shows no regard for the rights of Jewish Christians and judges their fundamentally correct behavior, according to the letter's assumptions, as hypocrisy—a harsh and unkind expression that can only be explained by a fanatically Pauline consciousness. Furthermore, the matter does not become any clearer. Not knowing where Paul's speech ends, and the passage in verses 15-21 having no clear relation to the incident, shows that we do not have an actual historical account here. The fact that no word is given about Peter's response or how the matter was resolved further strengthens this impression. In the Epistle to the Galatians, the conflict between Paul and Peter is merely the occasion to introduce the theme of justification by faith, which is then further elaborated in the subsequent doctrinal discussion.

1) St. Paul, p. 291 ff.
2) Epitre aux Romains p. 56 ff.

If the critics have tried to trace the account in Acts back to the Epistle to the Galatians, the opposite naturally suggests itself based on the previous results. The dispute between Paul and Barnabas, which in Acts follows immediately after the negotiations in Jerusalem and also takes place in Antioch, is the next solid point. This dispute must have a historical basis, as it originates from Mark's behavior on the first missionary journey (Acts 13:13). Just as Paul and Barnabas have a sharp disagreement here (ἔγένετο δὲ παροξυσμός, Acts 15:39), Paul has a dispute with Peter in the Epistle to the Galatians, and Barnabas is also involved in it. Whether the dispute in Acts had a similar cause to that in the Epistle to the Galatians, namely, a different stance towards Judaism, is hard to say. Acts suggests that Paul accused Mark only of cowardice for not wanting to go to work with them (15:38). But it could also be, as most interpreters assume, that Mark had legalistic concerns about advancing the gospel so far into Gentile territory, which would indeed present a further similarity to the conflict in the Epistle to the Galatians. The ἀποστὰς ἀπ' αὐτῶν would then become the apostate Peter, separating himself from Paul and his followers. But isn't the subject of the conflict quite different? There is no mention in Acts of Jewish scruples about food. Not at this point, but at another. Earlier, when Peter converted Cornelius and associated with this Gentile household, he did not consider Jewish dietary laws a hindrance, as the vision from heaven had already revealed to him the abolition of the distinction between clean and unclean (Acts 10:9-16). When he returned to Jerusalem, those of the circumcision argued with him, διεκρινοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς λέγοντες ὅτι εἰσῆλθες πρὸς ἄνδρας ἀκροβυστίαν ἔχοντας καὶ συνέφαγες αὐτοῖς (Acts 11:2-3). So, the same accusation made against Peter in Antioch by James' followers according to the Epistle to the Galatians, except that in Acts, Peter is not intimidated. It is explicitly stated that those who caused Peter this difficulty in Jerusalem were Jewish Christians, and since James also represents the stricter party in Acts (15:13ff., 21:18ff.), he must be sought behind these people if he later makes concessions. Thus, the incident in Antioch in the Epistle to the Galatians finds a corresponding parallel 1) in another incident in Acts. Combined with the παροξυσμός that breaks out between Barnabas and Paul, this provides the template on which the same can be modeled. Absolute certainty cannot be achieved here, and it remains possible that another event underlies the conflict in Antioch in the Epistle to the Galatians or at least Peter's visit to Antioch. We can more readily accept this since nothing further is heard about Peter in Acts, so it is unknown where else he may have gone. The assumption that another Acts of the Apostles, of which several existed besides the one preserved for us, provided information about this, and that the account in the Epistle to the Galatians is based not only on our Lucan Acts but also on its older sources, such as the Kerygma of Peter or similar, cannot be excluded. But since we no longer have these

sources, nothing further can be determined, and no progress can be made from this. It seems certain that the matter of Peter's visit to Antioch must have been known in written or oral tradition outside of the Epistle to the Galatians. The way it is presented in the letter suggests that it was known to the readers. A story told as it is here, beginning with ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, can only be mentioned by someone referring to something already familiar. There will be an opportunity to return to this point later.

1) So Bruno Bauer a. a. O. S. Γ24.

Thus the relationship that is usually established between the Epistle to the Galatians and the Acts of the Apostles is completely reversed. The former does not depend on the former, but the latter on the latter. This is, of course, the world turned upside down for our criticism today, and it is understandable that one cannot immediately get used to this contradictory viewpoint. Even Bruno Bauer, in his 1850 work on the Acts of the Apostles, assumed the relationship that is usually assumed, namely that Acts refers back to the Epistle to the Galatians, to which it offers a balancing presentation. But already in his Critique of the Pauline Epistles in 1852 he had established the opposite, at least for the Epistle to the Galatians, and had withdrawn his previous position. We believe that he was on the right track with this, and only the excessive exaggerations and the repulsive manner of presentation can make it understandable that these in any case astute and intelligent investigations have remained almost completely unnoticed until now.

We have reached the same conclusion. The presentation of the Epistle to the Galatians has the strong prejudice in its favor that the history of New Testament criticism places in its favor. But if we drop the assumption that the pure and clean truth itself must necessarily be present here and that everything that contradicts it is "disposed of" from the outset, then it is not so difficult to discover the irregularities, improbabilities and contradictions that abound in this report. The overall conclusion will then be that Acts is by no means without a tendency, but that the alteration of the historical material in it is not nearly as advanced as in the Epistle to the Galatians, that on the whole it bears far more of the historical colour of early Christianity than the Pauline legend in the Epistle to the Galatians, which, from a historical perspective, turns out to be the most improbable thing that could be said about these things. The dogmatic viewpoints dominate it to an even greater degree. If the Acts of the Apostles is the account of a mediating Pauline, then in the Epistle to the Galatians we hear the answer of a radical follower of Paul. The apostle of the Gentiles, says the Author of the Acts of the Apostles, was not an enemy of the law or of the Jewish Christians, he was on the most friendly terms with the community in Jerusalem and the early apostles from the very beginning, he celebrated the festivals of his people, and when it seemed necessary in a special case, he also performed circumcision. When disputes arose that were of a contentious nature, any confusion of minds was avoided by friendly concessions from both sides, in short, everything took place in peace and friendship and only the stubborn Jews, not the Jewish Christians, were Paul's opponents on all counts. What! cries the author of the Galatians, is this how our Paul was supposed to have spoken and acted?

Never! He did not receive his gospel from men, but directly from Christ. He did not go up to Jerusalem to the Jewish apostles, but away to Arabia. He learned nothing from Peter and James. He negotiated with the pillars of the early church as one power to another, and they recognized him in his office as apostle to the Gentiles. He never made the slightest concession, but did not give in for an hour to the false, insinuated brothers. Finally, he even fully maintained his position against the prince of the apostles, Peter, and rebuked him when he had cowardly and weakly given in to the Judaizers. This was the hero of free Gentile Christianity, and this is how we want him to be and read his story.

121

The realization of this wish is shown in the Epistle to the Galatians, which in its first part corrects the picture of Paul in Acts step by step. The correction took the form of a letter to the Galatians, because the apostasy of these communities must have given rise to Paul speaking to them about these things. Only the Paul of later Paulinism had reason to tell them all this. In the second chapter we touched on the question, on which interpreters differ, whether Paul communicated this history of his to the communities he founded on the first journey or to those he founded on the second. The opinion of the supporters of the latter, usually accepted view is that Paul could only write this to those on the second journey, because he should have communicated it long ago to those on the first, since their conversion falls before the apostolic convention and this also concerned them. This opinion takes on a whole new importance for us at this point. We say this: Whether it is the congregations of the first or the second generation, the apostle should have told them this history long before he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians. He could not and should not leave them in the dark about his history and his position towards the apostles and the congregation in Jerusalem as well as towards Jewish Christianity as a whole. And the real Paul certainly did this whenever he entered into close contact with a congregation. These new converts certainly all wanted to know something about the person and fate of their convert, and the apostle had no reason to refuse this. In this part of the Epistle to the Galatians, however, Paul never refers to his earlier statements; he speaks as if everything was new to them, as if they were learning the matter for the first time. So the readers will have actually learned this for the first time through this letter, i.e. the letter should have and did give them the right idea of Paul. After the beautiful but still very human image of Paul in the Acts of the Apostles, the heroic figure of the spiritual Paul, the law-free apostle of the nations, appears to them here, and this image was shown to them by a disciple who had penetrated into the spirit of Paul in a similar way to how the disciple whom Jesus loved had penetrated into that of the synoptic Christ.

Chapter 5

The signs in the remaining parts of the letter.

Result.

The course of the investigation had to anticipate the result in part. If the relationship between the Epistle to the Galatians and the Epistle to the Romans is that found in the third chapter, then our letter is dependent on this greatest of Paul's main letters in a way that excludes the unity of the author. And if, on the other hand, the relationship between the Epistle to the Galatians and the Acts of the Apostles is that described in the fourth chapter, then the latter also proves to be influenced by this historical work in such a way that it can only have been written after it was written, i.e. long after Paul's death.

This result is, however, so unexpected, not to say unheard of, that it seems necessary to go through the parts of the letter that have not yet been touched on, in order to find out whether there are any features of the later writing in them.

Firstly, we encounter the opening of the letter (1:1-5), which, according to the general view, immediately reveals the occasion and purpose of the writing through the emphasis on the divine origin of Paul's apostleship, namely, that it is directed against those who challenge Paul's apostolic independence and accuse him of lacking human authority. Against this accusation, Paul strongly asserts: Παῦλος ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρός. This assertion is also a self-testimony, and it is usually considered very justified and understandable, as the opposition against his adversaries prompted the author to speak these words. However, one might judge this differently. The claim to apostleship of divine origin is expressed so strongly that it contradicts the modesty with which a genuine author would otherwise present himself. No matter how much Paul may have been conscious of having received his office from God and not from men, it would scarcely befit him to express this consciousness so strongly from the outset. If his opponents relied on human authority while he relied on God's authority, he himself would be the least likely to say this without overstepping the boundary that separates justified self-confidence from boastful arrogance. We prefer the phrase ελάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὃς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος in 1 Corinthians 15:9. This raises the suspicion that it may rather be another person, an enthusiastic admirer of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, speaking about him than Paul himself. This is also the sentiment Bruno Bauer expresses when he questions whether any historical hero, even in conflict, would proclaim his legitimacy in such a manner1). Similarly, Pierson finds exaggeration and overzealousness2) in this opening, and it is likely only the habit of admiring in this the greatness and firmness of apostolic self-consciousness that has so far prevented many others from sharing this impression. One should not argue that "an apostle by the grace of God," like "a king by the grace of God," is fundamentally an expression of humility, a self-renouncing consciousness that the sole value of person and work rests on God's grace. For just as Paul speaks in 1 Corinthians 15:10, χαριτι δὲ θεοῦ εἰμὶ ὃ εἰμὶ, the apostle here does

not speak, but rather bestows upon himself the title ἀπόστολος διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρός in the sense of an absolute superiority over any merely human calling, thus in the opposite sense of modesty.

1) Critique of the Pauline letters p. 7.

2) de Rede on the Mountain etc. p. 101.

But in the end, this could be a subjective feeling, and even if in the following introductory section 1:6-10, this self-confidence of the Apostle escalates to the point where he twice calls down a curse on anyone, even an angel from heaven, who preaches a different gospel than the one he preached to the Galatians, the strength of this expression is certainly enough to cause amazement. However, who can say that Paul himself could not have written in such a manner? The exegetical difficulties of this section should also not be used against it. It is true that the phrase ο οὐχ ἔστιν ἄλλο in verse 7 is unclear; in meaning, one must translate it as: "which is not another," and in words: "which is not another," which interpreters then awkwardly interpret as: "the gospel that the others preach is no different from mine, only they present it as another."

Also, the question of whether the ὡς προειρήκαμεν in verse 9 refers to the preceding assertion in verse 8, or as most modern scholars now assume, to the Apostle's earlier stay with the Galatians, will not be pursued further here, although the former interpretation seems more correct to us. The harsh phrase: ἄρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν θεόν in verse 10, where only the assumption of the softened meaning of πείθω: "to win over," as represented by de Wette, Meyer, and others, brings out a tolerable sense, and Holsten's translation: "Do I now seek the approval of men or of God?" is almost more obscure than the text itself, will also be left as is. However, we note that a glance at 2 Corinthians 5:11, ἀνθρώπους πείθομεν, θεῷ δὲ πεφανερώμεθα, first makes clear what the sentence actually intends to say. Finally, the difficult ἔτι in the same verse, which Holsten1) wants to relate not subjectively to the speaker, but objectively to the crucifixion of Christ, is not indicated by the context at all. Here, the analogous ἔτι from our letter in 5:11, which also causes much trouble for interpreters, can be placed alongside for clarification: εἰ περιτομὴν ἔτι κηρύσσω, τί ἔτι διώκομαι; which can only be interpreted without force to mean that Paul indeed preached circumcision earlier, as Hausrath 1) has seen. This would mean that Paul initially taught and worked in less sharp contrast to the original apostles and received their approval. We do not wish to prioritize these difficulties here, but it is striking that they are so numerous and peculiar in this short introductory section.

1) The Evg. of Paul p. 131).

What is more important, however, is to consider the overall character of this section. It is well known that the Pauline letters generally follow a fairly consistent form, particularly concerning the beginning of the letter, which almost always follows a set pattern. After the more or less

extended address, there follows a shorter or longer section in which the Apostle usually gives thanks to God for the faith life of the respective congregation, naturally determined by the specific circumstances of the case. The formula with which this part is introduced, to stay within the circle of the four main letters, is, for instance, "First, I thank my God" (Romans 1:8), "I always thank my God" (1 Corinthians 1:4), "Praise be to the God and Father..." (2 Corinthians 1:3). This "I thank" and so forth is to be considered so standard that the smaller Pauline letters adhere to it, with the exception only of the First Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus, where the circumstances are different. For those who attribute these smaller letters not to the Apostle Paul himself but to his school, this is a sign that the form used in the main letters had become so established that it was later followed, and this opening was seen as a necessary part of a Pauline letter. How is this in the Epistle to the Galatians? The corresponding section is present, placed in the usual spot between the address (1:1-5) and the actual beginning of the letter (1:11). But instead of "I thank," there is "I am astonished" (θαυμάζω)! Naturally, the former was excluded by the content of the letter from the outset; the Apostle could not thank God for the faith life of congregations he had so much to rebuke, nothing but an expression of indignant astonishment was fitting. But is it likely that the Apostle chose this form if this letter was the first he wrote? Doesn't this "I am astonished" instead of the well-known "I thank" make the impression that the letter was written by someone who knew the Pauline form and followed it here as well, but appropriately replaced the praiseworthy opening with a reproachful one? In any case, it is easier to understand how a standing "I thank" could turn into "I am astonished" in the given case than how this formula could develop with such regularity from "I am astonished." However, this argument has full force only for those who consider all the smaller letters to be post-Pauline. If the First Epistle to the Thessalonians precedes the Epistle to the Galatians in time, then the former first introduced "we always thank" (1 Thessalonians 1:2) into usage, and from there, the change is a little easier to explain.

1) N.T. Contemporary History II p. 517 (1st ed.).

126

The two main sections, 1:11–2:14 and 2:15–4:7, have already been discussed above, so we turn to the last part of the letter, insofar as it has not already been examined.

Our attention is first drawn to the section 4:12–20, which interrupts the flow of the dogmatic discussion with the Apostle’s personal address. The first sentence is already striking: "Become as I am, for I also have become as you are. Brothers, I beseech you." The Galatians are to become like the Apostle; this could be understood since the discussion before was about the freedom in observing the feast days.

127

They are to adopt his freedom in this regard. But the clause, "for I also have become as you are," is hardly understandable. Has Paul condescended to the observances of the Galatians? That is hardly what he wants to say. Hence, there is considerable discussion among interpreters about the interpretation of this part of the sentence. To maintain the context, one can only

explain with Holsten and others: "Become free from Judaism, as I too have become free from it, like a Gentile." This brings to mind 1 Corinthians 9:21, "to those outside the law, I became as one outside the law." But this does not fit with the Galatians, as they have just given up their earlier free stance. Therefore, older interpreters explain: "Become free from Judaism, for I was once a Judaizer like you are now." But in that case, ημην (I was) should not be missing, and the motive would be very peculiar: "Become as I am, which is the opposite of what you are now, because I was once like you!" It would rather need to be stated why the Apostle has become so completely different. Therefore, other interpreters abandon the precise connection of the clause to the main sentence and explain the former more generally: "Give up Judaism, for I have also lovingly accommodated myself to you." So Rückert, following older predecessors. Finally, some even drop the reference to Judaism altogether: "Love me as I love you!" in which case it is unclear how this meaning comes from these words. A whole range of other nuances of opinions, between those mentioned, can be found listed in Meyer's commentary. This variety of opinions is again a troubling sign. The idea itself, that Paul urges the addressed to become as he is, is not surprising. It is found in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, where 4:16 says: "I urge you, then, be imitators of me," and again in 11:1: "Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ." The latter passage shows how the clause must actually read to give a clear meaning: Paul has imitated Christ; the Corinthians are to imitate him. The clause in our Galatians passage, "for I also have become as you are," points to another thought from the First Epistle to the Corinthians, namely the one already mentioned: "To those outside the law, I became as one outside the law," and to what precedes this: "To the Jews, I became like a Jew to win the Jews," etc. The ambiguity of our sentence probably arises from the fact that two reminiscences from earlier Pauline letters combined for the author of our letter into a new whole, which now neither fits the new context properly nor can deny its origin from disparate halves.

128

Equally puzzling is the following sentence: "You did me no wrong; you know it was because of an illness of the flesh that I preached the gospel to you the first time," etc. If the entire letter is full of the bitter feeling that the defection of the Galatians must awaken in the Apostle, how can he say to them, "You did me no wrong"? Or should this refer to the past, which the following sentence addresses? "You did me no wrong when I first appeared to you in Galatia"? But even in this case, as the interpreters have suggested, it does not make proper sense. If the Apostle were to speak naturally of that time, he would say something like: "At that time, you were friendly and devoted to me," but not first and foremost: "You did me no wrong," as if they were savages for whom this would be particularly praiseworthy. Here too, an expression from other letters seems to echo, such as 2 Corinthians 7:12: "Not for the sake of the one who did the wrong or of the injured party," where, according to the opinion of many interpreters, the Apostle himself is understood as the one wronged. Our sentence indeed seems to intend to refer to the past, but it does so in a way that makes clear understanding impossible.

On the other hand, what follows clearly enough refers to the Apostle's previous presence among the Galatians.

The first time, he preached the gospel to them because of a weakness of the flesh. They did not scorn or despise his trial in the flesh, or their trial due to his flesh, depending on the reading, but received him as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus. From this, a whole history of the Apostle's earlier activity in Galatia is constructed. He intended merely to pass through, but was compelled to stay due to an attack of his ailment. This ailment is thought to have been nervous seizures with an epileptic character, as some have assumed since Holsten1) and Krenkel2), while others, even more peculiarly, prefer to think of an eye disease because of the later statement: "if possible, you would have torn out your eyes and given them to me." We have already discussed this interpretation of the passage in the second chapter (p. 47), and a closer examination shows that it means something entirely different. Based on the earlier discussion, we feel justified in translating: "But you know that I preached the gospel to you previously due to a weakness of the flesh." For τὸ πρότερον does not necessarily mean the first of two times, but can simply mean "earlier." Although πρότερον is a comparative and implies an earlier time compared to a later one, the later time does not need to be in the past; it can correspond to the present. Hilgenfeld3) also explains this as possible, citing John 6:62, 9:8, Deuteronomy 2:12, and 1 Maccabees 11:27. For the language usage of John, this is certainly fully proven, because when it says in the first passage, "then what if you see the Son of Man ascend to where he was before?" no one would be tempted to translate "the earlier time." The usage in Paul's letters can only be gleaned from 2 Corinthians 1:15, where πρότερον without the article means "earlier" or "first," so there is no significant difference between usage with or without the article. Thus, the account of Paul's two previous visits to Galatia is eliminated, and the conclusions based on it regarding the letter's composition conditions become irrelevant. But what is meant by the πειρασμός μου ἐν τῇ σαρκί, or as Tischendorf VIII reads, the πειρασμός ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου? It could be that we should think of Paul's known physical ailment, the "thorn in the flesh," the "messenger of Satan" mentioned in 2 Corinthians 12:7. Then this passage would remind us that Paul was warmly received by the Galatians despite being afflicted by attacks of that strange and easily misjudged ailment during his stay. However, there might be another interpretation. Elsewhere in the Pauline letters, πειρασμός and πειράζω do not refer to affliction by illness, but to temptation by persecution. For example, in 1 Corinthians 10:13: "No temptation has overtaken you except what is common to mankind." On the other hand, ἀσθένεια usually refers to such afflictions, as in 2 Corinthians 11:30: "If I must boast, I will boast of the things that show my weakness," following a long list of the sufferings and dangers endured by the Apostle. Here, nothing prevents us from understanding πειρασμός and ἀσθένεια in the same sense, if we accept the view discussed in the second chapter that Galatia refers to the Roman province, not just the region of that name. Then our passage refers to the Apostle's first visit to the Galatians, i.e., his first missionary journey, and we should simply think of the persecutions he experienced at that time when considering the weakness of the flesh and the trial mentioned. According to Acts 13:50, he and his companion Barnabas experienced persecution and were expelled in Antioch of Pisidia. In Iconium (14:5), there was an attempt by both Gentiles and Jews to mistreat and stone them. In Lystra, they were first received with divine honors, with Barnabas hailed as Zeus and Paul as Hermes, but the mood quickly turned, and Paul was stoned and dragged out of the

city, presumed dead (14:19). However, when the disciples gathered around him, he revived and went back into the city. These episodes fit our passage in Galatians better than the account of the second missionary journey in Acts 16:6, which is commonly referred to but does not allow for this interpretation as we have shown earlier. The ἀσθένεια τῆς σαρκός and the πειρασμός ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου then refer to Paul's stoning, his helpless state as a half-dead person, which the Galatians did not use for mocking comments, nor did they respond with contempt or disdain. One could even directly relate the subsequent phrase: "you received me as an angel of God" to the Galatians' belief that Paul was Hermes, the messenger of the gods. However, this was said by the locals who were later converted by Paul and is more likely to refer to their acceptance of the Christian message, as this honor shown to Paul is further elaborated in verse 15.

1) On the Gospel of Paul and Peter 1868. p. 85.

2) Journal of Science! Theology 1873 p. 238.

3) Galatians p. 21 Anin. Usteri explains the same in the commentary.

Thus, this passage receives new light through its relation to the account in the Acts of the Apostles. Instead of the very peculiar meaning that interpreters have derived from it, we obtain a simple reminder of the external circumstances that accompanied the first proclamation of the gospel to the Galatians. Instead of assuming that Paul converted the Galatians due to an illness and thus essentially against his will and as a severely suffering person, we get a fitting reminder of the trials Paul endured from the hostile population at that time, in which the faithfulness of the brothers shone all the more brightly.

Now the Apostle turns again to the bleak present. "Have I then become your enemy by telling you the truth? They zealously court you, but not for good; they want to exclude you, that you may zealously seek them." Here, the wordplay with ζηλοῦν (to be zealous) and ζηλοῦσθαι (to be courted) in verses 17 and 18 is noteworthy. Previously, the Galatians directed their zeal toward Paul; now the opponents zealously court them, with the selfish intention that the Galatians, separated from Paul, will then zealously seek them. This zealousness or being courted is something good and should always occur for what is right and true. But even this sentence gives cause for reflection. The ζηλοῦν in verse 17 is understandable, but the ζηλοῦσθαι in verse 18 is almost incomprehensible. If taken as a middle voice, as most of the older interpreters did, it not only contradicts Greek usage, but one would also have to assume that Paul, who had just written ζηλοῦν in verse 17, now inexplicably uses ζηλοῦσθαι. If taken as a passive voice, as the more grammatically meticulous modern interpreters do, it is unclear whether it refers to Paul, his opponents, the Galatians, or is to be taken impersonally: "it is good to be zealously courted," etc. In this ambiguity, the matter remains unresolved until the parallel in 2 Corinthians 11:2 ("For I am jealous for you with godly jealousy") explains how this word may have been influenced here as a reminiscence from a passage where it indeed fits much better, namely in the sense of the Apostle's jealous love for his congregation, whom he wants to present as a pure virgin to Christ. Even more striking than this wordplay with ζηλοῦν is the expression: "they want to

exclude you" (θέλουσιν ἐκκλεῖσαι ὑμᾶς), where interpreters again ask: from whom or what do they want to exclude them? Sieffert answers: from non-Judaistic teachers, but since when does one exclude someone from teachers and not rather from a community? Holsten explains it as from the messianic community with its salvific blessings, and this is likely correct, only that the expression "to exclude" already points to an established ecclesiastical organization, a unified Christian Church that already practices excommunication. However, this does not belong to the age of Paul but to much later times, which is why the Syrian version reads "include" (ἐγκλεῖσαι), which is also peculiar but more likely to refer to the compulsion of the Judaistic law, something that indeed belongs to Paul's time.

133

In what follows, the heartfelt tones that the Apostle uses to win back the wayward congregations are unmistakable. However, the image "my little children, for whom I am again in the pain of childbirth" (τέκνα μου ους πάλιν ὠδίνω) very much recalls the analogous phrase in 1 Corinthians 4:15: "For in Christ Jesus I became your father through the gospel." There, the Apostle is the father of the congregation, having given it spiritual life. Here, he is supposed to be the mother, which sounds somewhat awkward and is more likely imitation than original.

Yet, this entire small section is a personal interlude between two dogmatic discussions. It aims to create the impression of a particularly vivid, emotionally charged dialogue between the Apostle and the apostate Galatians, and this impression is partially achieved. However, the various words, drawn from many reminiscences, do not quite come together as a whole, and many individual elements remain unclear and ambiguous.

This is followed by the comparison of the Jewish and Christian principles using the imagery of the two matriarchs, Sarah and Hagar. We have already discussed this image above, and here we only highlight verse 25, where it is said of present-day Jerusalem, represented by Hagar, "for she is in slavery with her children." What kind of slavery is meant here? Most modern interpreters think it refers to the service of the Mosaic law. Indeed, δουλεύειν (to serve) can well describe the servitude of following statutes, as immediately afterwards the Galatians are warned not to let themselves be burdened again by a yoke of slavery (δουλείας). However, this interpretation does not fit the subject: present-day Jerusalem with its children. When speaking of a city and its people, political rather than moral slavery is to be considered. Otherwise, the subject should be differently designated. Therefore, Pelagius, followed by some modern interpreters, thinks instead of slavery under the Roman scepter. But such slavery can only properly be spoken of after the destruction of Jerusalem, which marked the complete end of Jewish autonomy, an autonomy that had still been respected within certain limits under the governors and occasionally replaced by native rulers, Herod Agrippa I and II. Thus, the Jews say in the Gospel of John 8:33: "We have never been slaves to anyone." Only since 70 AD has the Jewish people, with their conquered and guarded capital, been entirely given over to Roman slavery. Therefore, in our passage, for those who wish to see, there is a clear indication regarding the terminus a quo, beyond which our letter should not be placed.

134

The truly paranetical section begins from 5:1 onward. This offers little that is remarkable; it consists of the usual exhortations encountered in the Pauline letters, combined with appeals tailored to the specific situation of the readers. At the beginning, 5:2-6, there is a strong warning against circumcision, as it entails adherence to the entire law. Striving for righteousness through the law means falling away from grace; the Christian standpoint, rather, is to wait in hope for righteousness through the Spirit by faith — a true inventory of the most commonly used Pauline terms in summary form: πνεῦμα (spirit), πίστις (faith), ἐλπίς (hope), δικαιοσύνη (righteousness). Strangely, this section ends with the statement that in Christ, neither circumcision nor the opposite matters, but faith working through love. This same statement appears again at the end of the letter in the form: "neither circumcision counts for anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation" (6:15), and it is also found in the First Epistle to the Corinthians 7:19 with a new addition: "but keeping the commandments of God." This phrase in our passage can be considered an borrowing from 1 Corinthians all the more because it contradicts the goal of the exhortation, which is to deter from circumcision. If circumcision is indifferent, it cannot exclude one from Christian salvation.

135

5:7-12 contains a lively discussion between the Apostle and the Galatians, similar to 4:12-20. In verse 9, we again notice an old acquaintance, the phrase from 1 Corinthians 5:6: "A little leaven leavens the whole lump," reproduced exactly with the same words. Verse 11 then brings another puzzling "ἔτι," just as the beginning 1:10 already did: "If I still preach circumcision, why am I still persecuted?" So, did Paul preach circumcision earlier? This is indeed how Hausrath 1) understands it, and it seems to be implied in the words. The suggestion that "ἔτι" belongs to the object rather than the subject and merely means that circumcision no longer exists for Christians does not seem possible to us, despite the opinions of the latest interpreters. The reference to Paul himself is better, but then one must not think, with de Wette and others, of the time before his conversion when Paul as a Jew had no reason to preach circumcision. Instead, as Hausrath suggests, it refers to an earlier period of Paul's Christian preaching, about which we know nothing else, and which is difficult to reconcile with the account given in Galatians chapters 1 and 2. It is possible that the Paul of the Epistle to the Galatians, with his sharp anti-Judaistic principles, is to be distinguished from the earlier, more mediating view of the same Apostle.

The pious wish, in which this renewed fight against circumcision culminates: "I wish those who unsettle you would emasculate themselves," with its escalation from circumcision to mutilation, is hardly bearable, and one wonders why recent interpreters, including orthodox ones, take no offense. Calvin had a finer sensibility; he found this meaning of the word here unacceptable and wanted to explain it as "may they be cut off," others more mildly: "may they be separated from the Christian community." It is true that the word can only be understood in the former sense here, but it is hard to imagine it coming from an Apostle, especially one who was born a Jew.

*) See above p. 125.

136

With the exhortation not to let freedom become an opportunity for the flesh, the transition is made in 5:13 to the actual moral exhortations. The first thought we encounter is that love is the fulfillment of the law, a thought much more fully developed in Romans 13:8-10. That the passage in Romans is the original and our passage the imitation is evident from two features. First, the connection: "not an opportunity for the flesh, but through love serve one another," is rather harsh. Freedom gives occasion to the flesh by encouraging a life in fleshly desires; that the flesh also expresses itself in discord is not the immediate but the derived idea. Furthermore, the application of this thought in 5:15 ends with the remark: "if you bite and devour one another, beware lest you be consumed by one another." So far, the entire letter has not mentioned any disputes among the Galatians but rather assumes that the Galatians' common defection from Paul necessitated his intervention. Therefore, our sentence here hangs in the air and fits better in the context of the Corinthian letters, which indeed deal with disputes among the members of the community, particularly 1 Corinthians 1:10ff.

The following passage, listing the works of the flesh and the fruit of the Spirit, has already been highlighted above. It is indeed a combination of thoughts from Romans 7, 8:14, 6:14 with the passage in 1 Corinthians 6:9, which is explicitly referenced by the phrase "as I warned you before." Here, we only ask whether the listing of all these sins as works of the flesh is otherwise odd. Among these are not only sins originating from sensuality, such as πορνεία (sexual immorality), ἀκαθαρσία (impurity), ἀσέλγεια (debauchery), but also a number of others that are more errors of the mind, such as εἰδωλολατρεία (idolatry), φαρμακεία (sorcery), or sins of selfishness, such as ἔχθραι (enmity), ἔρις (strife), ζῆλος (jealousy), etc. Modern interpreters and biblical theologians use our passage as a primary proof that Paul did not understand σάρξ (flesh) to mean merely sensuality, as the Hellenistic usage in Epicurus, Plutarch, etc., suggests, but rather that he understood σάρξ as the sinful nature of humanity in general, based on Old Testament foundations1). The recognized dependency of our passage on 1 Corinthians 6:9 shows that there the various kinds of sinners are simply listed, where the combination of sensual and selfish sins explains itself. That they are all here subsumed under the concept of ἔργα σαρκὸς (works of the flesh) is thus accidentally induced by the prevailing concept of σάρξ in verses 13-18 extending to this otherwise borrowed list. It follows that Paul indeed understood σάρξ to mean simply sensuality, as this concept developed in Hellenism under the influence of Platonic philosophy2), and the biblical-theological conclusions based on our passage fall away upon clarification of its critical relationship. However, this does not deny that the Pauline letters have a deeper concept of sin than Hellenism had, just as the Christian πνεῦμα (spirit) is something other than the mere human spirit.

1) See, for example, Cremer, pictorial theological dictionary of New Testament Greece, article σαρξ at the end.

2) See also Lüdemann, Anthropology of Paul, p. II). 70.

The sixth chapter would provide ample material to support the already made observation that the Epistle to the Galatians uses words from the other three Pauline letters. However, we refer

here to the concise evidence first provided by Bruno Bauer,3) which, despite the unpalatable shell of hostile mockery, generally contains a valuable core of accurate perception. The parallels he pointed out are: Galatians 6:1 = Romans 8:9 (1 Corinthians 2:13), 1 Corinthians 4:21; Galatians 6:2 = Romans 15:1, 3:27, 8:2; Galatians 6:3 = 1 Corinthians 8:2; Galatians 6:6 = 1 Corinthians 9:7-13; Galatians 6:7 = 1 Corinthians 6:9, 15:33 (2 Corinthians 9:6); Galatians 6:9 = 2 Corinthians 4:1 (16); Galatians 6:14 = 1 Corinthians 2:2; Galatians 6:17 = 2 Corinthians 4:10. These references to the thoughts and words of our chapter in other Pauline letters serve as evidence for the imitative activity of the author of the former, only insofar as it succeeds in demonstrating that the context in which they appear in Galatians is neither natural nor original.1) Otherwise, they would only prove that, as is easily understandable, the Apostle often used certain phrases and expressions in his letters. Therefore, it is particularly important to see if notable, otherwise difficult passages for interpreters find an easier explanation in this way, and this is naturally not always the case where a parallel occurs. In our section, however, there are some passages that sound striking enough in themselves to awaken critical judgment, and we will dwell on these for a moment.

3) Critique of the Pauline Letters, p. 68ff.

1) The constructions of the context of this section, which Lipsius provided in Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie 1876, pp. 188-192, and more recently Klöpper in Theological Studies and Sketches from East Prussia 1887, pp. 101-115, are, in my opinion, futile attempts to obscure the compilatory nature of the whole passage.

Since the purely paranetical tone has replaced the polemical one, starting with 5:13, there is nothing in our letter that points to the special relationship between the Apostle and the Galatians, as the earlier chapters, filled with his storm and stress, would indicate. The tone is calmly instructive and admonitory, like the closing part of the Epistle to the Romans. It is surprising that the Apostle now speaks so warmly to the same communities and seeks to build up their Christian life as if it had very healthy roots and was not, according to the rest of the letter, in extreme danger. In this regard, especially 6:1, the address "you who are spiritual" is strange, and furthermore, the exhortation in 6:6 that the student should show appreciation to the teacher of the word is strange. Both fit as little as possible into the overall tone of our letter. Regarding the latter exhortation, interpreters ask whether the phrase "share all good things" should be understood spiritually or materially, i.e., whether this community is recommended concerning moral good or worldly goods. Meyer-Sieffert in his commentary1) decides, after longer discussion, mainly in favor of the former explanation, that it is an exhortation to true fellowship between teacher and student in moral good, the student should strive and work communally with the teacher. Thus, the exhortation also relates to the main content of the letter, as this relationship was greatly disturbed among the Galatians by the influence of the pseudo-apostles. However, the forced nature of this explanation should be evident to everyone. When the Apostle urges: the student should share all good things with the teacher, one naturally thinks of other Pauline passages where the relationship of the student to the teacher is

discussed similarly. For example, 1 Corinthians 9:7-14, where the teacher's right to support is extensively discussed, and 2 Corinthians 11:7-10, 12:13-18, where the selfless behavior of Paul towards the Corinthian church is also presented as an exception and claimed as the Apostle's glory. There can hardly be any doubt that the same topic is touched upon in our passage. It is true, as Sieffert says, that "the peculiar lack of connection of such an exhortation with what precedes not only but also with what follows" speaks against this interpretation, but this actually proves, upon closer inspection, that we find here a reminiscence from other letters rather abruptly interwoven.

1) 7th edition, p. 350f.

The following metaphor of sowing and reaping (verses 7 and 8) also recalls 2 Corinthians 9:6, where this sowing and reaping refers to the good deeds the Apostle recommended to his readers. Since the relevant section elaborates on the exhortation to promote the collection for the saints in Jerusalem, this parallel also provides the connection point for the seemingly missing context in our Galatians passage. From the student's giving to the teacher, the author moves, through the exhortatory image of sowing and reaping in 2 Corinthians, to the use of this image in another sense, namely, sowing and reaping in the flesh and the spirit. Furthermore, verse 9 reminds us of the second Corinthian letter, where the phrase "do not grow weary" (ἐγκακοῦμεν) is found in 2 Corinthians 4:16. The thought developed in this passage about the soon-to-come time of rich reward also teaches us how to understand the phrase "μηδὲν ἐκλυόμενοι" in Galatians 6:9. Luther's translation, "without ceasing," has been mostly abandoned by modern interpreters in favor of "if we do not grow weary." But, as Usteri rightly notes in his commentary, "then we would have a tedious repetition of the warning against 'ἐγκακεῖν'," and the word order, as well as the form of the participle, indicates that it does not belong to "doing good" but to "we will reap." Therefore, it should be translated: "we will then also reap without growing weary," i.e., unceasingly, corresponding to the "eternal weight of glory" in the closely related passage in Corinthians. With this, and the exhortation to do good, especially to the believers, the admonitory part concludes, which in its calm mood and content, corresponding entirely to the other Pauline paraeneses, does not reveal that it was preceded by such a vehement letter.

Finally, the true character of the Epistle to the Galatians is once again expressed, and more sharply than ever before. An appendix follows, from 6:11-17, in which the purpose of the letter is summarized and the strongest possible rebuttal is hurled at the opponents. The appendix begins with the words: "See with what large letters I am writing to you with my own hand." The meaning of this sentence can scarcely be in doubt, as it undoubtedly refers, by analogy with the other conclusions of letters, to a note about the Apostle's own handwriting as opposed to the activity of a scribe. Thus, at the end of the First Epistle to the Corinthians (16:21), we read: "I, Paul, write this greeting with my own hand," and the Epistle to the Romans was written, naturally under the Apostle's dictation, by a certain Tertius, who notes (16:22): "I, Tertius, who wrote down this letter, greet you in the Lord." The Apostle's own handwritten greeting is even given in 2 Thessalonians 3:17 as a "sign of genuineness in every letter," i.e., a mark of

authenticity. In our passage, the question arises whether the remark in 6:11 also implies that Paul is now adding a handwritten postscript after the rest of the letter has been dictated. Most modern interpreters, such as Holsten and Sieffert, indeed take it this way. However, various difficulties arise. First, in that case, the "I have written" (ἔγραψα) must be in the epistolary sense, referring to the time when the recipient reads the letter. However, when ἔγραψα is used in other Pauline letters, it refers to what has already been written, i.e., it is a real past tense. For example, in 1 Corinthians 5:9, "I wrote to you in my letter" refers to an earlier letter that predates 1 Corinthians, and the same case recurs in 2 Corinthians 2:3, 4, 9. In Romans 15:15, ἔγραψα refers to the Epistle to the Romans itself, and in 1 Corinthians 9:15 to what has just been written. The only place in the Pauline letters where ἔγραψα can be understood in the epistolary sense is Philemon 19, and even there the other interpretation is more likely. For there, the ἔγραψα can very well refer to the immediately preceding assurance "charge it to me" (τούτο ἐμοί ἐλλόγα), which is merely confirmed by "I, Paul, write this with my own hand: I will repay it." It is therefore at least daring to take ἔγραψα in Galatians 6:11, contrary to the usual Pauline habit, as referring to what follows instead of what precedes. Furthermore, πηλίκοις ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα can certainly not mean "what a large letter I have written to you," as de Wette and Hofmann explain, since Paul uses the term ἐπιστολή for "letter" and it stands in the accusative case, γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν (Romans 16:22). But if one translates it as "with what large letters I am writing to you" and applies this to what follows, the objection raised by Usteri in his commentary rightly returns: "Paul certainly did not intentionally give the letters a special shape and therefore could hardly write ἔγραψα before seeing how they turned out." The πηλίκα γράμματα must indeed be particularly large letters, but they are those that Paul has written so far, and in essence, the phrase indeed refers to the entire letter written so far, which is highlighted at the end for its careful and personal composition by the Apostle. Therefore, this remark is certainly meant, as the Church Fathers already judged, as an authentication of genuineness, thus giving the "strange verse, inserted between thoughts of a different content" 1) its well-considered meaning. However, such a mark of authenticity is, in our view, a sign of the opposite, much like the analogous assertion at the end of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, 3:17, has long been recognized as such. By writing in the name of Paul, one had to attest to his authorship, and if this was achieved in other letters by the addition of a personal greeting, in our case, the entire letter being written by hand represents a higher, indeed the highest conceivable level of such authenticity verification.

1) Usteri, in the commentary p. 202.

That such a procedure appears to us as forgery cannot be denied, but in the eyes of the contemporaries of our author, as many known examples show, it had a much less offensive character. The more unique the content of the letter, the more emphatically the authorship by the Apostle himself had to be stressed at the end. For us, this means that in the Epistle to the Galatians, we are to see the purest and truest expression of the Pauline spirit, with Paul speaking to us even more authentically and from his innermost convictions than the Apostle of the Epistle to the Romans and the Corinthian letters. Moreover, our verse, regardless of how one understands it, is a sure indication that the Epistle to the Galatians was not the first Pauline

letter to come into existence, but that others existed before it. The emphasis on "with my own hand" points to the knowledge that Paul usually did not write with his own hand, as is indeed the case in Romans and 1 Corinthians, where only the greeting is supposed to be from Paul's hand. By stating here that the entire letter is written by hand, we have before us an increase compared to those letters. And since the comparative presupposes the existence of the positive and not vice versa, the Epistle to the Galatians must have followed other Pauline letters in time.

143

What follows is an intensified resumption of the polemic against the Judaizers, with only a few but fierce words that express the author's resentment against these opponents, containing accusations that suggest the almost passionate bitterness of the writer. The opponents are accused of trying to please people, wanting to escape the offense of the cross of Christ, i.e., to avoid the contradiction that a Jew's behavior as a Christian brings to the great fact of the Messiah's cross. They even seek to enforce the circumcision of the Galatians deceitfully, without themselves considering it necessary to fully keep the laws. The circumcision of these Gentiles is meant to bring them a triumph, similar to how David brought Saul two hundred Philistine foreskins as a price for the hand of his daughter. In contrast, the Apostle's only boast should be in the cross of the Lord, through which the world is crucified to him, and he to the world, a thought already expressed in 2:20 with the words: "I live, yet not I, but Christ lives in me," etc. Also expressed in 5:6 is the following statement: "Neither circumcision nor uncircumcision means anything; what counts is the new creation," only here it has a slightly different ending that clearly reminds us of 2 Corinthians 5:17: "If anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation." Then, peace and mercy from God are wished upon those who follow this rule— the term κανών is also used in 2 Corinthians 10:13, 15 —as well as on the whole Israel of God, meaning the true people of God of the new covenant. The term "the Israel of God" presupposes the contrast to "Israel according to the flesh" in 1 Corinthians 10:18, and the foundation of this entire perspective is given in Romans 9:6, where the principle is stated: "Not all who are descended from Israel are Israel," etc. With that, the Apostle has once again and ultimately expressed his opinion and now concludes with the remark: "From now on, let no one cause me trouble, for I bear on my body the marks of Jesus." The meaning is clear: I, who have been enrolled in the school of Christ's sufferings and marked with the signs of His sufferings, can no longer be disturbed by anything belonging to this world, and such matters as the conflicts regarding the Galatian congregations should remain far from me in the future. This is a remark that not only confirms our previous observations but also sheds new light on the circumstances of our letter's composition. Regarding the marks (στίγματα), most interpreters now lean towards Jerome's 1) interpretation, understanding them as "the scars and other marks of wounds and injuries that Paul received for his apostolic work."2) This refers to lists of endured persecutions and dangers, such as found in 2 Corinthians 4:7–15 and 11:23–33, and our verse would then mean the same as 2 Corinthians 4:10: "always carrying around in our body the death of Jesus." The objection is that, according to the usual view accepted by these interpreters, the Epistle to the Galatians was written much earlier than the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, so we cannot consider these sufferings as all belonging to the past when the former was composed. Indeed, if the Epistle to the Galatians falls into Paul's third journey, it would be preceded by the sufferings he endured during his first and second journeys according to Acts. But these are not as numerous

as the lists in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians would lead us to expect, and there remains a discrepancy between them and the Acts, which must be discussed later. Thus, we can only generally think of some endured mistreatments, like the stoning in Lystra and the flogging in Philippi, whose scars would be called "marks of Jesus," i.e., the marks inscribed on the apostle by his Lord as a slave's mark. However, the term sounds much more definite than such generalities would suggest. It is very likely1) that the view of some church fathers, that the Epistle to the Galatians was written from Rome, and the same opinion in the letter's postscript in later manuscripts: "written from Rome," rests on interpreting the marks as referring to Paul's imprisonment. Then, it means the marks left by chains and other mistreatments the prisoner had to endure, imprinted on the apostle's limbs. Although this explanation has not found favor among modern interpreters, it is noteworthy because we repeatedly encounter references to the sufferings of the imprisoned apostle in other Pauline letter conclusions. For example, Colossians 4:18: "Remember my chains," Ephesians 6:20: "for which I am an ambassador in chains," Philemon 9: "as Paul the aged (ambassador) and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ," similarly 2 Timothy 4:16–18. If the latter passage expresses the certainty at the end: "The Lord will rescue me from every evil deed and bring me safely into his heavenly kingdom," it is only a more detailed expression of what is briefly and obscurely stated at the end of the Epistle to the Galatians. For the sentence "From now on let no one cause me trouble, for I bear on my body the marks of Jesus" sounds, as Schrader1) already saw, like a farewell, and not just a farewell to the readers, but to the world and its troubles in general. "Let no one cause me trouble henceforth, for I bear the marks of my Lord on my body," says the apostle, who is about to part with the world altogether, weary of this earth and its struggles, yearning to follow his Lord in death, whose crucifixion sufferings have already imprinted themselves on his body in the marks left by the chains of the prisoner. Therefore, our entire letter, which follows the other three main letters, is also conceived as a letter from the last days of Paul's life. It is then the first link in the chain of captivity letters that continue the tone set once and further enrich the written monuments of his spirit, from the Philippians to the Second Timothy.

1) In the commentary on 6:17: "He who is circumcised after the coming of Christ does not bear the marks of the Lord Jesus, but has glory in his shame. However, he who has been excessively flogged, frequently imprisoned, beaten with rods three times, stoned once, and so on, as written in the catalog of boasting (II Cor. 11:33ff.), he bears the marks of the Lord Jesus on his body."

2) Thus says Sieffert in the commentary, 7th edition, p. 376.

1) See Usteri in the Commentary p. 224, Meyer-Sieffert, ibid., 7th edition, Introduction, p. 23.

1) The Apostle Paul, p.220ff.

146

An examination of the content of our Epistle to the Galatians, which has not been scrutinized in earlier sections, confirms the results found there. Consequently, the Epistle to the Galatians must be regarded as a literary product not of Paul himself, but of the Pauline school, presupposing the existence of the Epistle to the Romans and the two Epistles to the Corinthians. Its dependency on these predecessors, particularly on the former, has become evident from a closer consideration of many individual passages, leaving little room for doubt. Of course, if the matter were merely that our epistle repeatedly contains expressions, phrases, entire sentences found in other major Pauline epistles, little would be proven. That can happen and, in itself, is not a sign of inauthenticity. It is quite natural for the same writer to use the same thoughts and sometimes expressions repeatedly as opportunities arise. In the case of the smaller Pauline epistles, which are accused of inauthenticity, the lack of genuinely Pauline thought and language is cited as a reason for doubt, and expressions not found in the major epistles are carefully noted because such can indicate that someone other than the apostle, unaccustomed to writing in that manner, is the author. Thus, the opposite phenomenon—agreement between many passages of our epistle and other Pauline passages—could only speak in its favor.

147

However, the matter is not that simple. The passages in our letter that prompted us to look for parallels in other letters were those where the context was lacking, where thought and expression did not seem quite natural, where one had to ask whether the previous explanations had all remained forced and contrived. The look at other letters, where the same thought or expression appeared in a different context, then provided the explanation for what had not been fully understood before. It showed that this or that stone, which did not quite fit into the structure of the Epistle to the Galatians, had been broken from a wall for which it was originally hewn, and in which it fit best. Thus, the individual observations gained more and more support and clarity until the result was finally established. Just as a light, when lit, initially only makes its immediate surroundings clearly visible, but then gradually allows the eye to recognize more distant things, so too has the light that shone from the parallel passages of the Epistle to the Romans on the doctrinal part of our letter gradually illuminated the rest of its content. Much has come into a new light in which it can be better recognized than before. Thus, the whole helps the individual and the individual helps the whole, creating a conviction that is as well-founded as the investigating mind can achieve in such difficult and contentious matters.

148

This view can be formulated as follows with regard to our letter. After the Epistle to the Romans and the two Epistles to the Corinthians, and drawing upon them, our Epistle to the Galatians was written by a Pauline follower who took the opposition of free-thinking Gentile Christianity against the advancing Jewish Christianity, which had been expressed in those three letters in a gradual escalation, to its peak. With the full force of a superior spirit, he lashed out against the tendencies of his time that sought to make Christianity Jewish again. In the doctrinal part, the

letter develops the arguments provided by the first main section of the Epistle to the Romans, namely the proof that man is justified by faith without the works of the law through the reconciliation offered by God in Christ. This proof includes the correct understanding of the Old Testament, where the true path of salvation is demonstrated using Abraham's example. It goes beyond what has already been presented in the Epistle to the Romans in two points: that the law only comes indirectly from God, being given through the mediation of angels, and that Judaism is placed on the same level as paganism in its knowledge of God, with both being seen merely as the worship of heavenly bodies. In the historical part, the letter appears as a counterwriting against the Acts of the Apostles, which had portrayed the Apostle Paul as too accommodating to Judaism and too dependent on the original apostles. In contrast, the letter presents the Apostle in his principled stance towards Judaism and his apostolic independence, offering a purer interpretation point by point against the Acts, while still using its reports as a basis, without excluding the possibility of other sources (Gal. 2:11). In the other sections of the letter, the author mostly adheres to models from the three preceding Pauline main letters, which he reworks independently and adapts to the purpose of the new letter. The form of an epistle to the Galatians was chosen because the genre of apostolic letters already existed, and since the communities of Rome and Corinth had already received their letters, the Galatian province known from the first missionary journey of the Acts of the Apostles provided a fitting setting, where the Apostle had first suffered persecutions from the Jews. Since the Epistle to the Galatians followed the three other main letters and the Epistle to the Romans had already chosen its historical setting in the Apostle's last stay in Corinth, shortly before his arrest in Jerusalem, the period of Roman imprisonment emerged as the external precondition for the writing. In his imprisonment, Paul receives news of the imminent and partially already occurred defection of the Galatian communities from his gospel, and on the verge of closing with the world, he addresses this letter as the purest expression of his spirit and opinion to the erring communities, a letter from which one should clearly recognize the Apostle's actual stance towards Judaism. The letter would thus have been written not only long after the fall of the Jewish people and state (4:25) but also after the Acts of the Apostles. Since the latter writing cannot have originated before the beginning of the second century, as its acquaintance with Josephus proves for the Lucan writings in general, the Epistle to the Galatians is to be placed under the reign of Hadrian, and specifically after 120 AD.

This view will undoubtedly be challenged by asserting that it claims the impossible. A letter as fresh and lively as the Epistle to the Galatians bears the stamp of the Pauline spirit too clearly for it to have been composed by a mere imitator. It is a work of a single cast and does not at all give the impression of a patchwork based on other letters. This objection is very understandable, and the perspective on the Epistle to the Galatians that underlies it was also long shared by the author. However, the dogmatic and historical content of our letter has already been shown, and as for the impossibility of a later figure creating such a work, it depends solely on what kind of personality this later figure is. One does not necessarily need to see in him a mere imitator; he could be a Pauline follower with an independent, sharply defined intellectual individuality who knows how to use the catchphrases of early Paulinism in a new, spirited way and to combine individual elements into a new whole. In such questions, one easily forgets that

a letter merely attributed to Paul does not necessarily have to be the miserable work of an unoriginal imitator. If a significant, intellectually powerful personality stands behind it, the work will also bear its stamp despite the partial reliance on earlier material.

However, it is not possible to judge from our letter alone about this and many other details. It is necessary to include the three other main Pauline letters in the investigation and to understand these four together as a whole. A detailed critique of these three main letters is not intended here; only what serves as the necessary background for the view developed in relation to the Galatians will be provided. The fact that declaring the Epistle to the Galatians as inauthentic also implies the inauthenticity of the other main letters is so clear that no further words need be wasted on it. The four letters are so closely related in content and form that they stand or fall together, and the essence of the Epistle to the Galatians can only be understood when all the main letters are historically comprehensible as products not of the Apostle himself, but of a Pauline school. Therefore, it will now be unavoidable to also investigate the relevant questions concerning the other main letters to the extent necessary.

Second Section,

Critical Remarks on the Main Pauline Letters.

First Chapter.

152

The correct order of the four main letters.

With regard to the order in which the main Pauline letters were written, the prevailing view is that the letter to the Galatians comes first, followed by the first and second letters to the Corinthians, and the letter to the Romans concludes this series. These letters are usually placed in the life of the Apostle Paul, as known from the Acts of the Apostles, with the letter to the Galatians being written around 55 AD in Ephesus, the first letter to the Corinthians at the beginning of 58 in the same place, the second in the autumn of the same year in Macedonia, and the letter to the Romans at the beginning of 59 in Corinth.

Regarding the letter to the Galatians, one of the results of our previous investigation was that this placement must be considered erroneous, and this letter should rather conclude the series. This followed primarily from the dependency relationship in which this letter stands to the letter to the Romans, secondly from the passage 5:21, which contains a clear reference to I Cor. 6:9, and thirdly from the conclusion of the letter, which is said to have been written by the imprisoned apostle bidding farewell to the toils of earthly life. It is necessary to briefly revisit the second of these characteristics, as it is also important for determining the order of the other letters.

153

The passage in Gal. 5:19-21 is indeed, when correctly understood, proof enough in itself that the letter to the Galatians presupposes the first letter to the Corinthians. By itself, one could follow the older and newer exegetes and refer it to an oral instruction that the Apostle had given to the Galatians during his previous presence. However, we know nothing specific about the content of such communications, so it is initially only conjecture that they took place—and indeed with this specific content. On the other hand, the passage I Cor. 6:9-10 presents all the essential elements that can be demanded when referring to something previously said. We compare the two passages side by side.

1 Cor 6:9-10	Galatians 5:19-21
9 Or do you not know that wrongdoers will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: Neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor	**19** The acts of the flesh are obvious: sexual immorality, impurity and debauchery; **20** idolatry and witchcraft; hatred, discord, jealousy, fits of rage,

men who have sex with men **10** nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God.	selfish ambition, dissensions, factions **21** and envy; drunkenness, orgies, and the like. I warn you, as I did before, that those who live like this will not inherit the kingdom of God.

If one compares the two passages, it becomes apparent that not only are the main keywords like "ropveiz" and "elöwkokarpsia" and these two in close connection at both places identical, but also the vices named differently in words appear the same in substance in both places. Notably, the addendum "they will not inherit the kingdom of God" is so literally the same that the agreement is strikingly evident. Now, which of the two is more natural to assume: that the Galatian passage refers to a merely presumed oral communication, or to this written one, which otherwise meets all the requirements that one can demand of such a citation and only conflicts with the opinion that the letter to the Galatians must have been written before the first letter to the Corinthians? One must first examine whether this opinion might ultimately be a mere prejudice before disregarding such a real reference point. In our opinion, the "rpoeiroy" quite certainly refers to the mentioned Corinthians passage, and we then see from it not only in what order these two letters were written one after the other, but we also learn that the author of the letter to the Galatians has the Apostle Paul repeat to the Galatians something he had previously written not to them but to the Corinthians. This then means nothing less than that Paul writes the four main letters to the entire Christian church, that the addresses of the individual letters are merely a pretext, that the readers of the most recent letter know the older ones, in short, that the Apostle is credited with literary works that contain his teaching as a whole and, formally, as letters to individual congregations, are separated from one another but can still refer to and point to each other, as they were read by the entire Christian community, as already expressed by the Muratorian fragment: "cum ipse beatus apostolus non nisi nominatim septem ecclesiis seribat ..... una tamen per omnem orbem terrae ecelesia diffusa esse dinoseitur. Et Johannes enim in ‚Apocalypsi licet septem ecelesiis seribat, tamen omnibus dieit." [=Although the blessed apostle himself writes only to seven churches by name ... yet one church is recognized as being spread throughout the entire world. For even John, in the Apocalypse, though he writes to seven churches, speaks to all.]

154

If we continue to determine the relationship between the First Letter to the Corinthians and the Letter to the Romans, some light is shed on this relationship by comparing the two passages, 1 Cor. 15:56 and Rom. 7:8-13. The sentence in the Corinthian letter, "The sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law," is not easily understandable without knowledge of Paul's entire doctrine of the law and its relationship to sin, as well as of death as the consequence of sin. However, this doctrine is not elaborately presented anywhere in the First Letter to the Corinthians; rather, it is developed in the first part of the Letter to the Romans, particularly in the mentioned passage, where we find the sentences: "For without the law sin was dead ... but when the commandment came, sin came to life, and I died, etc." The discussion in Rom.

5:12-21 can also be included here, as the sentence "sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin" belongs to the same line of thought. Therefore, it is to be assumed that at least the first part of the Letter to the Romans, chapters 1-8, precedes the First Letter to the Corinthians. Other parallels supporting this result are Rom. 7:1-2 "the law has authority over a person only as long as that person lives ... a married woman is bound to her husband as long as he is alive" compared with 1 Cor. 7:39 "A woman is bound to her husband as long as he lives," where the use of the addition "as long as he lives" shows that the Roman passage precedes, since there the imagery of the woman being freed from her dead husband is further elaborated. Furthermore, Rom. 8:9 compared with 1 Cor. 3:16, where in both passages the expression "the Spirit of God dwells in you" reappears, but it only signifies something in the Roman passage and belongs to the argumentation, whereas in the Corinthian passage it merely enriches the expression.

Therefore, it can be assumed that the first part of the Epistle to the Romans, which constitutes its essential core, precedes the First Epistle to the Corinthians. However, it is very difficult to decide whether the other two parts of the Epistle to the Romans, chapters 9-11 and 12-14, share this relationship, or whether these sections, which we will have to deal with separately, were not yet in existence when the First Epistle to the Corinthians was written. Bruno Bauer 1) answers the question in the latter sense and supports his view with the following observations: In Romans 12:3, the phrase "to each according to the measure of faith that God has assigned" is found, which is also present in 1 Cor. 7:17, "let each person lead the life that the Lord has assigned to him," but in Corinthians, it refers not to the measure of faith but to the life situation assigned to each person, analogous to the following "each as God has called him." According to Bauer, the concept of the measure that God allots, correctly applied to the various distributions of spiritual gifts in Corinthians (cf. 1 Cor. 12:11), is wrongly applied to faith in Romans, where it is understood in a weakened sense, quite different from its use in the core of the Epistle to the Romans. However, firstly, the Corinthians passage is not about spiritual gifts but about life circumstances, and then it is not clear why the expression "measure of faith" in Romans 12:3 should not be original, since it is clearly explained in the following verses what this different measure consists of, namely, in the distribution of the various spiritual gifts, which in Romans do not include faith, whereas in 1 Cor. 12:9, faith appears among the charismata. Furthermore, Bauer points to the enumeration of these spiritual gifts in Romans 12:4-8, which he claims is almost literally copied from 1 Cor. 12:4-11. It is true that the latter passage contains a more detailed and explicit account of these gifts, but this does not necessarily mean that the shorter, more suggestive passage in Romans is derived from it. In Romans, it is not a matter of listing spiritual gifts but of parenesis, into which the section ultimately transitions, hence the brief and somewhat unclear treatment of this subject. This does not necessarily presuppose the presentation in 1 Corinthians, but only the knowledge of the spiritual gifts, which were familiar to the Christian communities of that time. The fact that in both places the image of the body and its members is applied to these gifts, in Romans only summarily and suggestively, in 1 Corinthians extensively and emphatically, does not prove that the former passage is an excerpt of the latter.

1) Criticism of Paulin. Letters, 3rd section P. 67. 119.

156

A further example of literal agreement is provided by the passage about the weak in faith, 1 Cor. 8 and Rom. 14. We compare the main points of contact side by side.

157

Röm. 14, 13 μηκετι ουν άλλή- λους χρίνωμεν, αλλά τούτο κρίνατε μάλλον, τό μή τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τφ άδελφφ ή σχάνδαλον. Röm. 14, 13 and others we praise them, but you judge this rather, the inevitable obstacle tf brotherf or scandalon.	I Cor. 8, 9 βλεπετε δέ μήπως ή εξουσία υμών αυτή πρόσκομμα γένηται τοΐς άσθενέσιν. I Cor. 8, 9 you see, don't you? or your authority is a hindrance he becomes sick.
Röm. 14, 15 εί γάρ διά βρωμά ό αδελφός σου λυπεΐται,ούκέτι κατά αγάπην περιπατεΐς· μή τψ βρώματί .σου έχεΐνον άπόλλυε, ύπέρ ου Χριστός άπέθανεν. Röm. 14, 15 i gar dia broma your brother is sorry, why not walk in love; don't stink .you had apollye, thanks Christ died.	I Cor. 8, 11 άπόλλυται γάρ ό ασθενών έν τή σή γνώσει, ό αδελφός οι' ον Χριστός άπέΟανεν. I Cor. 8, 11 apollytai gar o patients in this knowledge, o brother o' on Christ apeOanen.
Röm. 14,21 καλόν τό μή φα- γεΐν κρέα μηδέ πιεΐν οίνον μηδέ έν ω ό αδελφός σου προσκόπτει. Röm. 14,21 good thing eat no meat, drink no wine while your brother scouts.	I Cor. 8, 13 διόπερ εί βρώμα σκανδαλίζει τον αδελφόν μου, ού μή φάγω χρέα είς τόν αιώνα, ινα μή τόν αδελφόν μου σκανδαλίσω. I Cor. 8, 13 stinks scandalizes my brother, uh do not eat debt to the century, lest I scandalize my brother.

That the writer of one passage—whether it is the same person both times or not—had the other passage in view cannot be doubted. However, the question is which one precedes the other. Here too, the judgment is by no means easy, and one can argue for either case. Nevertheless, it should be noted that in 1 Cor. 8, the concept of ἀσθενής (weak) is introduced quite abruptly. In verse 7, there is mention of a συνείδησις ἀσθενής (weak conscience), and in verse 9, the ἀσθενείς (weak) are suddenly mentioned without transition. This is easier to understand in the Romans passage, where from the beginning, the discussion is about the ἀσθενῶν τῇ πίστει (weak in faith) (Rom. 14:1). Therefore, we would prefer to lean towards the priority of the Epistle to the Romans in this case as well.

Some passages belonging to the last two chapters of the Epistle to the Romans and having parallels in the First Epistle to the Corinthians can indeed be interpreted in the opposite sense. For example, the exhortation in Romans 15:2-3 that each should seek to please their neighbor, based on the example of Christ who did not seek to please Himself, seems to be an elaboration of the shorter admonition in 1 Cor. 11:1: μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε, καθὼς κἀγὼ Χριστοῦ ("Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ"), a passage we already referred to in connection with Gal. 4:12. Also, in the Corinthians passage (10:33), the statement πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω ("I try to please everyone in everything I do") precedes. Further parallels include 1 Cor. 10:11 and Rom. 15:4, which highlight the typical significance of the Scripture, and 1 Cor. 14:33 with Rom. 15:33, referring to "the God of peace." Additionally, the saints mentioned in 1 Cor. 16:1 are further clarified by Rom. 15:26 as "the saints in Jerusalem."

Given the uncertainty in which this part of the question remains, it would be welcome if a clear connection could be found between the Epistle to the Romans and the First Epistle to the Corinthians, similar to the one we found between the latter and the Epistle to the Galatians in the passages Gal. 5:21 and 1 Cor. 6:9. In fact, if we are not mistaken, the comparison of the two passages 1 Cor. 4:6 and Rom. 12:3 could gain similar significance. The Corinthians passage reads: "Now, brothers, I have applied these things to myself and Apollos for your benefit, so that you may learn from us the meaning of the saying, 'Do not go beyond what is written.' Then you will not be puffed up in being a follower of one of us over against the other." This passage is obscure, and interpreters are divided in their explanations. The idea that the Corinthians should learn from Paul and Apollos not to be puffed up against each other is clear and fitting. But what does the phrase "do not go beyond what is written" mean? Generally, γέγραπται is used to introduce a quote from the Old Testament. Therefore, Grotius1), for example, explains that the reference is to Deut. 17:20, "so that his heart may not be lifted up above his brothers," which corresponds only very loosely. Meyer and others think it refers generally to the Old Testament as containing written norms of humility and modesty. But this is too general to be the intended meaning here. Chrysostom and other Greek Fathers related γέγραπται to sayings of Christ like Mark 10:44 and Matt. 7:1, which contain general admonitions to humility but do not precisely fit the context here, even if we assume these sayings were in written form with the solemn γέγραπται at the time of Paul, based on the usual dating of these letters. Hofmann interprets

γέγραπται as referring to the general concept of the measure allotted to each by God. But γέγραπται in New Testament usage usually refers to something actually written. Heinrici finally suggests that the phrase in quotes likely reproduces a catchphrase used to cast a negative light on the apostle's proclamation and that of his like-minded followers. This explanation, however, is unsatisfactory, as it replaces the difficulty of an unknown reference with the even greater one of an even less known catchphrase used by the apostle's opponents in Corinth. Nonetheless, the observation that the words are "as if in quotation marks" can shed light on the matter. There is a known parallel to our passage in Romans 12:3. At the beginning of the parenetic section, the apostle exhorts the readers to humility in mutual dealings: "For by the grace given to me I say to every one of you: Do not think of yourself more highly than you ought, but rather think of yourself with sober judgment, in accordance with the faith God has distributed to each of you." This is a sharply pointed, characteristic sentence that, with its wordplay on the expressions "more highly than you ought to think"—"think with sober judgment," is exactly the kind of phrase meant to enter common usage and become a citation. As such a citation, the author of the First Epistle to the Corinthians can use it again and remind his readers that it is written—namely, elsewhere, in the Epistle to the Romans. Here, the expression γέγραπται is naturally not to be taken in its most solemn sense, as quoting a divine word, especially since it does not say καθώς γέγραπται but just γέγραπται. The phrase μή ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται (do not go beyond what is written) is an allusion to a cleverly crafted word from the Epistle to the Romans, a word spoken by the apostle "by the grace given to me," thus with apostolic authority, making it all the more suitable to be called out to the communities later. This similarity between 1 Cor. 4:6 and Rom. 12:3 becomes particularly evident when we restore the word φρονεῖν, omitted by Tischendorf in the textus receptus, as preserved by most manuscript correctors and translations, especially the Syriac, and as it is exegetically necessary for the sentence. Then the phrase in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται φρονεῖν, contains a reference to a clever, sharply formulated word from the Epistle to the Romans, a word that the apostle speaks "by the grace given to me," thus with apostolic authority, making it all the more suitable to be called out to the communities later.

1) See the evidence in Meyer-Heinrici's exegetical handbook on this passage.

A similar passage is found in 1 Cor. 5:9: "I wrote to you in my letter not to associate with sexually immoral people." It is very difficult to say what this reference pertains to. It is unlikely to refer to the present letter, as in verse 11, the νυνὶ ἔγραψα is distinguished from it. Most interpreters currently believe the reference is to an earlier, now lost, letter to the Corinthians. However, this explanation appeals to the unknown and is the least likely according to our particular view of the composition of the four main letters. One might consider Rom. 13:13-14, where Christians are exhorted to walk properly as in the daytime, not in revelry and drunkenness, not in lewdness and lust. However, this does not correspond closely enough, and the concept of μή συναναμίγνυσθαι is not fully covered by it. Whether some other piece of Pauline epistolary literature is meant, perhaps one that has now found a place in one of our four letters, such as 2 Cor. 6:14-18 1), where a strong warning is given against associating with

unbelievers, we dare not say. There is a yet unclear relationship hidden beneath this reference that needs further investigation.

1) Schrader considers the passage to be an insertion in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Likewise Ewald and Hilgenfeld, Introduction, p. 287 Anin.

Regarding the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, there is hardly a need to prove that it was written after the First Epistle, as this is generally accepted. Indeed, the state of affairs in Corinth as assumed in chapters 7 and 8, the apostle's further journey from Ephesus to Macedonia (2:12, 7:5 compared with 1 Cor. 16:5), and the renewed discussion of the issue with the incestuous man (2 Cor. 2:5 compared with 1 Cor. 5:3)—even though the latter is presented somewhat differently in the second letter—leave no doubt about this. This is true even if the reference in 2 Cor. 10:7 "if anyone is confident that they belong to Christ" is not completely evident as referring to the so-called Christ party in 1 Cor. 1:12. Perhaps there can even be found a direct reference to the earlier letters in this epistle, though it is difficult to provide conclusive evidence for this. In the announcement of the apostle's intention to come to the Corinthians, there is a "third time" that has always puzzled interpreters. According to the Acts of the Apostles, Paul had been to Corinth only once when he wrote the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (on the third missionary journey in Macedonia, Acts 20:1). But in the Second Epistle, he now intends to come for the third time (12:14, 13:1). This leads some interpreters to assume an additional, unrecorded journey to Corinth, of which Acts says nothing. Others prefer to understand the passages in the Second Epistle differently, interpreting 12:14 as referring to his third intended visit to Corinth1), though this is challenged by 13:1 "This will be my third visit to you." We believe that these announcements, although formally referring to intended journeys, actually pertain more to his spiritual visits, namely through letters. If 13:1 says "This will be my third visit to you: 'Every matter must be established by the testimony of two or three witnesses,'" this would subtly indicate that our Second Epistle to the Corinthians is the third in the series of Pauline letters. Thus, there is no need to assume either an otherwise unknown and contradictory journey to Corinth (1:23) or to force an interpretation. Only in this way does the phrase "Every matter must be established by the testimony of two or three witnesses" acquire its full and apt meaning—the three letters are as many witnesses to the Pauline gospel that must be re-impressed upon the communities. However, this interpretation remains within the bounds of mere conjecture for now.

1) So Baur, Paulus I S. 337 ff.

We have already seen above that the Epistle to the Galatians is the fourth in the sequence. Accordingly, the order of the main Pauline epistles is as we have them in the canon: Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians. The Epistle to the Romans, particularly in its first part, is the most significant piece in the entire series; the later letters all depend on this original to a greater or lesser extent. Without delving into a detailed analysis of the content of these four letters, we can state that there is a continuous intensification in the tone in which the Pauline gospel is presented and defended against the Judaistic doctrine starting from the Epistle to the Romans. The Epistle to the Romans is still calmly explanatory, moderate, and fair towards the opponent, only occasionally interspersed with polemical flashes. Pauline theology is presented more decisively in the first and even more so in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, where the last four chapters conduct a sort of hand-to-hand combat with the adversary. However, the Epistle to the Galatians speaks in the most agitated manner, asserting the apostle's complete independence concerning his teaching and his person in relation to the original apostles. It is the declaration of independence of the free-thinking, educated Gentile Christianity from the Jewish Christianity, which was fighting with human authorities and slavish adherence to the law, and which in the second century sought to subjugate the West from the East.

Chapter Two:

Paul and the Gospels

1. Citations of the Words of Jesus by Paul

If the order of the four main Pauline epistles is as we have determined, it follows that the previous conceptions about these letters must be re-examined. Among these conceptions is notably the idea that these letters are the oldest writings we have in the New Testament, older specifically than the Gospels. This is the judgment of the entire critical school and a large part of other scholars in this field.

It is believed that the four major Pauline letters from 55-60 AD, perhaps accompanied by some of the smaller ones, and the Apocalypse from the year 68, are the oldest writings that have been preserved. These two foundational pillars, rooted in the formative period of the church, are thought to have supported the further development of New Testament literature. The Gospels, especially, are considered to have followed the Pauline letters much later, and particularly the Gospel of Luke is seen as distinctly Pauline, familiar with, and utilizing the Pauline letters, as is also assumed of the other Lucan writing, the Acts of the Apostles.

Our next task is to examine this view.

Regarding the Gospels in general, we also hold that they were written relatively late, at least in the form we have them today. They all presuppose the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. While Mark and Matthew, the latter probably in an older edition, still belong to the first century, Luke is dated after the year 100, mainly due to his acquaintance with the writings of Josephus, as demonstrated by Holtzmann and others. Nevertheless, the question arises whether the Pauline letters are indeed older than the Synoptics, whether they really preceded them or rather followed them. The prevailing opinion holds the former, but we must investigate whether this is correct or not.

First and foremost, it is acknowledged that Paul shows familiarity with certain sayings of Jesus. The question then arises whether he knows them from oral tradition or from written sources—in the latter case, from our Gospels or similar books. The general assumption now is the former. It is said that the words of Jesus were transmitted orally from person to person, and Paul learned many of them in this way. He derives other words of the Lord from divine revelation, always emphasizing that he says this as something communicated to him by the Lord. This is indeed how one must think of it—if no other explanation is to be preferred. However, historical probability requires that we first investigate whether these words could have come to Paul of the

four main letters in a much simpler way, namely through knowledge of some written gospel, either within or outside the circle of those we still have. If we examine the four main letters for such traces of the words of Jesus, the Epistle to the Romans initially offers only sparse results. The expression "guide of the blind" in Rom. 2:19 recalls Matt. 23:16, 24, where Jesus pronounces woes upon the Pharisees and scribes as "blind guides," and Matt. 15:14 and Luke 6:39, where they are called "blind guides of the blind." However, this image is also frequently found elsewhere and is too obvious to conclude with certainty that it must have been taken from the gospel passages. Similarly, the expression "you, the judge" in Rom. 2:1, with the elaboration "for in whatever you judge another, you condemn yourself," only remotely reminds us of the saying from the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. 7:1: "Do not judge, so that you will not be judged." On the other hand, Rom. 12:14 contains a saying that strikingly points to our Gospels: "Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse." Comparing this with Matt. 5:44: "Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you," and Luke 6:28: "Bless those who curse you," the Pauline saying appears as a summary of these two versions of the gospel saying. The passage Rom. 13:8-10 undoubtedly contains a thought known from the Gospels, namely that the law is summed up in love, which is its fulfillment. Thus, Jesus answers the scribe's question in Matt. 22:34 about the greatest commandment, stating that love for God and neighbor is the first and greatest, adding that "on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets," similar to Paul's statement: "The law is summed up in this commandment: 'Love your neighbor as yourself,'" and "Love is the fulfillment of the law." The order in which the commandments are listed in this Romans passage: "You shall not commit adultery, you shall not murder, you shall not steal," closely matches Mark 10:19, where the sequence is "Do not commit adultery, do not murder, do not steal," while in the Decalogue, "You shall not murder" comes first. Whether Rom. 13:12: "The night is nearly over; the day is almost here" is related to Luke 12:38, Matt. 25:6, i.e., the gospel image of the coming of the Lord in the late night or early morning, remains to be seen, as well as whether Rom. 14:12: "Each of us will give an account of ourselves to God" is related to Matt. 12:36, where it is said that people must give an account for every idle word they have spoken. In the Romans passage, it is also about judging one's brother, i.e., sins of the tongue. Finally, it should be noted that the application of the Isaian image of the cornerstone to Christ in Rom. 9:33 seems to go back to Jesus' word in Matt. 21:42, Mark 12:10, Luke 20:17 (cf. also Acts 4:11) about the stone the builders rejected, which became the cornerstone. For the combination of the image of the stumbling stone with that of the cornerstone and the understanding of the latter as referring to Christ (cf. 1 Pet. 2:6-8) cannot be derived merely from the combination of Isa. 8:14 and 28:16 but presupposes that Christ as the cornerstone was a known image to the author, likely originating from the gospel passage.

Similar indications are also found in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, but they are even more pronounced. However, slight echoes should not be given too much weight here either. Such echoes include 1 Cor. 2:11: "No one knows the things of God except the Spirit of God," where one might think of Matt. 11:27 and Luke 10:22: "No one knows the Father except the Son" (according to the versions of Justin and the Clementines). Another is 1 Cor. 1:22: "Jews demand signs," which recalls the Gospel pericope of the Pharisees' demand for a sign (Mark 8:11, Matt.

12:38, 16:1, Luke 11:29), though this could also arise from other knowledge of Jewish wonder-seeking. Further echoes might include 1 Cor. 1:19: "God chose the foolish things of the world to shame the wise," compared to Luke 10:21, Matt. 11:25: "You have hidden these things from the wise and learned and revealed them to little children." Also, 1 Cor. 3:10 belongs here, with the image of the "temple of God" used for the community (cf. 2 Cor. 6:16 and the "not made with hands" in 2 Cor. 5:1), which reminds us of Jesus' words about destroying and rebuilding the temple, as given in Mark 14:58: "I will destroy this temple made with human hands and in three days will build another, not made with hands." The "temple not made with hands" is understood here as the community of God, and it remains very questionable whether the image was borrowed by Mark from Paul or vice versa. In the context of the latter, it arises quite naturally from the premise; in the Corinthians passage, it is treated as something well-known. However, we will find the same image elsewhere, so it cannot be decisively determined which was its original source.

167

All this may remain undecided. However, in this letter, we encounter a number of passages from which the author's familiarity with our Gospels can be inferred with considerable certainty.

In the chapter concerning marriage (7), Paul distinguishes between what he personally considers right and what is a command of the Lord. His advice to the unmarried is to remain single unless it is necessary to marry. However, to those who are married, he says (7:10), "Not I, but the Lord commands that a wife must not separate from her husband, or if she does, she must remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband, and the husband must not divorce his wife." This command corresponds exactly to what we read in the words of the Gospels (Matt. 5:32, 19:3; Mark 10:2; Luke 16:18). There, Jesus forbids a man to divorce his wife, and in the passage from the Sermon on the Mount, it is added: whoever divorces his wife causes her to commit adultery, and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery. Thus, Paul's citation of Jesus' command aligns with the Gospel passage in that 1) a man must not divorce his wife, and 2) a divorced woman should not remarry. However, the prohibition against a wife separating from her husband remains uncovered. This latter aspect is peculiar, especially as the Corinthians passage presumes it to be a command of the Lord. According to Jewish law, divorce was allowed only for the man, not for the woman. On the historical basis of Jesus' words, the prohibition for a woman to separate from her husband is not conceivable. In the Corinthians letter, it clearly arises from the changed circumstances into which the apostolic preaching had entered, explained by the greater freedom of pagan customs.1) Therefore, it is not surprising that an exact parallel to this specific prohibition is not found in our Gospels, nor should it be assumed that Jesus might have spoken thus orally. In essence, however, this prohibition is fully justified within Jesus' strongly emphasized inviolability of the marital relationship, for if man and woman are one flesh and what God has joined together, man should not separate, then separation is naturally excluded, regardless of which side initiates it.

Moreover, Paul's expression: γυναῖκα ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς μὴ χωρισθῆναι directly recalls Matt. 19:6: ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω.

1) So, in Justin's *Apology* 11, chapter 2, the wife sends her husband the so-called "repudium" (the document of divorce), and thereby ends the marriage, separating herself (ἐχωρίσθη).

168

Therefore, Paul's citation can very well simply refer to our Gospels. Admittedly, the possibility remains that it might refer to oral tradition; however, when there is an exactly corresponding written source, the simpler assumption is that this written source underlies the reference. Immediately afterward, when transitioning to the question of whether virgins should marry (1 Cor. 7:25), Paul says: "Now concerning virgins, I have no command from the Lord," the fact is simply that the Gospels do not contain any saying of Jesus on this point, as the passage about eunuchs in Matt. 19:12 is not relevant here. In Jesus' teaching, the issue of virgins not marrying is never mentioned, as this point, like the previously mentioned issue of marriage separation by the woman, has no validity or application within the context of Hebrew customs. Therefore, there could not have been any saying of Jesus on this topic circulating in oral tradition, and the same applies to our Gospels. Hence, nothing from this perspective stands in the way of the assumption that the Corinthians passages refer back to them.

The passage in 1 Cor. 9:14, "In the same way, the Lord has commanded that those who preach the gospel should receive their living from the gospel," also points to an explicit command of Jesus. There is no doubt that this refers to the instruction given by Jesus to the disciples in Matt. 10:10 and Luke 10:7, where the preacher of the gospel is to receive his support from those to whom he preaches. However, since Paul's expression is very general, it remains undecided whether this passage presupposes the Gospels or only the oral tradition.

169

It is different with the passage about faith that can move mountains in 1 Cor. 13:2: "If I have all faith, so as to move mountains." Although this is not cited as a word of Jesus here, examination shows that such a word underlies it, specifically from the Gospel pericope about the cursing of the fig tree in Matt. 21:21 and Mark 11:23, the same word that Matthew already has on another occasion earlier in 17:20: "If you have faith as small as a mustard seed, you will say to this mountain, 'Move from here to there,' and it will move." The connection between the concept of faith and the image of moving mountains suggests that this Gospel saying is the basis. The latter expression is a common metaphor among the rabbis for overcoming seemingly insurmountable difficulties. They say of a particularly astute and learned colleague, "He is a mountain mover."1) However, mountain-moving faith is unknown to them; this expression in this context exists solely in the New Testament and is thus a specifically Christian product. One might again assume that Paul had learned of the story in which Jesus speaks of the

mountain-moving power of faith through oral tradition. But why make this assumption when the matter is clearly presented in the Gospels? This assumption is apparently made only because it is believed that our Gospels were written long after the Pauline letters, but this belief is not so unassailable that the reverse should not at least be considered worth examining.

> 1) [HEBREW TEXT] see the passages in Lightfoot, Hebr. on Mt. 21, 21 and in Buxtorf, lexicon rabb. talni. s. v. [HEBREW TEXT], also Wünsche, new contributions to the explanation of the Evg. p. 201. 245.

The content of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is not very suitable for comparisons with the Gospels. The first section is speculative and dogmatic, dealing little with concrete subjects. The second section, chapters 8-9, contains personal news and addresses the matter of collections. The third section, chapters 10-13, is so individually apologetic that opportunities for references to gospel words scarcely appear. However, in this letter, there is a word that strongly reminds one of the Gospels, namely 2 Cor. 1:17, where Paul asks: "Was I vacillating when I wanted to do this? Do I make my plans according to the flesh, ready to say 'Yes, yes' and 'No, no' at the same time?" This statement is so peculiar that it is not immediately understood. Some interpreters translate the phrase: "so that with me it may be 'Yes, yes' and 'No, no'," meaning that I would always be right in my decisions, no matter how circumstances might change. However, this interpretation does not work because verse 18 states: "Our word to you has not been Yes and No," which condemns saying Yes and No simultaneously. This also clarifies the meaning of the immediately preceding statement, which must be taken hypothetically as a rhetorical question. The phrase "Yes, yes" and "No, no" is a well-known passage from Jesus' teachings in the Gospels: Matt. 5:37, "Let what you say be simply 'Yes' or 'No'; anything more than this comes from evil." This saying is also cited in the Epistle of James, where in 5:12 it reads: "Let your 'Yes' be yes and your 'No' be no, so that you may not fall under condemnation." Generally, all three passages agree that the affirmation and negation formulas, each repeated twice, are juxtaposed. The rabbis, as well as the Greeks and Romans, used this expression—see Lightfoot for the former and Wetstein for the latter. Each of the three passages has its peculiarity. In the passage from James, "yes" and "no" are subjects the first time and predicates the second time. In Matthew, they are predicates both times. Finally, in Paul's letter, according to the incorrect interpretation mentioned, it would be the same as in James, but according to the correct interpretation, it is similar to Matthew. Given that the application of the formula in 2 Corinthians is somewhat unusual, and its meaning ("my 'Yes, yes' should also be 'No, no'") must first be sought, it becomes more likely that the simpler usage as found in Matthew underlies it. Of course, it is also possible that oral tradition or simply knowledge of the saying from everyday life is the basis here.

Further connections between this letter and the Gospels can perhaps be assumed in isolated instances, but they are not sufficient for conclusive proof. Whether the phrase "ἐξέστημεν" in 2 Cor. 5:13 is related to Mark 3:21 "ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη" must remain undecided, despite the fact that only in these two instances does "ἐξίστημι" without "τοῦ φρονεῖν" mean "to be out of

one's mind," while in other Greek sources it usually has that additional context. The "gentleness and meekness of Christ" in 2 Cor. 10:1 could come from the tradition about the character of the historical Jesus, although it more likely comes from our Gospels, where passages like Matt. 11:29 "I am gentle and humble in heart" and 12:19 about the Servant of God "He will not quarrel or cry out" are quite close. The idea that Satan disguises himself as an angel of light and his servants as servants of righteousness, as stated in 2 Cor. 11:14-15, reminds one of the wolves in sheep's clothing in Matt. 7:15, but it could also have arisen independently of it. Finally, the legal proverb in 2 Cor. 13:1 "every matter must be established by the testimony of two or three witnesses" strongly resembles Matt. 18:16: "so that every matter may be established by the testimony of two or three witnesses," but it should not be forgotten that the oldest basis is Deut. 19:15, where the Greek translation already offers the same words. Therefore, the familiarity of the author of 2 Corinthians with the written Gospels remains unproven, but also unrefuted. Given what we have observed in 1 Corinthians, it becomes more likely, and the idea that the author was familiar with the Gospels can be considered plausible.

If we also examine the Epistle to the Galatians for its connections to the words of Jesus, the result, for similar reasons, cannot be much more significant. The letter, in both its doctrinal and admonitory parts, is so different from the synoptic style that one can hardly expect to find many connections. Accordingly, there are only a few passages where one might speculate about familiarity with the Gospels. The contrast in 2:18 between "destroy" and "build" has some content-related, but not formal, connection to the synoptic, Jewish expressions "loosing" and "binding" in Matt. 16:19 and 18:18. It also reminds one of the words about destroying and rebuilding the temple in Matt. 26:61 and Mark 14:58 (John 2:19), but no dependency can be proven, as the expression is also common elsewhere. Similarly, the "foolish Galatians" in 3:1 only briefly reminds one of "foolish and slow of heart to believe," as Jesus addresses his disciples in Luke 24:25. The closest connection might be the statement about the fulfillment of the law in the commandment of loving one's neighbor in 5:14, which could suggest the saying about the greatest commandment in Matt. 22:39 as its source. However, according to our previously reached conclusions, this dependency is not direct but mediated through Rom. 13:8-10, where "has been fulfilled" corresponds to "the fulfillment of the law." Therefore, the yield here is not abundant, which, given the character of this letter, is not surprising.

Thus, we would like to base the assumption of the familiarity of the main Pauline epistles with the words of Jesus from written Gospels on passages such as Romans 12:14, 13:8-10, 1 Corinthians 7:10, and 13:2, while disregarding everything of lesser importance.

2. The Pauline Accounts of the Lord's Supper and Resurrection

We now turn to the two sections in the First Epistle to the Corinthians whose relationship to the Gospels has long been recognized, but about which it has often been judged that these very

sections prove the greater antiquity of this epistle compared to the Gospels: the accounts of the Lord's Supper and the Resurrection.

173

The account of the institution of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor. 11:23-26 runs parallel to the accounts of the Synoptics in Matt. 26:20-29, Mark 14:17-25, and Luke 22:14-20. Among these three accounts, those of Matthew and Mark are closely related on one side, and those of Luke and Paul on the other. It is acknowledged that Luke's account shows the greatest similarity to that given in our epistle. It will be necessary to compare the two accounts word for word.

Lc. 22, 14 και δτε έγένετο ή ώρα άνέπεσεν, καί οι απόστολοι σϋν αύτφ. 15. καί εΓπεν πρδ; αύτού;· έπιθυμία έπεθύμησα τούτο τό πάσχα φαγεΐν μεθ' ύμών πρδ τού με παθεΐν· 16. λέγω γάρ ύμΐν δτι ούκέτι ού μή φάγω αύτδ δω; οτου πληρωθή έν τή βασιλεία τού θεοΰ. 17. καί δεξάμενο; ποτήριον εύχαριστήσα; εΓπεν· λάβετε τούτο καί διαμερίσατε εΐ; εαυτού;· 18. λέγω γάρ ύμΐν δτι ού μή πιω άπδ τού νΰν άπδ τοΰ γενήματο; τή; αμπέλου δω; δτου ή βασιλεία τοΰ θεοΰ έλθη. Lc. 22, 14 and it did not happen or hour fell, and the apostles syn utf. 15. and erben prd? his;· I wished this with desire the pascha fagein met' ymon prd to me pathein; 16. I say gar ymin Why don't I eat this here? to be paid in his reign god 17. and seen? glass did i thank erben; take this and did you share it? self?· 18. I say, why don't I drink? to nyon apd to genimato? the vine here? his or his kingdom god come	I Cor. 11,23 έγώ γάρ παρέλαβον άπδ τοΰ κυρίου, δ καί παρέδωκα ύμΐν, δτι ό κύριο; 'Ιησού; έν τή νυκτί ή παρεδίδετο I Cor. 11.23 I received it From the Lord, and I delivered ymin, what's up sir? 'Jesus; in the overnight or delivered
19. καί λαβών άρτον εύχαριστήσα; εκλασεν καί εοωκεν αύτοϊ; λέγων τούτο έστιν τδ σώμα	ελαβεν άρτον 24. καί εύχαριστήσα; εκλασεν καί εΐπεν· τούτο μου έστιν τδ σώμα τδ ύπέρ ύμών (κλώμε-

μου τδ υπέρ ύμών διδόμενον τούτο ποιείΐτε εΐ; τήν έμήν άνάμνησιν. 20. καί τδ ποτήριον ώσαύτω; μετά τδ δειπνήσαι, λέγων τούτο τδ ποτήριον ή καινή διαθήκη έν τώ αΐματί μου, τδ ύπέρ ύμών έκχυν- νόμενον. 19. and bread holders did i thank he cried and woken up these; saying this is td body I am in favor of you by giving this who are you? I remember her. 20. and a glass like that? after You are having dinner, saying this is a glass or new testament in me my blood, for your sake law	νον)· τούτο ποιείΐτε εΐ; τήν έμήν άνάμνησιν. 25. ώσαύτω; καί τδ ποτήριον μετά τδ δειπνήσαι, λέγων τούτο τδ ποτήριον ή καινή διαθήκη έν τώ έμφ αιματι· τούτο ποιείΐτε εΐ; τήν έμήν άνάμνησιν. 26. όσά- κι; γάρ έάν έσθίητε τδν άρτον τούτον καί τό ποτήριον πίνητε, τόν ΐίάνατον τοΰ χυρίου καταγγέλλετε, άχρι οΰ έλθη. received bread 24. and gave thanks? cried out and said: this is mine td body td surfaces (clothes- no); who is this? the month memory 25. so? and td after a glass you have dinner, so to speak this td cup or new testament in the blood; this is what you say huh? I remember her. 26. as- and? for if you eat this bread and drink the cup, you denounce the husband's sin, without coming.

That these two accounts are so similar that one could not have originated without the other is evident from the substantial verbal agreement between them. The words spoken during the distribution of the bread are identical in both accounts, except that in Luke, instead of "διδόμενον," Paul either has nothing, as the best textual witnesses show, or has "κλώμενον," "διδόμενον," or "θρυπτόμενον" as some witnesses supplement. The addition of "τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν" is characteristic of both Luke and Paul, as it is entirely absent from Mark and Matthew. The words spoken during the distribution of the cup are not quite identical. Luke says "τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον," which Matthew and Mark also have at this point, but Paul does not have this. Instead, Paul repeats "εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν" from the first clause and further justifies it with his own concluding sentence. Otherwise, the text of both accounts agrees here as well. The characteristic "μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι" and the form "τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη" instead of "τοῦτο ἐστιν ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη" as Mark and Matthew have, also testify to precise agreement. The first question is, in the points where Paul and Luke differ, which one is more original? And then, is the account that Luke and Paul have more original than the one that Matthew and Mark provide? Much seems to argue for the originality of the account in 1 Corinthians compared to that of Luke, and this is also the view that is almost universally shared. The account is, above all, shorter and simpler. It has only a single distribution of the cup, while Luke, in a peculiar way and differing from the other Synoptics, reports a double distribution

(verses 17 and 20). It has the shorter formula "τοῦτο μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν," at least according to the corrected text, and it has only "ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι" without "τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον." Therefore, this account is best suited for liturgical use, as it has been used in the Christian church from ancient times. However, these favorable points are countered by opposite ones that have perhaps been too little considered until now. "Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν," begins the account. How did Paul receive his communication from Christ? Oral instruction from the living Jesus is naturally excluded, and heavenly instruction from the glorified Christ could be assumed by analogy, as Paul sometimes boasts of such heavenly revelations (Gal. 1:12, 2:2; 2 Cor. 12:1). But this mode of receiving does not easily align with the content of the communication. While it is easy to think that the apostle in moments of religious ecstasy heard heavenly voices and received hints through them about what he should do or heard inexpressible words that went beyond all human thoughts, it is difficult to imagine that such a revelation would have contained a very sober historical account like the institution of the Lord's Supper. Here, one must definitely think more of human mediation, as even proponents of supernatural communication acknowledge. The preposition "ἀπὸ," as opposed to "παρά," does not denote direct reception from Christ but rather reception from Him, more precisely from Him through someone else. If it says, "I received it from the Lord," what I also delivered to you, "παρέλαβον" and "παρέδωκα ὑμῖν," the manner of delivery also determines the manner of reception. The apostle delivered to the communities the news he had received through Christian tradition, and there is nothing to prevent us from assuming that this tradition was very similar to what our evangelists also received and passed on. In the same terms, the news of Christ's resurrection is introduced in our letter in 15:3: "παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον," and there can be no doubt that the tradition of the earliest community is being referred to. Thus, in our case as well, this same source has flowed, and it remains possible that the tradition already fixed in writing in the Gospels underlies it, as well as one still circulating in oral tradition. So, even if it must still be admitted that Paul's account is based on oral tradition, there is fundamentally nothing against the idea that he could have drawn it from our Gospel of Luke, provided its form can be explained from it. This possibility arises from examining the beginning of the account and becomes more likely when examining its conclusion. That the exhortation in verse 26, "For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes," is to be understood as Paul's words and not still as Jesus' words should be evident and is recognized by most commentators. The phrases "τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου" and "ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ" loudly testify to this, as in the Apostolic Constitutions1), where these words are put into Jesus' mouth, it is said "τὸν θάνατον τὸν ἐμόν" and "ἄχρις ἂν ἔλθω." If verse 26 is added by Paul and yet so kept as if it belongs to the Lord's Supper account, it sheds light on the entire formation of this account. The "γάρ" in verse 26 evidently justifies the conclusion of verse 25 "εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν," for as the celebrants are exhorted to repeat this celebration until the Lord comes, they thus keep His memory alive. Therefore, the repetition of "εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν" during the distribution of the cup is connected with Paul's addition in verse 26 and is itself an addition, namely to the Luke text, which has this phrase only the first time during the distribution of the bread.

1) VIII. 12, IG. see also Meyer-ITeinrici on this point.

177

What initially cast the Luke text in an unfavorable light is its peculiar mention of two cups, which differs from Matthew and Mark and led some to conclude an awkward amalgamation of two sources. However, the first cup in verse 17 is closely linked with the first meal in verse 15, where Jesus says, "I have eagerly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer. For I tell you, I will not eat it again until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God." This corresponds exactly with the offering of the first cup with the words, "Take this and divide it among yourselves. For I tell you, I will not drink again from the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." These two moments, therefore, belong together. In Luke, they form a first act of the Lord's Supper, with the significance of a farewell meal1) with the disciples and a reference to its fulfillment in the kingdom of God. This is followed by a second act, again involving eating and drinking, but now with the significance of a memorial meal for Jesus during the time between his death and the Parousia. This explains the seemingly peculiar second cup; it is an innovation introduced by Luke to enrich the meaning of the event. He was justified in doing this, as during the Jewish Passover meal, which Jesus celebrates according to all the Synoptics, not just one but several, typically four, cups were given and drunk with solemn words. The account in the First Epistle to the Corinthians otherwise adheres to that of Luke but omits this first act because it was not essential to the matter and is not included by Matthew and Mark. However, its knowledge of this act is evident from the added concluding sentence, "For whenever you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes." Here we have, in a different form, the reference to the future coming of the Lord, which is contained in Luke's first act in the twice-repeated words: "until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God," "until the kingdom of God comes" (verses 16, 18). While our account omits the rest, considering it a mere prelude to the words of institution, it preserves this specific reference by placing it at the end in another form. Here, "proclaiming the Lord's death" is to be understood in a specifically Pauline sense, referring to the salvific significance of Christ's death, which is proclaimed anew in the repeated celebration of the Lord's Supper, both to the community and to outsiders. Whether "καταγγέλλετε" is understood as indicative or imperative essentially makes no difference, but given the context and the parallel "ποιεῖτε" in verses 24 and 25, the latter is likely preferable.

1) Probably not the communal meal, as Baur, Kanon. Addendum p. 483 assumes, since κοινωνία is not mentioned here at all.

178

Thus, in our passage, we do not have the simplest account of the Lord's Supper but rather a simplified version. The foundation is Luke's account, which is essentially retained but significantly trimmed of its incidental elements, resulting in a concise and straightforward account that can be used as a standard formula for communication to the congregations.

If Luke's account is the basis for Paul's narrative and not the other way around, it then raises the question of whether this Lukan-Pauline type is older than that of Matthew and Mark. Comparing the words of institution, it becomes clear that the first two Synoptics indeed precede the third in this respect. In Mark 14:22ff, Jesus says while breaking the bread, "This is my body," whereas in Luke, it is the same with the addition, "which is given for you; do this in remembrance of me." And when offering the cup, Mark states, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many," while Luke has, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which is poured out for you." In both cases, what Luke adds can easily be seen as an expansion, particularly the phrase "new covenant," which Jesus likely did not say. Matthew 26:26ff generally follows the same text as Mark, only adding "for the forgiveness of sins" at the end. Given this situation, it should be clear that Matthew and Mark provide the older text compared to Luke and Paul, a conclusion reached by many who otherwise consider Paul's account the oldest without realizing the inconsistency. For instance, Meyer-Heinrici notes regarding 1 Corinthians 11:24, "in remembrance of me," that "these words are not yet present in Matthew and Mark, whose simple 'This is my body' suggests the original, unexpanded form without further explanation or reflection. This preference should generally be given to the accounts of Matthew and Mark (with Mark's being preferred among the two) over Paul and Luke." Rückert1), after carefully comparing all accounts, concludes, "The words of institution have their shortest form in Mark, a slightly longer one in Matthew, and an even longer and differing form in the second half in Paul and Luke, compelling us to choose in favor of the first two." Additionally, Rückert observes that Paul already presents a highly developed dogmatic theory about the meaning of the act, leading him to conclude, "We must choose between what seems the only conceivable consideration of the circumstances and what Paul teaches." Those not bound by dogma "must admit that here Paul embarked on a path not sufficiently grounded in the events or words, presenting the seeds of a history that, at least in its blessings, does not speak in his favor."

1) The Lord's Supper, p. 241, 242.

There is only one criticism to be made of these judgments: they find faults in a report which, according to their own criteria, should be the oldest and most faithful, while still maintaining the Pauline origin of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. From our standpoint, which has abandoned that assumption, their reasons gain their full weight and their judgment is justified.

Let us now turn to the second point: the report in the First Epistle to the Corinthians on the resurrection of Christ (15:1-11).

This report has become decisive for the critical view of Jesus' resurrection. It underpins the interpretation that the appearances of the risen Christ were visions, as Paul lists his own encounter with Christ on the road to Damascus as the last among the others, thereby placing it

on the same level in terms of form. It also supports the view that Jesus' resurrection from the grave was not the original form of the tradition but rather the appearance of the glorified Christ from heaven, without necessarily requiring the body to have emerged from the grave. Finally, it emphasizes Paul's consistent use of the term "ὤφθη" (was seen), indicating a supernatural, visionary experience1). Therefore, one can say that this report has become the lever for modern criticism to attempt to set aside the more realistic-sounding resurrection accounts of the Gospels. Much of the confidence in advocating the vision hypothesis rests on the precedence of this report over the tradition as presented in the Gospels. All of this must become uncertain if the authorship of this report by Paul is disputed, posing an unexpected threat to criticism at one of its most crucial points.

1) See Holsten's treatise, which has become authoritative for the critical school, Paul's vision of Christ, printed in the treatise on the Evg. of Paul and Peter 1868, p. 65ff.

Indeed, the resurrection account in the First Epistle to the Corinthians is remarkable and peculiar enough to favorably bias its antiquity. After some introductory remarks, it provides a formal list of six appearances of the risen Christ, of which only a few can be identified, if at all, with those reported in our Gospels, while most remain unique to this account. An attempt to derive this report from our Gospels, specifically from Luke, seems doomed to failure from the outset. Nevertheless, despite all appearances to the contrary, the question must be examined to what extent elements of this remarkable account might intersect with those in our Gospels, especially Luke's.

The first point emphasized in the account is that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures. This corresponds to the early Christian and specifically Pauline understanding of Christ's death as an atoning sacrifice for sins. It particularly aligns with the teaching the risen Christ gives to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus in Luke 24:26-27, where he reproaches them for their hard-heartedness in not recognizing that Christ had to suffer these things and enter into his glory. He then clarifies this by explaining all the prophetic passages from Moses onward that point to this. While this scriptural justification for Jesus' crucifixion is generally assumed elsewhere, it is hardly as explicitly stated as in this passage of Luke's Gospel. Furthermore, among the appearances to the disciples, the first one mentioned is that to Peter. Again, only Luke among the Synoptic Gospels offers a parallel to this. In Matthew, only the women see the risen Christ in Jerusalem, and he appears to the eleven disciples only in Galilee; there is no specific mention of Peter. It is unknown how the original ending of Mark might have reported this; in the current concluding part of Mark, there is no mention of an appearance to Peter. However, in Luke's account, there is a passage (24:34) where the two disciples returning from Emmaus are greeted by the others with the joyous exclamation, "The Lord has indeed risen and has appeared to Simon," which notably resembles 1 Corinthians 15:5: "he appeared to Cephas." Finally, a third parallel with Luke can be found, as the risen Christ appears to the apostles after the Emmaus disciples return, just as in 1 Corinthians 15:5 "to the twelve."

However, this does not fit exactly, as not only the Twelve or Eleven are present, but also others (see Luke 24:9, "the eleven and all the others"), and of the Emmaus disciples, at least one, Cleopas (24:18), does not belong to the Twelve. The appearances mentioned in 1 Corinthians 15 to the 500 brethren, then to James, and finally to all the apostles, are entirely unknown to Luke and the other Synoptics, as neither the identification of the appearance before the 500 brethren with the farewell scene at the Ascension in Acts 1:1-14 nor with the Pentecost event in Acts 2:1-4 meets the necessary requirements for congruence.

182

Thus, we must conclude that the report in the First Epistle to the Corinthians appears independent of our current form of Luke's Gospel. However, to infer from this that we have an account of incomparable historical value here, one that dates back to the earliest times of the community and possibly relies on information from the original apostles themselves, would be a hasty judgment. When examined more closely, this report also has quite a few weak points.

First, the manner of its introduction is somewhat striking. "Now, I would remind you, brothers, of the gospel I preached to you," is how the message begins. "I remind you, brothers, of the gospel I preached to you." One does not remind a community of something that has already been preached to them; rather, if they have perhaps forgotten it and if occurrences in their lives suggest that they are no longer following it, one would remind them of it.1) The expression in the Galatians is better used: "For I would have you know, brothers, that the gospel that was preached by me is not man's gospel" (Galatians 1:11), where the sentence at least acquires a new content through the attraction. When the formula γνωρίζω ὑμῖν is otherwise used in the main letters, it introduces new and important information, as in 1 Corinthians 12:3 and 2 Corinthians 8:1. Here it is different — unless, as seems more likely to us, in fact, a new communication is indeed being made, which must be presented as already known only in form, since it cannot be assumed that Paul had not previously mentioned this to the community. If we dissolve this form, we retain a solemn and earnest introduction to the following report, which thus presents itself as being published for the first time.

1) S. B. Bauer, Critique of the Pauline Letters. 2nd part, p. 70.

183

Secondly, the report is introduced as a communication that Paul had received from others: "For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received." It is commonly thought that the fifteen-day stay in Jerusalem (Gal. 1:18), three years after his conversion, provided the occasion for him to receive this communication from the original apostles, and thus from the most reliable source imaginable. However, how does this reconcile with the fact that the last of the appearances mentioned is the one that happened to Paul himself, as if this too were an element of the apostolic resurrection testimony? For Paul, indeed, it belongs in the same line as the

earlier appearances, but whether it had this character for the original community is at least doubtful. Paul's opponents accused him precisely of dealing with visions and revelations (2 Cor. 11:16; 12:1; 5:13), and the critical school has rightly found in the analogous accusation made against Simon Magus in the Clementine literature1) a reminder of this opposition to the appearances of Christ. Now, according to our report itself, this cycle of appearances is acknowledged and represented by both apostolic circles, the Jerusalem and the Pauline: "Whether then it was I or they, so we preach and so you believed." Accordingly, the appearance of Christ to Paul must have been preached by the original apostles just as the appearances to the first apostles were preached by Paul himself. This does not seem likely, considering how Paul linked his apostolic office to this appearance (1 Cor. 9:1) and how it was consistently contested by the opposing party (1 Cor. 9:2). Particularly, this appearance cannot possibly belong to what Paul received from the original community, and if it is nonetheless formally aligned with the others as if there were no distinction, it shows that the form of this report is not originally naive but rather artfully and consciously constructed.

1) Clem. Hom. XVII. 5. 13. 14.

184

Thirdly, it should be noted that in Paul's account in verse 4, the burial of Jesus is explicitly testified to with the term "he was buried," just as it is in our Gospels. The proponents of the vision hypothesis do not all go as far as Volkmar, who explains the entire narrative of Jesus's honorable burial as a fabrication based on Isaiah 53:9 1). However, the tomb of Jesus still poses a certain difficulty for them. Biedermann2) has noted that Holsten3), in his abstract reasoning, goes too far when he presents the matter in such a way that the discovery of Jesus's body in the tomb would not have been considered an argument against his resurrection by the disciples, because they conceived of his resurrection body as a pneumatic one, having nothing to do with the body laid in the tomb. Therefore, if the vision hypothesis primarily builds upon Paul's account and views the Gospel accounts as a later, more coarse elaboration, the "he was buried" in Paul's account testifies that, at least with regard to Jesus's tomb, Paul's account is no different from the Gospels.

1) The Gospels, p. 603.
2) Dogmatics, 1st edition, p. 232 note.
3) On the Gospel of Paul and Peter, p. 126 ff.

185

Fourth, Paul's accounts lack a detail that is intrinsic to the Gospel narratives, namely that the first news of the resurrection was brought by women who found the tomb empty. Whether one considers this point important or not, the role that women played in the development of the resurrection belief should not be underestimated and is an integral part of the entire story. For this reason, it is generally assumed that Paul does not deny the participation of women but

deliberately omits it for practical reasons. Hase1) has best described these reasons, stating: "The message of the women, especially that of Magdalene, may have been deliberately omitted so as not to begin with what opponents could call women's chatter." Indeed, according to the Gospels, not only did the disciples initially dismiss the women's news as nonsense (Luke 24:11), but later Celsus also took this point as the starting point for his attack on Christian faith. Therefore, the omission of the women's message in Paul is already an element of artificial adjustment of the reports, and in this respect, the Gospels still have the more naive representation.

Fifth, the appearance of the risen Christ to more than five hundred brothers indeed presents a greater challenge to any explanation in terms of the vision hypothesis than is generally admitted. The remark that Keim2) and others make to explain this—that visions are contagious—is not really sufficient to clear up the difficulties. One must necessarily assume a lot of other things, all of which are equally speculative: it might have been a Christian gathering, perhaps at night, one person might have had the vision and the others, prompted by him, saw the same, and so on. It is particularly striking that nothing else is heard about this event in the New Testament or outside of it, since the account in the Acts of Pilate is so obviously a much later legend that it cannot be given any weight. Ultimately, one must consider one of the initial scenes in the Acts of the Apostles, perhaps the Pentecost event, to which Volkmar connects this account. Then the question arises whether the account in Acts does not deserve preference over ours in that it is based not on a direct vision of Christ but on being filled with the Holy Spirit.

1) History of Jesus p. 592.
2) History of Jesus of Nazara III p. 591.

Sixth, the vision experienced by James, which occupies the fourth position in our report, is unique to this account. The New Testament otherwise does not mention it, although James, as the head of the Christian community in Jerusalem and the brother of the Lord, is well-known enough to justify such a mention. Interestingly, there is a parallel to this feature of our report in what Jerome records about the Gospel of the Hebrews. This is the well-known passage from his *Catalogus Virorum Illustrium* (Chapter 2): "The Gospel that is called 'according to the Hebrews,' which I recently translated from Hebrew into Greek and Latin, and which Origen often used, reports after the resurrection of the Savior: 'The Lord, after handing over His burial shroud to the servant of the priest, went to James and appeared to him. James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour in which he had drunk the Lord's cup until he saw Him risen from the dead.' Shortly afterward, it continues: 'He took bread, blessed it, broke it, and gave it to James the Just, saying to him: 'My brother, eat your bread, for the Son of Man has risen from those who sleep.'" This is the only passage in early church literature outside our report that recounts an appearance of the risen Lord to James. It is true that the timing does not match exactly, for in the Gospel of the Hebrews, James is the first to whom the risen Lord appears, whereas in 1 Corinthians, this appearance is listed fourth, following those to Cephas, the Twelve, and the Five Hundred. The timing in the Gospel of the Hebrews cannot be pushed forward, as James is

fasting until he sees Jesus. In our report, the later timing of this appearance seems established by the repeated "ἔπειτα" (then). However, exact agreement is not required here; the time difference is minor compared to the agreement in the person involved. The person is decisive here because no other mention of James is found in the context of the resurrection reports. If the mention of James in our report finds a parallel only in the Gospel of the Hebrews, it does not necessarily gain credibility from this fact. This non-canonical gospel is old and widely used, but it is unlikely to be older than our Synoptics. At least, the securely transmitted sections of it can mostly be demonstrated as reworkings of our Synoptic accounts, and only in a few details might the Hebrew Gospel have preserved something more original. The peculiar and tasteless resurrection account certainly does not belong to these.

187

This observation, regarding the occurrence of the appearance to James in the Gospel of the Hebrews, serves as an instructive hint about the nature of the entire Pauline resurrection account. While no trace of this account is found in our Gospels, Luke's account in Acts is the closest parallel to our Pauline passage. In the Acts of the Apostles, Luke first reports the farewell of the risen Jesus to his disciples on the Mount of Olives near Jerusalem (Acts 1:1-11), and then mentions the names of the first disciples, starting with the twelve apostles, who were present and later returned to Jerusalem (Acts 1:12-13). He further adds in verse 14 that they all continued in prayer along with some women and Mary, the mother of Jesus, and his brothers. Among the brothers of Jesus, James is undoubtedly included. Thus, we are informed here that, already a short time after the resurrection, James was in Jerusalem and belonged to the community, as he later appears as a leader of the same alongside Peter and John, mentioned by both Paul and the Acts of the Apostles, as well as other ecclesiastical literature. This is the only place in the New Testament where we hear that James and the other brothers of Jesus had already embraced the Christian cause at that time, and Luke could only have this tradition from reliable sources. This is one of the elements leading to the conclusion that the first part of Luke's Acts of the Apostles, as well as the second, is based on older sources. Here, an earlier Jewish-Christian apostolic history or a gospel in some earlier form must lie at the foundation. If one wishes, one may think, as Volkmar 1) does, of the *Kerygma of Peter*. The Acts of the Apostles could have drawn from this text here, and the report in 1 Corinthians might have come from the same source. This is further supported by other reasons. We have already noted that the appearance of the risen Christ to Peter is mentioned only in Luke's Gospel among the evangelists, in the words "he appeared to Simon" (Luke 24:34). These words have no context in the preceding account of Luke's Gospel—the appearance is assumed but not narrated. Only in 24:12 is there a faint echo, where after the women's report it is said: "Peter, however, got up and ran to the tomb, and bending over, he saw the strips of linen lying by themselves, and he went away, wondering to himself what had happened." But this verse has been critically disputed; Tischendorf omits it with Codex D and the Itala, and Westcott-Hort bracket it as inauthentic. Nevertheless, it is predominantly attested, not only by most manuscripts but also by internal evidence. For in verse 24, where the Emmaus disciples report that some of their own had gone to the tomb and found it just as the women had said, it is clearly presupposed, and it cannot be a mere insertion from John 20:6, as the wording does not precisely match. Nonetheless, this verse does not justify the statement in verse 34, "he appeared to Simon," since Peter does not

see the Lord but only the empty tomb. Thus, "he appeared to Simon" remains unexplained in Luke's resurrection account, and it is understandable that some might view this phrase as having come directly from 1 Corinthians 15. However, it is also possible that both Luke and 1 Corinthians 15 rely on the account of an older source, which was used at the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles by Luke.

1) The Gospels p. 621.

189

There is another indication pointing to this. Among the fragments of the Gospel of the Hebrews, Jerome1) mentions another one related to the resurrection of Jesus, a fragment found in the letter of Ignatius to the Smyrnaeans 3:2 in Greek, which Eusebius also cites in his Ecclesiastical History III.36.11 as taken by Ignatius from an unknown source. In Jerome's account, the fragment reads: "Ignatius wrote a letter to Polycarp, in which he also bears witness regarding the Gospel that I recently translated, saying: 'I indeed saw him in the flesh after his resurrection, and I believe that he is, and when he came to Peter and those with Peter, he said to them: Behold, touch me and see, for I am not a bodiless demon.' And immediately they touched him and believed." Jerome mentions this elsewhere as well (in Isaiah, Book XVIII, Prologue), identifying it as stemming from the Gospel of the Hebrews or the Gospel of the Nazarenes, leaving no doubt about its origin. In the Greek text of Ignatius, the wording is: "And when he came to those around Peter, he said to them: Take, handle me, and see that I am not a bodiless demon." Among all the evangelical resurrection accounts, only Luke provides a parallel: Luke 24:39. When the two disciples from Emmaus returned and were reunited with the others, Jesus stood among them. As they thought they were seeing a spirit, he reassured them with the words: "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; touch me and see, for a spirit does not have flesh and bones as you see that I have." Although the agreement is not complete, the core is the same: Jesus' invitation to the disciples to touch him and verify that he is not merely a "spirit."

1) Catalogue. man. ill c. 16, s. Hilgenfeld, New Testament received outside the canon, 2 Aufl. S 29

190

Since it has now been shown as likely that the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles is based on an older source, it is all the more possible that we are also directed to this older source in the Lukan resurrection account, from which both the "he appeared to Simon" (Luke 24:34) and the "touch me" (v. 39) and the mention of James (Acts 1:14) originate. Therefore, nothing prevents us from assuming that the peculiarities of the Pauline account also derive from this source and thus do not necessarily need to be much older than Luke.

Having recognized the account of the Last Supper in 1 Corinthians as artificially simplified and arranged, a similar conclusion now emerges for the resurrection account. For the reasons given above, we cannot consider it the first and oldest of those preserved for us. It lacks the

historically reliable detail of the women's message; in the appearance to James, it shows a relationship with the apocryphal literature of the early church, and its entire structure is evidently deliberately arranged to appear as a joint proclamation by the Jewish apostles and Paul. The three names characterizing the parties of the apostolic age, Peter, James, and Paul, each receive an appearance of the risen Lord. In between, appearances to larger groups are inserted: Peter — the Twelve — the Five Hundred — James — all the Apostles — Paul. Peter is joined by the Twelve as the leader, and immediately after them, the Five Hundred brothers, similarly to how Luke 9:1 mentions the sending out of the Twelve, and then 10:1 the Seventy. James begins a new series, followed by all the apostles, among whom he and the later ones are also counted, as James is considered an apostle in Galatians 1:19, and Paul and Barnabas are called "the apostles" in Acts 14:14. Paul himself concludes the sequence, thus significantly joining the ranks of the first witnesses and standing alongside the other two chosen ones, Peter and James. This arrangement shows far more intention and art than it initially reveals, and there is no reason to prefer it over the much simpler evangelical accounts. Thus, we find no instance here that forces us to assign the earliest date to 1 Corinthians.

191

3. Paul and Luke

Now we must ask, what is the relationship between the principal Pauline letters and the Gospel that has been traditionally designated as the specifically Pauline one, namely the Gospel of Luke? Modern criticism unanimously views this Gospel as representing Paul's teachings, particularly as centered in his four major letters, albeit in a somewhat moderated form. The Gentile-Christian Gospel of justification by faith without the works of the Law is applied to the Gospel story here, explaining some transformations of the material compared to the Gospel of Matthew.

Examples include:

- The genealogy of Jesus traced back to Adam, the father of all humanity, instead of just to Abraham, the father of the Jews.
- The placement of Jesus' appearance in Nazareth at the very beginning, contrary to tradition, expressing the idea that Christ was rejected by his homeland and then received more faithfully by those farther away, mirroring how Paul first preached to the Jews and then to the Gentiles when the Jews rejected the Gospel.
- The introduction of the seventy disciples sent out by Jesus, representing the seventy Gentile nations, alongside the previously sent twelve apostles to the Jews.

Moreover, the whole Gospel frequently contrasts self-righteous works with faith-based humility. This is depicted through characters such as the haughty Pharisee and the great sinner, the sisters Martha and Mary, and parables like the rich man and poor Lazarus, the Good Samaritan versus the priest and Levite, the prodigal son and his elder brother, and the Pharisee and tax collector. This contrast represents the works-based Jewish Christianity and the faith-based

Paulinism. Additionally, numerous details and expressions in Luke's Gospel closely align with the Pauline letters, suggesting a close literary relationship. Thus, the judgment that Luke's Gospel relies on the Pauline letters appears well-founded. If this is the case, these letters must have existed long before Luke's Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles. This would naturally affirm their authenticity. The Lukan portrayal everywhere presupposes these letters, demonstrating the presence and significant influence of pure and original Paulinism from the earliest times, making it incomprehensible without it. This evidence for the authenticity of the principal Pauline letters, derived from their subsequent impact first in Luke and then throughout the New Testament, is a powerful defense against any challenge to their authenticity. It is no coincidence that Scholten1) has emphasized this point in his rebuttal against Loman with the greatest emphasis. Furthermore, Volkmar's1) recently gaining perspective, initially proposed, that Mark is not a colorless neutral figure as characterized by the Tübingen school but a decided Paulinist, has gained traction. Even Holsten2), who otherwise places Mark in a secondary position, explicitly acknowledges this. Thus, we would have two Paulinist evangelists, one "decided" and one "explicit," as Volkmar describes Luke, firmly establishing the precedence of the Pauline letters over the Gospels.

1) See above S. IG. Hijdragen pp. 63—70.
1) The Religion of Jesus 1857 p. 203.
2) The Synoptic Gospels p. 179 ff.

It is indeed undeniable that Luke, especially in comparison to Matthew, adopts a universalistic, Gentile-friendly standpoint. The characteristics of this standpoint mentioned above can mostly be recognized as valid instances of this. It is certain that Luke is less concerned with the Law than Matthew, that he often challenges Jewish preferential rights, and that he widely opens the gates of the kingdom of God to all truly faithful individuals. In this sense, his Gospel can indeed be called "Pauline." However, one should not overemphasize this perspective and see a reference to Paul and Paulinism in almost every specific word of Luke's Gospel, as has been done in a recently republished otherwise quite useful evangelical synopsis3). Much of what appears Pauline can also be interpreted differently. For example, Weizsäcker4) has objected to the interpretation of the 70 disciples as messengers to the Gentiles and has offered a different interpretation. There is also a clearly discernible tendency in Luke's Gospel towards the old, the traditional, and sometimes even the Jewish. The characters in the prehistory of the Gospel are models of Old Testament piety, and throughout the later context of the Gospel, there are decidedly Judaeo-Christian statements, such as the perpetual validity of the Law (16:17) and the similarly colored sayings in the Sermon on the Plain (6:20-26). Indeed, it has been suggested, perhaps rightly, that a series of Lukan narratives and sayings, such as the parable of the unjust steward, the rich man and Lazarus, and so on, are based on an "Ebionite source." However, it ultimately does not matter whether this or that piece is Pauline or not. The question is rather whether Luke represents a form of Paulinism that can only be understood based on the four principal Pauline letters. His Paulinism could be an older, simpler form, as even if these letters are assigned to a later time, it does not necessarily exclude the existence of the historical

Paul and an earlier form of Paulinism in the Christian Church. Therefore, our concern is solely whether the Gospel of Luke necessarily presupposes these letters or whether the relationship can be thought of differently.

3) Schulze, Evangelientafel 1886 in the notes and introduction.
4) The Apostolic Age p. 404.

194

If we consider the judgment of the early church, it unanimously acknowledges a connection between the Pauline letters and the Gospel of Luke. However, instead of asserting that the letters are the foundation of the Gospel, the early church actually claims the opposite: that the Gospel was known to the Apostle Paul when he wrote these letters and that he even cited it in them. There are several passages in the principal letters where an ευαγγέλιον (gospel) is mentioned, or where a teaching is described as χατά τὸ ευαγγέλιόν μου (according to my gospel). The church fathers simply related these passages to our Gospel of Luke. For instance, when it says in 2 Corinthians 8:18, "We have sent with him (Titus) the brother whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches" (οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν), Origen1) directly attributed this to Luke, who wrote the Gospel praised by Paul. Eusebius2) also explained that when Paul speaks of his own gospel in his letters, saying "according to my gospel," he is referring to the Gospel of Luke. Jerome3) mentions this opinion as a widely held belief. In fact, the agreement between the Pauline letters and the Gospel of Luke has even been interpreted to suggest that Paul indirectly authored the Gospel. Irenaeus4) states that Luke wrote down the Gospel proclaimed by Paul, and Tertullian5) notes that Luke's work is commonly attributed to Paul, implying that Paul initiated and inspired it.

1) Bei Eusebius VI. 25, 6, s. Holtzmann, Einleitung. 2. Auf. S. 399. 34G.
2)K. G. III. 4, 7: fasi Si so ara of this gospel they mention the
Paul ever so often used to say about his own gospel riddles
my laugh
3) Catalogus virorum illustr. c. 7: quidam suspicantur, quotiescunque in
epistolis suis Paulus dicit, juxta Evangelium meum, de Lucae significare
voluinine.
4) Bei Eusebius K. G. V. 8, 3 xal Louchas Si o acholouvos Paulus the yp'
of his evangelical gospel, a Bible was lost.
5) Adv. Marcionem 4, 5. Lucae digestum Paulo ascribere solent.

195

This opinion of the church fathers, that the Gospel of Luke is mentioned in the Pauline letters, is nowadays regarded as a great naivety. The relationship, it is claimed, is actually the reverse: Luke wrote much later, after Mark or Matthew or both, while the Pauline letters date back to the

very earliest times. However, though this patristic view is given little weight today, it is still worth examining, because even if the church fathers were merely upholding tradition and had no knowledge of scientific criticism, tradition can sometimes contain valuable hints.

196

First of all, the claim of the church fathers is based on the fact that when Paul says "according to my gospel," he means the Gospel of Luke. This phrase appears in two passages of the Letter to the Romans: 2:16 and 16:25. In the former passage, there is a reference to the future day of judgment: "on the day when God judges the secrets of men according to my gospel through Christ Jesus." The addition "according to my gospel" is now understood by modern commentators to refer to the oral proclamation of the gospel by the apostle, which included the doctrine of the Last Judgment as an integral part. The latter is indeed so unquestionable that it can even be called banal, and one understands that commentators are striving to find a more specific thought for this particular reference to the Pauline gospel. For example, Meyer-Weiss in his commentary on this passage suggests that the "according to my gospel" could not refer to the well-known and undisputed fact that God will judge or that He will judge the hidden things, but also does not state the norm of judgment; rather, it could only refer to the fact that God will judge through Jesus. But is that significantly better than the rejected views? Is not also the position of Christ as the judge of the world a very general doctrinal point of the early church? That Christ will come to hold the Last Judgment is stated not only by Paul but also by James (5:9), Peter (1 Peter 4:5), and John (1 John 2:28, 4:17), and no one has ever doubted this. Should Paul then have referred to his particular gospel for such a generally believed doctrine? Hardly. Rather, it is much more plausible what the church fathers meant: that here there is a reference to an existing account of the Last Judgment to be held by Christ, as found in our gospels. Luke, too, frequently mentions the judging role of the Son of Man, not only at the end of the eschatological discourse (21:36) but also earlier in passages like 9:23ff., 12:22ff., 13:25, 17:22ff., and 22:29-30. Therefore, the reference that God will judge men through Jesus Christ, according to the Pauline gospel, can indeed refer to the Gospel of Luke. It is commonly objected that in the New Testament, "gospel" never means a written document but rather the oral message about Christ. However, this assertion is itself very questionable. Mark 1:1, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ," is to be understood such that it refers to the account of the work of Jesus, what we call the gospel story, since the construction that connects "beginning" with "there was John" is too forced to have been the intention of the writer. Since the account that Mark gives of the life of Jesus is a written one, the meaning "written account of the life of Jesus" is thus established, and it remains to be seen whether the same meaning should be assumed in other New Testament passages. One can say that the angel in Revelation 14:6, who flies through the middle part of the heavens with the eternal gospel, likely has it, as Düsterdieck1) also explains, "initially as a visible object, perhaps in the form of a little book like in Revelation 10:2, in his hand." These passages, which indicate the early use of "gospel" to denote a document, would then include our passage. The only remaining consideration against this is that in our passage Romans 2:16, the entire verse is so loosely connected that, for example, Weisse2) considered it a gloss, which indeed has much to support it, as the verse is idle and says nothing new, only providing an explanation of the announced judgment of God.

But precisely in the case that we have here a later addition, its reference to a written gospel would be even more likely, indeed probably indisputable.

1)Meyer's exeget. Hdbch. 3rd ed. p. 477 f.
2) Contributions, ed. Sülze p. 30.

The situation is somewhat different with the second instance where the phrase "χατά τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου" is used in the Epistle to the Romans, namely 16:25 in the concluding doxology. Here, "χατά τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου" is connected with the following "χατά τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ," and since the latter naturally means oral proclamation, the former should be taken accordingly. However, this passage is of no consequence, because this concluding doxology is known to be one of the most questionable elements of the already disputed chapters 15 and 16.

A light on "χατά τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου" is shed by a passage from another Pauline letter, which, although it does not belong to the earlier letters, nevertheless expresses all the more clearly the later Pauline opinion about our phrase. It is II Timothy 2:8: "Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, descended from David, according to my gospel." If we ask the exegetes what the phrase "according to my gospel" means here, Hofmann refers it to "remember," implying that the remembrance of the salvific fact of Jesus' resurrection should occur according to the apostle's gospel, which contradicts the word order. Therefore, most, including de Wette and Huther, refer it to the clauses following "Jesus Christ." Among these, however, the reference to the resurrection of Christ cannot be meant again. For this is the general content of the evangelical proclamation without any distinction among the apostles or between church and non-church parties. So, only "descended from David" remains, and indeed Romans 1:3 testifies that Jesus' descent from David was also acknowledged on the Pauline side. But it is unlikely that our passage refers to this, for the occasional mention of this Davidic descent of Jesus in a letter's opening, where the context suggests it, is one thing, and the explicit proclamation of the same as an essential part of the gospel is another. The latter certainly cannot be thought of in Paul, and thus the explanation of Paul's oral gospel does not suffice here either. When it says, "Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, descended from David, according to my gospel," it cannot mean "the one who, as I also preach, is descended from David." For Paul would hardly have had much reason to preach this; it belongs to the external knowledge about Jesus. Hence, of all the explanations, the old one of the Church Fathers fits best, who understood this gospel to be a written one, specifically Luke's. In this gospel, Jesus' Davidic descent is testified not only by the genealogy in 3:31 but also by multiple explicit mentions (1:27 "of the house of David," 2:4 "of the house and lineage of David"). Rightly, Baur1) already thought of the Gospel of Luke in the context of the Timothy passage. This Davidic descent is emphasized here, as the commentators correctly note, in contrast to the Gnostic vaporization of Jesus' person, and the reference to the historical account of this descent in a written gospel was certainly the most appropriate argument against these tendencies. Thus, the passage gives a clue about the historical foundation of faith in Christ, and only understood in this way does it become meaningful and fitting. Of course, then, the "ἐν ᾧ κακοπαθῶ" in verse 9 must be referred to

"Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν" and not to "τὸ εὐαγγέλιον," which presents no difficulty. For if the apostle suffers for the gospel (1:8) and as its herald (1:11), he also suffers for Jesus' sake, of whom he is a prisoner (1:8) and as a soldier of Jesus (2:3), so that both relationships are possible here.

1) Pastoral Letters p. iWff. cf. Boltzmann, Pastoral Letters 8.408.

199

If our passage in the phrase "χατά τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου" very likely contains a reference to the Pauline Gospel of Luke, then the analogous view in Romans 2:16 also gains new support. If the passage in Romans is an addition by a later author, then we have two passages from which it follows that later Paulinism understood the phrase in this way. If it originally belongs to the Epistle to the Romans, then this understanding is already that of the author of Romans 1-8; otherwise, the matter remains the same.

200

In addition to this phrase "χατά τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου," which the Church Fathers interpreted as referring to Luke, the already mentioned passage II Corinthians 8:18 also comes into consideration: "And we have sent with him the brother who is praised by all the churches for his work in the gospel." The usual interpretation of this passage is that it refers to the unnamed and unknown brother sent with Titus, who is praised in all the churches for his evangelical proclamation, i.e., for his zeal and skill demonstrated in preaching the gospel. This explanation is not impossible, as "εὐαγγέλιον" can indeed mean oral preaching about Christ in this context, as it is used in 10:14, Philippians 4:3, 15, and I Thessalonians 3:2. However, the expression could have been chosen more aptly; it should refer to "zeal in the gospel" or something similar, rather than merely "praised in the gospel." Also, the addition "by all the churches" suggests something more and different than just zeal in Christian proclamation, since it is unlikely that this brother personally came to all the churches. This same brother is then described in verse 19 as a representative (χειροτονηθείς) of the churches and a constant companion of the apostle. Hence, it is not surprising that from early on, people thought of one of Paul's known companions and specifically of Luke because of the "gospel." This was already the view of the author of the interpolated Ignatian epistle to the Ephesians 15: "as Luke testifies, who is praised in the gospel by all the churches," and then Origen, Jerome, Ambrose, and later interpreters like Grotius, Emmerling, Schrader, Olshausen1). Thus, the Gospel of Luke would indeed be the gospel praised by Paul, as Origen expressed it. Most modern interpreters, however, dismiss this explanation outright as a foolish invention of the Church Fathers. But one may question whether this is justified. For example, if one reads the discussion in Rückert's commentary on how striking it is that Paul mentions two other "brothers" besides Titus without naming them more explicitly, and how the Corinthians could have distinguished which of the two sent to them was

meant in verse 18 and which in verse 22, from which Rückert concludes that the "brother" in verse 18 was Titus' brother—if one considers these difficulties, one will not be easily satisfied with the usual explanation. Rather, the thought arises that the whole passage could contain a veiled reference to some prominent persons in the apostolic church who belonged to Paul's circle and whose memory the author wanted to honor in this way. Indeed, the idea of Luke comes closest to the brother whose praise in the gospel is spread through all the churches. For that he was thought of as a companion of Paul is beyond doubt according to Colossians 4:14 and Philemon 24, and he is also to be thought of as such in Acts, even though, or precisely because, he is not mentioned there. Thus, one can only agree with the Church Fathers' assumption, albeit in a different sense than they intended, and it emerges with probability that there is another reference to the already existing Gospel of Luke in the major Pauline letters.

1) See also the commentaries on 11 Cor. 8, 18.

However, all this may be left as it is. The question of whether the Gospel of Luke precedes the main Pauline letters is not to be decided based on such individual hints, which always remain obscure and doubtful, nor based on the tradition-dominated judgment of the Church Fathers. Rather, it must be determined from direct literary interactions between the two sets of writings, to ascertain whether such a relationship exists at all and on which side the dependency is found.

Numerous studies have already been conducted on this literary relationship, one of the most thorough being found in the book by the so-called Saxon Anonymous1): "The Gospels, Their Spirit, Their Authors, and Their Relationship to Each Other." Much of what the author of this book proposes is of doubtful value, and the entire argument, made with detailed comparisons of language usage, that the Gospel of Luke and the Pauline letters partly flowed from one and the same pen, falls away for us. The similarity in language usage between Luke and Paul does exist to a certain extent, but it is accompanied by equally significant differences, especially concerning the four main letters, which, in their concise and vigorous style, form a category of their own, while Luke's language usage indeed shows closer affinity with the later Pauline letters and particularly with the Epistle to the Hebrews. Therefore, this argument does not apply here; what it proves does not contribute to deciding our question, and what would contribute cannot prove it. Rather, it is solely about the passages that present more or less literal interactions between the Pauline letters and Luke. The book of the Anonymous lists many such passages on pages 260-264, but a considerable sifting is certainly necessary among them, especially since the author also includes the smaller Pauline letters. Nevertheless, some points are undoubtedly present, and these alone are sufficient to bring our question to a decision. These interactions have also been recognized by others, but the relationship is generally understood to mean that the dependence is on Luke's side, who interwove his Gospel with Pauline

expressions.1) Therefore, the often recurring situation is also present here, where literary dependence is easily recognized and acknowledged, but opinions about the nature of this dependence are diametrically opposed, and in such cases, a definite decision is notoriously hard to reach. For instance, the passages in Justin Martyr where an interaction with the Gospel of John is evident are viewed by most as indicating that the dependence is on Justin's side2). However, there have also been those who argued the reverse, claiming that the Gospel of John depended on Justin, and certain reasons can be cited for both views. Thus, it will also be understandable in our case that the present relationship can find opposite interpretations, and it will depend on the investigation of the details to determine which of the two views deserves preference.

1) Holtzmann, Introduction p. 400, calls him Hasert, thus breaking the long-preserved anonymity. I quote from the second edition of 1852.

1) So Holtzmann, Introduction p. 401.
2) Volkmar, the origin of our gospels p. 91 ff,

We immediately take the example where the agreement is so literal that it is striking, namely:

Lc. 10, 7. 8 έν αυτή δέ τή οικία μένετε έσθοντες και πίνοντες τά παρ' αυτών .... και εις ήν αν πόλιν εϊσέρχησθε καί δέχωνται ύμας, έσθίετε τά παρατιθέμενα ύμϊν. Stay there, eating and drinking whatever they give you, for the worker deserves his wages. Do not move around from house to house. "When you enter a town and are welcomed, eat what is offered to you.	I Cor. 10, 27 ει τις καλεΐ ύμας τών άπιστων και θέλετε πορεύεσθαι, παν το παρατιθέμενον ύμϊν έσΐθετε μηδέν άνακρίνοντες διά τήν συνειδησιν. I Cor. 10, 27 If an unbeliever invites you to a meal and you want to go, eat whatever is put before you without raising questions of conscience.

The context in the passage from Luke is that Jesus, after sending out the Twelve, also sends out seventy other disciples and gives them instructions in a speech, for which Luke borrows much of the material from the speech addressed to the Twelve in Matthew 10:5ff. In Matthew, the Lord instructs the disciples that when they enter a city, they should find out who is worthy there and stay with them until they leave. And when they enter a house, they should greet it with a blessing of peace. If the house is worthy, their peace will come upon it; if it is not worthy, their peace will return to them. Luke reproduces this almost verbatim but then adds: in that same house, eat and drink what they provide, for the worker is worthy of his wages. Do not go from one house to another. And when you enter a city and they receive you, eat what is set before

you, and heal the sick there, etc. That Luke's text is secondary to Matthew's is evident first from the somewhat awkwardly inserted instruction: do not go from one house to another in verse 7, which is properly concluded in Matthew with the simple "stay there until you leave" (10:11), whereas Luke in verse 7 supplements "stay in that house" with instructions about eating and drinking and then specifically reiterates the command to stay in the first-chosen lodging. Furthermore, Luke's dependence is evident in the content of his additions. There are two such additions: the first, in verse 7, gives the preacher of the gospel the right to accept sustenance from those he serves, and the second, in verse 8, dispels concerns about the purity of the food provided. The preacher of the gospel should not worry about whether the food set before him is prepared according to Jewish dietary laws, which Jewish Christians still insisted upon, but should eat without hesitation whatever is available. For Luke's Gentile-Christian standpoint, the Jewish dietary laws have indeed been abolished, as the example of Peter in Acts 10:9ff. makes explicitly clear. Therefore, he includes this in the instructions, which, as directives to Gentile messengers, must necessarily take such situations into account. Hence the second addition, introduced with "and when you enter a town and they receive you," after the motif has already been better addressed in verse 5 "whatever house you enter," reveals itself as such. Thus, what Luke has here that is new compared to Matthew is an explicit reference to the invalidity of Jewish dietary laws in Christian missionary practice.

205

The context is entirely different with Paul. There, the discussion revolves around meat sacrificed to idols, and the principle is established that for the Christian who has knowledge, no meat is inherently forbidden, even that which is used in idol sacrifices, because an idol is nothing. Thus, such a Christian may eat what is sold in the meat market. And he may also eat everything that is set before him when invited to pagan houses, as long as the question of whether it is idol meat is not raised. For the conscience remains unaffected in this case. Only when it is explicitly pointed out that it is idol meat does another perspective come into play: the conscience, especially that of the weaker brothers who still half-believe in idols and idol meat as something special, must be respected. Therefore, even the free-thinking Christian should abstain from eating in this case.

Thus, the phrase "τὸ παρατιθέμενον ἐσθίετε" (eat whatever is set before you) appears in entirely different contexts in both places. Three possibilities arise: either the two passages are completely independent of each other, or Luke uses Paul, or finally, Paul uses Luke. We consider the first case possible but unlikely. The expression "eat what is set before you" can easily arise independently, and although the agreement is significant, it is not complete; Luke uses the plural "τά παρατιθέμενα," Paul the singular "τὸ παρατιθέμενον," with the addition "πάν." Nevertheless, the concurrence is striking, and since one should not attribute too much to chance without necessity, and since the Pauline letters often touch on Luke's, the possibility of usage should at least be considered.

The dependence of Luke on Paul is widely accepted, for example, by Holtzmann and others. However, it cannot be said that Luke could not have arrived at his expression in his context without the Pauline model. His construction is indeed loosely put together, but this stems from his use of the relevant passage from Matthew and requires no further explanation. Above all, one must consider whether the question of whether the disciples going out may eat unclean food or whether they are still bound by the Jewish dietary laws is naturally an older issue in the history of Christianity than the question of idol meat, which, in the form discussed in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, already presupposes a longer coexistence of Christians with pagans. Therefore, the dependency might very well be on the side of the Pauline passage. Although its context is good and firm and no external sign of borrowing adheres to the phrase "παν τὸ παρατιθέμενον ὑμῖν ἐσθίετε" (eat whatever is set before you), the whole discussion about idol meat has something so forced and unnatural about it that we might consider it more artificially arranged than genuinely Pauline work. When one reads how interpreters have to struggle to determine who is meant by "ἐκεῖνος ὁ μηνύσας" (the one who informed) in verse 28, doubt arises as to whether clear understanding is possible at all. The free-thinking Christian should not eat idol meat as soon as someone tells him it is idol meat, for the sake of the one who indicated it and for the sake of conscience. But not for the sake of one's own conscience, but for the sake of the other's. For why should one's own freedom be directed by another's conscience? — This context is nearly incomprehensible. If it is said for the sake of the one who indicates, one might first think it is the host where the meal is taking place, for only he can know which meat comes from idol sacrifice and which does not. Therefore, Grotius, Mosheim, and Semler1) understand the host by "ὁ μηνύσας." But verse 29 opposes this, as this "ἕτερος" (other person) seems to have a weak conscience, thus must be a Christian, which the host, presumably pagan, cannot be. Hence, Osiander, Neander, and others think of a Christian fellow guest. But how can he recognize that the meat is idol meat? This would be more likely for a pagan who has knowledge of it, which is why Chrysostom and Theodoret, followed by de Wette among modern interpreters, think of a pagan fellow guest. But how would such a person have a weak conscience? To complete the list, others have also thought of a Jew, a Jewish Christian, or a Gentile Christian, but all combinations fail in some respect. Therefore, Meyer-Henrici finally decides to leave the matter undefined, running the exegesis aground. It seems, therefore, that this entire exposition is not so directly taken from life and not so securely belongs to apostolic times. Rather, it gives the impression that a later writer artificially constructed the cases to elucidate the principle prevailing in his circles, sometimes resulting in unnatural situations.

1) S. Meyer-Heinrici in the commentary on the passage. — See also Bruno Bauer, Critique of the Pauline Letters, 2nd part, p. 59.

However, if this is the case with this Pauline passage, the assumption that an expression from the Gospel of Luke might have been used here cannot be dismissed so quickly. The phrase "παν τὸ παρατιθέμενον ἐσθίετε" (eat whatever is set before you) could rather be modeled after "ἐσθάτε τά παρατιθέμενα" (eat what is set before you) than the other way around. For in the specific case discussed in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the "παν" (all) had to be added; in

Luke, it was not necessary. If Luke had taken his expression from Paul, he could very well have used "παν" as well. It was not necessary, but it was possible in his context. Since he does not have it, it is more likely to assume that it was added rather than omitted. Thus, the situation stands in such a way that a definitive judgment about the dependency of one text on the other cannot be made. However, the precedence of Luke seems more probable than the opposite, and only the old ingrained prejudice that Paul is a much older writer than Luke has so far hindered a different assessment of the facts.

208

A further parallel between Paul and Luke is found in the passage

Lc. 12, 42 τις άρα έστιν ό πιστός οικονόμος χ. τ. λ. therefore he is the faithful steward.	I Cor. 4, 1—5 ούτως ημάς λογιζέσδω άνθρωπος ώς ύπηρέτας Χρίστου και οίχονόμους μυστηρίων θεοΰ. δ δέ λοιπόν ζητείται έν τοΐς οίχονόμοις ινα πιστός τις εύ-ρεδιζ, χ. τ. Λ. This, then, is how you ought to regard us: as servants of Christ and as those entrusted with the mysteries God has revealed. **2** Now it is required that those who have been given a trust must prove faithful.

208

The image of the faithful steward initially appears in the Gospel of Luke, where it is used multiple times; alongside the faithful steward in our passage, there is the unfaithful one in Luke 16:1–9. In the Pauline letters, this image, apparently influenced by 1 Corinthians 4:2, is also found in Titus 1:7, where the bishop is called "God's steward," and additionally in 1 Peter 4:10, "as good stewards of the manifold grace of God," thus used in a metaphorical sense for the steward of spiritual goods. The image itself is not so far-fetched that two writers could not come up with it independently. However, in the passage from the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the agreement is more extensive. Luke uses the image as Jesus' admonition to his disciples to prove themselves faithful stewards in view of the day when the Lord will come (when his master comes) and demand an accounting from the stewards. Similarly, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, it is explained that no more can be demanded from the steward than that he be faithful. For the apostle, it is of little concern to be judged by the Corinthians or any human tribunal; God is the one who judges him, and therefore judgment should be left until the Lord comes (until the Lord comes), who will bring to light what is hidden, etc. It becomes highly

probable that one passage influenced the other, especially since the concept of stewardship, in which teachers are stewards in relation to ordinary Christians, is the same in both places. Compare "stewards of the mysteries of God" in Paul with "to give them their food at the proper time" in Luke. Is it not more natural to assume that the image of the steward originally belongs to the parable-rich Gospel of Luke rather than that Luke transplanted it from the Pauline letters into his Gospel?

209

In our opinion, these passages are quite clear and convincing regarding the existing literary relationship. However, in other cases, it is more difficult to determine on which side the dependency lies. This is the case, for example, with…

Luke 20:38 πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν *for all shall live unto him/for to him all are alive.*	Rom 14:7-8 ἐάν τε γὰρ ζῶμεν, τῷ κυρίῳ ζῶμεν . . . . . ἐάν τε οὖν ζῶμεν ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν, τοῦ κυρίου ἐσμέν for if we live, we live unto the Lord. . . . . whether we live or die, we are the Lord's

In Luke, we have an addition unique to him in the synoptic words of Jesus: "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." In Paul, the thought and expression "living to God" appear frequently, for instance, in 2 Corinthians 5:15: "that those who live should no longer live for themselves but for him who died for them and was raised again," Romans 6:11: "alive to God," and Galatians 2:19: "live to God." However, the meaning is somewhat different. In Luke, the dead live to God in the afterlife, while in Paul, the person lives to God in this life and also belongs to him in death. Thus, it is conceivable that the expressions only coincidentally sound similar.

The numerous other passages that the Saxon anonymous author lists seem to us even less helpful in providing a definitive decision, so we set them aside.

However, when Holtzmann derives Luke 8:12, "so that they may not believe and be saved," from 1 Corinthians 1:21, "to save those who believe," and similarly connects "spirit and power" in Luke 1:17, 35, 4:14 to 1 Corinthians 2:4, "my message ... with a demonstration of the Spirit's power," the latter is rather unique to Luke (Acts 1:8, 10:38) and, as shown by the example of Elijah in Luke 1:17, grows out of Old Testament ground. The former passage could only be cited if it were certain that the Pauline gospel of salvation through faith only emerged with the main Pauline letters and not also independently of them, forming the doctrine of Paul and his entire school beforehand. The question is not whether Luke is Pauline or not; this can readily be admitted, but there could very well have been a Paul and a Paulinism before the main letters, and in this case, the Pauline element in Luke and elsewhere can be explained just as well as if all Paulinism had to be derived solely from the main letters. The question of how the Paulinism

of the other New Testament writings relates to the main Pauline letters and whether such Paulinism might have existed before them must be answered later. For now, it suffices to state that the frequent connections between Luke and Paul do not certainly indicate the dependency of the former on the latter in any single case, but in some cases, rather suggest the opposite relationship. This would also be the result that the Saxon anonymous author would have found if he had stayed on the straightforward path his investigation indicated and not confused the matter by assuming that Paul was a co-author of Luke's Gospel. He even says on page 260: "Unique thoughts expressed in unique ways are such an exclusive and inextricable property of a person that they could not easily come from two different pens unless one writer was dependent on the other, which would have to be said of Paul here, since he clearly refers to passages from the Gospel in his letters." Thus, it is essentially the old prejudice that has so far prevented a proper appreciation of the observations at hand. Moreover, the dependency is not one of going back to old and recognized authorities but a sporadic and not at all slavish one, which does not point to a significant difference in time. In any case, the main Pauline letters will have followed the Lucan writings very soon, and the composition of both will not be far apart; indeed, there could even be a relationship of mutual usage between the earlier and later works of the two series, as the resurrection account in 1 Corinthians 15, according to our findings, is not directly based on our Lucan Gospel but on a common source. The question remains whether Luke, in an earlier and simpler form, was available to the author of the main letters, a question already suggested by the relationship of the Marcionite Luke to the canonical one, and which is not conclusively answered by showing the overall dependency of Marcion on Luke. For in some points, at least in some readings, even the newer researchers consider Marcion's text to be more original.1) Thus, many questions remain open. For us, however, it suffices to demonstrate that the literary dependency of Luke on the main Pauline letters is not as firmly established as is commonly assumed.

1) S. Scholten, The Pauline Gospel, German by Redepenning, p. 53.

Third Chapter:

The Citations

1. The Quotations of Old Testament Passages

The numerous quotations of Old Testament passages in the Pauline letters do not need to be individually examined here. For us, it is only important to determine the relationship of Paul to the Old Testament and in what language he read and quoted it. As is well known, the New Testament writers usually use the Alexandrian Greek translation of the Old Testament, the so-called Septuagint (LXX), for their purposes, and only exceptionally do they refer back to the Hebrew original text. This latter case occurs especially with Matthew, as Bleek1) first clarified, in those passages where, according to the peculiar pragmatism of his historiography, he uses words from the Old Testament as moving levers for the progress of Jesus' story, usually with the formula "ἵνα πληρωθῇ" (that it might be fulfilled), etc. Otherwise, the Septuagint translation is almost universally the form of the Old Testament used by New Testament writers, just as it is for Philo and Josephus.

1) Contributions p. 57, see Introduction to the New Testament, 3rd edition p. 321.

For Paul, it is no different, and this is a fact that deserves to be highlighted. The Old Testament was also familiar to him in the Greek translation, and only rarely do his citations suggest that he might have consulted the original text as well. This previously much-misunderstood fact has been conclusively established by the careful investigation of Kautzsch.2) The result of his study can be simply reproduced here. Kautzsch himself summarizes it as follows: "Regarding the 84 passages we have enumerated, the situation is as follows: 34 passages exactly match the Alexandrian translation. Only slightly diverging from the LXX are 36 passages. The deviations are more significant in 10 passages, but still in such a way that the difference can be attributed to a free method of citation. Two passages (Romans 12:19 and 1 Corinthians 14:21) diverge even further from this translation, yet in a manner that does not deny knowledge of it. Finally, two passages (both from Job: Romans 11:35 and 1 Corinthians 3:19) agree completely with the Hebrew text, with the translation of the LXX likely being unknown to the apostle. As can be seen, we arrive at the result that Paul, with the exception of those two passages from Job, depends entirely on the Alexandrian translation, as he cites 34 of 82 passages exactly and 48 more freely, from memory, according to the LXX. From this, one can also discern whether the judgment of those (including Bleek) who claim that the apostle almost always follows the LXX but reverts to the Hebrew original text where there are significant deviations is correct. Rather, I am convinced, based on all that has been said, that the apostle never deliberately departed from the LXX translation, although I admit that in citing a few passages (possibly including

Romans 12:19 and 1 Corinthians 15:54), he remembered both the Hebrew text and the Alexandrian translation." So much for Kautzsch.

2) De veteris Testament! locis a Paulo Apostolo allegatis. Inaugural dissertation by E. E. Kautzsch, Leipzig 18G9. p. 109 ff.

213

So, there are actually only four passages where one might question whether Paul consulted the Hebrew original; for all the others, knowledge of the Septuagint (LXX) suffices. Of these four passages, two are taken from the Book of Job, namely Romans 11:35 from Job 41:3 and 1 Corinthians 3:19 from Job 5:13. The third, Romans 12:19, refers to Deuteronomy 32:35, and the fourth, 1 Corinthians 15:54, to Isaiah 25:8. These four passages alone1) require a more in-depth investigation.

The two passages from Job are indeed such that dependence on the LXX translation is excluded, which becomes immediately apparent upon comparison. Romans 11:35 reads: "ἢ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ;" However, in Job 41:3, the LXX reads: "ἢ τίς ἐστιν ὁ ἀντιστήσεταί μοι καὶ ὑπομενεῖ;" where not only are the two verbs given completely differently, but even the pronoun is "μοι" instead of "αὐτῷ" the first time and is absent the second time, according to the chosen verb "ὑπομενεῖ," which requires none. The Hebrew text at this point is: "מִי הִקְדִּימַנִי וַאֲשַׁלֵּם" which means: "Who has preceded me that I should repay him?" and this can only mean: "Who has shown me kindness beforehand so that he would have a claim for repayment from me?" says God. The Pauline translation agrees quite well with this; "προέδωκεν" is quite a correct rendering of "הִקְדִּימַנִי," and "ἀνταποδοῦναι" also expresses the Hebrew text's "וַאֲשַׁלֵּם" well. However, it cannot be said that Paul simply correctly translates the Hebrew text. Because "ἀνταποδοθήσεται" is in the third person and is passive, while in the Hebrew original, it is the first person active. In this respect, the Pauline citation touches again on the LXX, which also shows the third person with their "ὑπομενεῖ." Kautzsch therefore judges that they read it differently, namely according to the similar passage in Job 9:4. Thus, the judgment that the Pauline citation is given according to the Hebrew becomes uncertain again, and it raises the question of whether the situation is different, for which the other citation from Job must first be considered.

1) Regarding I Cor. 14:21 see below p. 222.

214

This is found in 1 Corinthians 3:19: "For it is written: 'He catches the wise in their craftiness' = Job 5:13 according to the LXX: 'He catches the wise in their cunning,' Hebrew: מֵכִין עֲרוּמִּים בְּעָרְמָתָם:." Again, the deviation is significant enough to prove that the Pauline citation cannot depend on the LXX. Instead of the somewhat bland, general terms "καταλαμβάνειν" and "φρόνησις," Paul uses the much more concrete and rarer "δρασσόμενος" and "πανουργία." The verb "δρασσόμενος" predominantly appears in later Greek writers and means to seize with the hand, to grasp, to snatch. Should Paul have improved and expressed the LXX's saying more

precisely in free citation? Hardly. But the Hebrew could not have led him to this either, for the verb תפש is a quite ordinary term for catching or seizing, and the LXX's translation "καταλαμβάνειν" is quite appropriate. Furthermore, Paul uses the article, "τούς σοφούς," whereas the Hebrew and the LXX do not. Perhaps "πανουργία" could indicate a more precise translation of the Hebrew עָרְמָה, as opposed to the too general "φρόνησις" of the LXX. Here too, we are led to the conclusion that the Hebrew can hardly have been the basis for Paul's deviation in translation, and we align with what Kautzsch explains1): perhaps Paul here follows a different translation of Job than the LXX. This judgment would also apply to the other citation from Job. We do not know of another Greek translation of the Old Testament before Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, and these three do not provide assistance here. Regarding the first-mentioned passage, Romans 11:35, another solution could be that the passage is not cited from Job at all, but rather from Isaiah 40:14, where, although not in the Vatican text, the Alexandrian text of the LXX has the addition: "ἡ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ καί ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ," exactly as Paul gives it. Since the beginning of Isaiah 40:14 is indeed cited in Romans 11:34, one naturally expects that the continuation of the citation would not suddenly switch to another book, but would stay with Isaiah. And the addition seems old enough, as evidenced by Codex Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus, to be considered genuine, or at least to have existed in Paul's time. Accordingly, Ewald assumes that Paul is citing Isaiah 40:13-14 as he read it in his LXX, which would be a welcome solution to the difficulty. However, on the one hand, it often happens that Pauline citations have infiltrated the text of the LXX at the respective passages, as, for example, after Psalm 14:3, the citation from Romans 3:13 entered the Vatican text of the LXX from other Psalm passages, so it could easily have happened the same way in our case. On the other hand, this proposal only resolves the difficulty for one Job citation, Romans 11:35, while the other remains unexplained in its deviations from the LXX. Thus, regarding the passage "ὁ δρασσόμενος" etc., it is indeed difficult to say where Paul might have gotten this translation. Might he have perhaps referred to the citation indirectly through another, perhaps apocryphal, writing, so that the form would be attributable to the latter? In any case, as Meyer notes in his exegetical handbook, the phrase "ὁ δρασσόμενος" etc. is an incomplete sentence that must have been part of a larger context, as is the case with Job 5:13.

1) a. a. O. p. 70.

The third of the mentioned passages is Romans 12:19: "For it is written: 'Vengeance is mine, I will repay, says the Lord.'" The basis for this is Deuteronomy 32:35, where the LXX has: "in the day of vengeance, I will repay," whereas the Hebrew text reads: "לִי נָקָם וְשִׁלֵּם." Here, too, the LXX version aligns so poorly with the original text that it must be assumed they were translating from a variant, perhaps "לִי נָקָם וְשִׁלֵּם." However, the Pauline form of the saying cannot be explained from our Hebrew text. The "ἐγώ ἀνταποδώσω" (I will repay) aligns more with the LXX than with "וְשִׁלֵּם," which can only mean "Vengeance and recompense are mine." Therefore, it cannot be proven here either that Paul altered the text because of the Hebrew. Rather, it is more likely that the phrase from the Song of Moses was so widely known and frequently used at that time that it had acquired a form that circulated conveniently, and Paul cited it in that form.1)

Perhaps the LXX in the copy Paul had read this way; we cannot know if variants existed at that time that our manuscripts and other witnesses no longer report.

The fourth passage is 1 Corinthians 15:54: "Then the saying that is written will come true: 'Death has been swallowed up in victory.'" This cites Isaiah 25:8, where the LXX has "κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος ἰσχύσας," an evidently misunderstood and almost incomprehensible rendering of the Hebrew "בִּלַּע הַמָּוֶת לָנֶצַח" (He [God] has swallowed up death forever). Therefore, Paul's dependence on the LXX cannot be considered here, as almost everything is different: "κατεπόθη" is passive, "κατέπιεν" is active, "θάνατος" is the object, whereas in the LXX it is the subject, and "εἰς νῖκος" instead of "ἰσχύσας." However, Paul could not have followed the Hebrew either, as the passive "κατεπόθη" does not correspond to the active, and the entire meaning of the sentence is different. Thinking of a completely free citation would not be far-fetched because shortly after, in Paul and in connection with this, a similarly free citation from Hosea 13:14 follows: "Where, O death, is your victory? Where, O death, is your sting?" where the LXX has: "Where is your penalty, O death? Where is your sting, O Hades?" However, the deviation there is only in words, whereas here it is in meaning, and therefore a mere free citation does not suffice as an explanation.

1) So Meyer-Weiss on Rom. 12, 19 Note. However, Onkelos-Aquia could also be the source, which is only rejected there because there are no other analogous traces.

217

Therefore, we cannot fully agree with Kautzsch's1) view that the citation is given partly according to the LXX and partly from memory of the Hebrew original text. In our case, the matter becomes even more interesting, as we are now in a position to compare the other Greek translations. The fragments2) preserved from them offer the following:

Aquila: "καταποντίσει τὸν θάνατον εἰς νῖκος,"
Symmachus: "καταποθήναι ποιήσει τὸν θάνατον εἰς τέλος,"
Theodotion: "κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νῖκος."

At first glance, one can see that all three of these translators are closer to the Pauline form of the citation than the LXX or the Hebrew text. Aquila has "εἰς νῖκος," Symmachus has "καταποθήναι," and with Theodotion, the agreement is even complete. This observation gives pause for thought. Should we assume that the convergence is coincidental? The case is too characteristic for that, and the difference from the Hebrew and the LXX too great. Should we conclude that Theodotion adopted the Pauline citation, as Bleek3) considers possible?

1) a. a. O. P. 105.
2) In Field, Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt, 1875. Tom. II. to Isa. 25.8.
3) Introduction to the Old Testament 1860 p. 766.

218

But that would only be conceivable if he were a Christian, which is unlikely, and if he also otherwise followed the New Testament, which, as far as we can compare, is not confirmed.1) Should we finally dare to hypothesize that the author of the First Epistle to the Corinthians used Theodotion? On closer inspection, this would not be entirely unthinkable. Typically, Theodotion's translation is placed towards the end of the second century, and then, of course, it would be out of the question for the author of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, no matter how late it was written, to have used his work. However, this dating of Theodotion is probably incorrect and should be adjusted to a significantly earlier period. It is solely based on a statement by Epiphanius2), who fabricates all sorts of stories about these three translators and Theodotion in particular, which have no foundation. To make Theodotion the third among these translators, he invents an emperor Commodus II, who supposedly ruled after Severus, although history knows nothing of him, recognizing only one Emperor Commodus, who reigned between Marcus Aurelius and Pertinax from 180-192. It is possible that Theodotion wrote under this Commodus, which is the usual assumption.3) But we must probably go back further. The oldest and apparently most reliable information about this man is provided by Irenaeus4), who, on the occasion of the disputed translation of Isaiah 7:14 by the Jews, remarks: "Therefore, God became man; and the Lord himself saved us, giving the sign of the virgin, but not as some now dare to translate the scripture: 'Behold, the young woman shall conceive and bear a son,' as Theodotion the Ephesian and Aquila the Pontic have interpreted, both Jewish proselytes; and following them, the Ebionites say he was begotten of Joseph." From this, Irenaeus knows the translations of Theodotion and Aquila, but not yet that of Symmachus. He also identifies the former as originating from Ephesus and the latter from Pontus. Regarding the time they belong to, it would be premature to conclude from Irenaeus' "now" that they were his contemporaries. It is generally accepted, in line with Jewish accounts, that Aquila lived under Hadrian, thus in the first decades of the second century. Irenaeus' "now" contrasts with the "once" of the LXX, as he presents their translation as old and competent against the attempts of the newer translators. Irenaeus often extends his timeframe somewhat, for he says of the Revelation of John 1) that it was seen not long ago, "but almost in our generation, towards the end of Domitian's reign." If the time of Domitian, a hundred years earlier, is still considered close to his own generation, then the term "now" in the specific context should not be taken too literally. The translation at least, which he criticizes in Theodotion and Aquila, "young woman" instead of "virgin," can be traced back with full certainty to Justin Martyr. He already puts this objection in the mouth of the Jew Trypho: "For the scripture does not say, 'Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son,' but 'Behold, the young woman shall conceive,' etc."2) Therefore, the Jews in their polemic against Christianity at Justin's time must have already translated the Isaiah passage as Aquila and Theodotion did according to Irenaeus. Credner3) does not want to admit that Justin here cites Aquila (or Theodotion), but his reason that these translators not only use "young woman" but also deviate in the rest of the text from the LXX, while Justin otherwise cites the LXX text, is not decisive, as Justin first quotes the phrase according to the LXX and then inserts the distinguishing term "young woman" into this text, while the other minor words are not considered here. Rightly, therefore, Wellhausen1) assumes that Justin refers to a written translation of the passage. Since it is established that Aquila is older than Justin, it is not clear why Justin's reference should not apply to Aquila's style of translation, even though Justin speaks generally of Jews who translate in this manner. Aquila translated in a Jewish sense, and the Jews thought

like Aquila. Thus, Theodotion, whom Irenaeus mentions before Aquila as a representative of this translation, could also have written before Justin. Field2) also rightly judges that Irenaeus' statement does not imply that Aquila and Theodotion were his contemporaries but only that they flourished before his time. If Theodotion had written only under Commodus (180-192), Irenaeus, whose work "Adversus Haereses" was written during the pontificate of Eleutherus (177-192), could hardly have known him, and even less would he have mentioned him before the much earlier Aquila. Additionally, the double equation of Aquila = Onkelos, Theodotion = Jonathan, assumed by Wellhausen3), which would thus correspond to these Greek translators to the two Jewish Targumim to the Old Testament, is rather a sign of greater antiquity.

1) S. Kautzsch a. a. O. p. 104 Aura.
2) de mens, et pond. 17.
3) So also Field, hexapla 1 p. XXXVIII, but he only says: he was earlier than Symmachus and may have written under Commodus.
4) Adv. haer. 111. 24 the Greek text in Eusebius K. G. V. 8, 10.

1) In Eusebius K. G. III. 18, 3.
2) Dialogus cum Tryphone c. 67.
3) Contributions to the Introduction to the Biblical Writings, 2nd vol. p. 198.

1) Bleek's introduction in «las alte Testament 1878 p. 581.
2) Hexapla, T. I. S. XVIII.
3) Bleek's introduction p. 808.

Thus, it would not be impossible that in our striking case of the concurrence between Theodotion's translation of Isaiah 25:8 and the citation in 1 Corinthians 15:54, the dependency lies on the side of the Christian author. The use of Theodotion by Christians would be all the less surprising, as, according to the testimony of Jerome1), other parts of the Old Testament, specifically the Book of Daniel, were also read by Christians according to Theodotion's translation, and overall, Theodotion's translation was the closest to the LXX, as both Epiphanius and Jerome attest 2). Furthermore, if it should be confirmed that Theodotion's translation had already influenced the Shepherd of Hermas 3), then its great antiquity and early use among Christians would be fully substantiated.

1) Preface to Daniel: "The Church does not read the prophet Daniel according to the LXX interpreters, but uses Theodotion's edition, and I do not know why this happened." Further references in de Wette, Lehrbuch der Einleitung ins Alte Testament, § 44i.

2) Epiphanius, de mensuris et ponderibus 17: "Because he provided the majority of what corresponds to the LXX, for he usually aligned the most with the consensus of the LXX." — Jerome, Preface to the Gospels: "He stands between the new (Aquila and Symmachus) and the old (LXX)." In Ecclesiastes II: "The LXX and Theodotion agree in

many places, including this one," according to de Wette, Einleitung ins Alte Testament, § 44 h.

3) See Harnack, in the Theologische Literaturzeitung 1885, p. 146, where it is indicated that, according to Prof. Hort in Cambridge, the name of the angel θεγρί in Shepherd of Hermas Similitude IV, 2, 4 corresponds to the translation Theodotion gives of Daniel 6:23.

221

Nevertheless, we refrain from explaining the literal correspondence of the Pauline citation with Theodotion in this manner, which would indeed lead to decisive results regarding the dating of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. The reasons are as follows. Firstly, it is not entirely certain that Theodotion actually wrote "κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νῖκος." The Hexaplaric Syro-Hexapla 4) gives, for Theodotion at this passage, a text that would read in Greek "κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος εἰς νῖκος," matching the verb form in the LXX, thus breaking the agreement with Paul. Kautzsch 5) therefore directly suspects that Paul's citation might have been added to the Hexapla text, and some scribe then considered it as Theodotion's version.

More importantly, in the Pauline citations from the Old Testament, there are virtually no other instances of contact with Theodotion. A comparison can be made in about thirty cases, and among these, hardly any show a resemblance in the citation's rendering. For example, in Genesis 2:7, the LXX writes "καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχήν ζῶσαν," and Paul in 1 Corinthians 15:45 has "ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχήν ζῶσαν," while Theodotion (according to Field) writes "καὶ ἐγένετο Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχήν ζῶσαν." It is clear that Paul's passage, tailored to the purpose of his argument, expands "ἄνθρωπος" with the addition "ὁ πρῶτος — Ἀδὰμ" and does not use Theodotion. In other characteristic citations, Paul and Theodotion do not align at all. The citation immediately following ours in 1 Corinthians 15:55, "ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ νῖκος; ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον;" is given by Theodotion as: "καὶ ἔσται ἡ δίκη σου ἐν θανάτῳ καὶ ἡ πληγή σου ἐν ᾅδῃ." Isaiah 28:16, cited in Romans 9:33 as "ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ οὐ κατασυνθήσεται," is rendered by Theodotion, Aquila, and Symmachus as "ὁ πιστεύων οὐ σπεύσει." Finally, the phrase "ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται," cited from Habakkuk 2:4 in Romans 1:17 and Galatians 3:11, is given by the LXX as "ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται," while Theodotion, like the other two translators, renders it as "ὁ δὲ δίκαιος τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πίστει ζήσει," correctly according to the Hebrew original text. Therefore, there is no evidence of contact between Paul and Theodotion in other cases, making it very unlikely that it occurred in the one mentioned and only in that one.

4) According to Field T. II p. 472.
5) a. a. O. p. 104 note.

222

Furthermore, the case is not unique where a Pauline citation aligns with one of the other three Greek translations. In 1 Corinthians 14:21, Paul cites Isaiah 28:11 in the following form: "In the

Law it is written: 'With other tongues and through the lips of foreigners I will speak to this people, but even then they will not listen to me,' says the Lord." The LXX has: "Through mocking lips and another tongue, they will speak to this people, and yet they would not hear." The Pauline translation is more accurate and serves the purpose of using a divine prophecy to support speaking in tongues while also warning against overestimating it. However, it is not certain that Paul corrected it according to the Hebrew text. Here we have the testimony of Origen1), who asserts that he found the equivalent in Aquila's translation. Just as the citation in 1 Corinthians 15:54 aligns with Theodotion, so 1 Corinthians 14:21 aligns with Aquila. There is another similar example in the New Testament where a citation does not match the LXX but aligns with the three later translators, namely the famous passage in John 19:37 and Revelation 1:7, from Zechariah 12:10: "They will look on the one they have pierced." While the LXX renders the passage as: "They will look to me because they have danced triumphantly," evidently because they read it as Jerome has noted, Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus have "they have pierced." Just as the New Testament uses this word, so does Justin Martyr in Apology 1.52 and Dialogue with Trypho 32 and 64, always with "they have pierced." This example shows that a coincidence of an Old Testament citation used in the New Testament with the other Greek translations instead of the LXX is not unprecedented. Rather, readings that those have already occur frequently with Justin and before him. We might best explain this phenomenon, as Credner2) suggests, by assuming that the translation of the LXX had already undergone corrections in essential passages before these new translations and that such corrected versions were used by New Testament writers. Then this assumption is sufficient to make recourse to the Hebrew text appear unnecessary even in the case of the significant deviations of Pauline citations from the LXX.

1) In Philocalia p. 35 ενρον γάρ τά έβ'Λνναμνϋντα τή Λέ;ει ταύτη έν τή τοΰ Άκύλου έρμηνεία κ είμενα.

2) Contributions to the introduction. 2nd vol. p. 299.

If the result obtained by Kautzsch is thus confirmed, we would like to extend it further and assert that it is just as unnecessary to assume that the author of the main Pauline letters understood Hebrew as it is for the writings of Justin1). Not even the use of any etymology from Hebrew, as frequently found in Philo, betrays knowledge of this language. The etymology related to Hagar (Gal. 4:25) refers to Arabic and is moreover quite inaccurate. The use of the Alexandrian translation and the assumption that this had already undergone corrections in some passages suffice to explain the knowledge of the Old Testament demonstrated by those letters.

1) S. Credner a. a. O. Vol. 1. P. 100ff.

2. The Use of Non-Canonical Writings

a) The Ascension of Moses

The use of non-canonical writings in the New Testament is not without precedent, but it is generally an indication of a later date of composition. For example, the Epistle of Jude and the Second Epistle of Peter are known to contain such references. In Jude 9, where the dispute between the Archangel Michael and Satan over the body of Moses is mentioned, there is, according to the trustworthy testimony of Origen2), a reference to the apocryphal writing titled "The Ascension of Moses." In the same epistle, verse 14 contains an explicit reference to the Book of Enoch. The same allusion to the dispute between Michael and Satan is also found in the Second Epistle of Peter (2:11). Furthermore, the Second Epistle to Timothy (3:8) mentions the dispute of Moses with the Egyptian magicians Jannes and Jambres, which, again according to Origen's testimony, also alludes to an apocryphal book named after these two figures 3). These writings all belong to the latest parts of the New Testament, and their contact with apocryphal writings is itself a cause for suspicion. If similar references could be found in the main Pauline letters, it would indeed be significant. If, at the same time, the writing with which there is contact could be securely dated, it might provide a clue to the dating of the main Pauline letters under certain circumstances.

2) De principiis III. 2, 1 s. Hilgenfeld, introduction. P. 740.

3) S. Hilgenfeld a. a. O. p. 755.

Such connections between the main Pauline letters and the aforementioned writing, the *Assumptio Mosis* (The Assumption of Moses), have been noted multiple times. Inspired by Lipsius, Hilgenfeld 1) claimed that Paul was familiar with this apocryphal text, and this observation has recently been utilized by Loman2) in support of his view. The relevant passage is Romans 2:15, which reads: "They show that the requirements of the law are written on their hearts, their consciences also bearing witness, and their thoughts sometimes accusing them and at other times even defending them." This is compared to a passage from the *Assumptio Mosis3)* 1:12-13: "For he created the world on account of his people and did not begin the creation of it until he made it manifest that in it the nations would be convicted and humbly dispute among themselves." The similarity in thought between the two passages is immediately evident, and it would also be unmistakable in expression if we still possessed the *Assumptio* in its Greek original rather than just in an ancient Latin translation. For "arguere" would be translated to Greek as "κατηγορεῖν," as Lipsius4) translates the passage: "καὶ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἀπεκάλυψε ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἔθνη κριθήσονται καὶ ταπεινωθήσονται μεταξύ ἀλλήλων τῶν διαλογισμῶν κατηγορούντων αὐτά." The similarity in thought is particularly evident in that, on the one hand, the people of Israel are granted a certain revelation of God, while the Gentiles dispute about it, and on the other hand, this disputing occurs "among themselves," "μεταξύ ἀλλήλων" = "inter se." The phrase "palam fecit" strongly recalls the starting point of Paul's discussion about God's revelation to the Gentiles in Romans 1:19: "ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς

ἐφανέρωσεν," and similarly, "ab initio orbis terrarum" recalls Romans 1:20: "ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου." Thus, there indeed seems to be a connection between these two passages.

1) N. T. extra canonem receptum fase. I p. 107—135.

2)Theol. Tydschrift 1882 p. 480.

3) Text according to Fritzsche, libri apocryphi V. T. 1871. Not everything in the text seems to be in order, Volkmar wants to read quam ut ab initio — faceret se et in ea etc. 8. Volkmar, Mose Prophetie und Himmelfahrt 1867 p. 138. 21.

4) See Hilgenfeld, Nov. Test, extra canonem receptum fase. I. Clementis epist. 1866 p. 96.

Against this, Scholten1) has raised objections. He finds the translation of "arguere" as "κατηγορεῖν" not very precise. He emphasizes that the passage in the *Assumptio* deeply degrades the Gentiles, while the passage in Romans elevates them, and finally, that the passage in Romans contains nothing that suggests a citation. However, these objections are not very convincing. It is not clear what can be criticized about the translation "arguere" as "κατηγορεῖν," as "arguere" means to accuse with the implication of conviction, and that fits perfectly in the context. The fact that the passage in the *Assumptio* is directed against the Gentiles, while the passage in Romans speaks more favorably about them, is not a counterargument. Why should a word from another text not acquire a new direction in a new context? Although the passage in Romans does not appear to be a citation, that is not necessary; the word is not directly quoted but used as a reminiscence. The author had no reason, rather the opposite, to name or even hint at the source. Thus, the likelihood remains that whoever wrote Romans 2:15 knew the *Assumptio*. The only obstacle to a definitive decision might be that the Romans passage itself could be considered an interpolation, as it disrupts the connection between verses 12 and 16 along with the attached verses 13 and 14. For this reason, Laurent1) considers verses 13-15 as a marginal note, while others2) prefer to omit verse 16. In short, the whole passage is not very secure ground, and it would be risky to build too much on this one trace of knowledge of the *Assumptio*. The question arises whether there are not other traces as well.

1) Bijdragen p. 113.

1) New Testament Studies p. 17.

2) So Weisse, contributions ed. Sülze. p. 31.

Loman3) indeed identified another passage, though he attributes little evidential weight to it, namely Galatians 3:19-20, where Moses is called a mediator (μεσίτης). This corresponds to the expression in the *Assumptio Mosis* immediately following the previously cited passage (1:14), where Moses says: "I was prepared to be the mediator of that covenant." Scholten4) again criticizes the translation of "arbiter" as "μεσίτης," but this criticism is also unfounded, as the terms are indeed equivalent. The accuracy of the translation can even be supported by an old testimony. Gelasius of Cyzicus, in the Acts of the Synod of Nicaea (II, 18)5), has preserved the original: "And God appointed me before the foundation of the world to be the mediator of his covenant." However, it is quite possible that no use of the *Assumptio* should be assumed here either. For Loman himself noted that by 55 AD, the Jewish theological concept of Moses as a mediator could have reached a Christian writer through other means than the *Assumptio Mosis*.

3) a. a. O. p. 481.

4) a. a. O. P. 114.

5) Mansi, Coll. Cone. II p. 844. Conciliorum Collectio regia II p. 392.

These two passages limit the number of potential parallels between the main Pauline letters and the *Assumptio Mosis*. Certainly, a modest result! But it should not be forgotten that we only have the first part of this Jewish apocalypse preserved in manuscript, and even that is rather incomplete and uncertain in a palimpsest that was barely decipherable in places. In the lost part, there could also have been passages used in Paul's main letters. This is not merely an empty conjecture, but an assumption based on the old testimony of church writers, which must be briefly addressed here. There are two Byzantine church writers who explicitly testify that Paul cited the *Assumptio Mosis* in his letters. First, Georgios Syncellus, from the 9th century, writes the following in his *Chronography*1): πλήν χα'ι ό μακάριος Παΰλος σπανίως έχρήσατό τισιν ές απόκρυφων χρήσεσιν ώς οτε φησ'ιν έν τή πρδς Κορινδίους πρφτη έπιστολή· ά ύφ&αλμδ; ούχ ειδεν καί ούς ούχ ήκουσεν καί έπ'ι καρδιάν άνΒρώπου ούχ άνέβη Χβΐ τά έςής Ήλία απόκρυφων 2), χα'ι πάλιν έν τή πρός Γαλάτα; έχ τής Μωυσέως άποκαλύψεως· ούτε περιτομή τι έστιν ούτε ακροβυστία άλλα καινή κτίσις, χα'ι έν τή προς Έφεσίους έκ τοΰ Ίερεμίου λεγομένων απόκρυφων έγειραι ό καΟευδων καί ανάστα έκ τών νεκρών χαΐ έπιφώσει σε ό Χριστός. [="Moreover, the blessed Paul rarely used some apocryphal works, as when he says in his first letter to the Corinthians: 'What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the human heart conceived' and so forth from the apocryphal sayings of Elijah. And again in the letter to the Galatians from the revelations of Moses: 'Neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is anything, but a new creation,' and in the letter to the Ephesians from the apocryphal sayings of Jeremiah: 'Awake, O sleeper, and arise from the dead, and Christ will shine on you.'"] Joining him is the Byzantine Patriarch Photius, also from the 9th century, who says in his *Amphilochia* 3): "He used the voice from the apocryphal writings of Moses, saying: 'Neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is anything, but a new creation.'" Thus, two Byzantine Fathers, citing examples, boldly claim that Paul sometimes used apocrypha. This claim is even weightier since Syncellus, for instance, crosses himself before using apocryphal writings and does not want to encourage following Paul's example at all. Syncellus cites three passages from Paul's letters as derived from apocrypha:

1. 1 Corinthians 2:9, which he says comes from an apocryphal book attributed to Elijah. Now, this passage, introduced solemnly with "it is written," is usually related to Isaiah 64:4, but the resemblance is so distant that a reference to a more accurate parallel should be gratefully accepted. For if the LXX writes: "From of old no one has heard or perceived by the ear, no eye has seen a God besides you," no one would easily recognize this as the source for 1 Corinthians 2:9: "What no eye has seen, nor ear heard," etc. Instead, the book from which the passage is taken belongs to the Old Testament pseudepigrapha and is known as testified by Origen1) after the prophet Elijah. Jerome also knew of this book and noted that the passage in 1 Corinthians 2:9 was said to be taken from it, although he disputed this as a heretical and very questionable claim. He writes:2) "Certain people usually follow the nonsense of apocryphal books at this point (1 Cor. 2:9) and say that the testimony is taken from the Apocalypse of Elijah, while in Isaiah according to the Hebrew it reads (Isaiah 64:4 follows)." The church father, less open-minded than Origen, naturally cannot admit that this New Testament passage was borrowed from an apocryphal work, and thus sticks to the Isaiah passage, despite its unsuitability.

1) Syncellus' *Chronographia*, edited by Goar, Paris 1652, p. 27.

2) This is the passage that Hegesippus criticized, according to Stephanus Gobarus in Photius' *Bibliotheca*, Cod. 232, p. 288, ed. Bekker, when he says that it was foolishly spoken and contradicts Scripture and the word of the Lord: "Blessed are your eyes because they see, and your ears because they hear," etc. (Matthew 13:16), which also indicates the standing of the main Pauline letters among Jewish Christians at that time.

3) Photius, *Amphilochia*, Quaest. 183, see Wetstein, N.T. on Galatians 6:15.

1) to Mt. 27, 9 Works ed. Delarue III S. 916. Die Stelle sei vom Apostel from the secrets of Elijah the prophet angeführt.

2) Epist. 101 to Pammachiutn, s. Fabricius, Codex pseudepigraphus V. T. S. 1072 ff.

229

2. The other passage that Syncellus cites is Galatians 6:15: "Neither circumcision nor uncircumcision means anything; what counts is the new creation." This passage is said to have been found in the *Assumptio Mosis*. Although it is not present in the part of the *Assumptio* that has been preserved, it is not impossible that it was in the lost portion. While it is difficult to say in what context such a free statement might have appeared in an entirely Jewish work, it is not inconceivable, as the preserved part also warns against outward piety and hypocrisy, describing people "who teach that they are righteous" but are not (chapter 11). There is even less reason to doubt this since the second witness, Photius, also confirms that this passage was in the same apocryphal work. When two Byzantine church writers from the ninth century— a time when apocrypha were highly controversial and prohibited from reading—make such a remark briefly and clearly, we certainly have no reason to doubt it.

230

3. As for the third passage, the Epistle to the Ephesians is not among the main Pauline letters we are concerned with. Nevertheless, it is interesting that Ephesians 5:14, "Therefore it says: 'Awake, O sleeper, and arise from the dead, and Christ will shine on you,'" which previously could only be roughly derived from a combination of Isaiah 60:1, "Arise, shine," and 26:19, "The dead shall rise," etc., is now known to be a direct citation from an apocryphal book bearing the name of Jeremiah. In this book, referred to as "Jeremiae apocrypha"1) by Jerome in his commentary on Matthew 27:9, Syncellus read the saying: "Awake, O sleeper, and arise from the dead, and Christ will shine on you"—clearly in the sense of a literal, not merely figurative, call to resurrection at the coming of the Messiah. Here too, we have no reason to doubt this statement.

1) S. Fabricius, cod. pseudepigr. V. T. S. 1102.

From this, it is very likely that at least two passages in the main Pauline letters, namely Romans 2:15 and Galatians 6:15, make use of the *Assumptio Mosis*. If we knew when the latter was written, it would provide a good reference point for dating the main Pauline letters. Unfortunately, the dating of the *Assumptio Mosis* is one of those points on which there is still no consensus among scholars. The proposed dates range1) from 2 BC (Wieseler) to 137 AD (Volkmar), and given the difficulty of determining the time from partially illegible apocalyptic calculations or the still unexplained name Taxo—which Volkmar convincingly interprets as Rabbi Akiba—it will likely be a long time before we can speak of any certainty here. However, the later dating of the text seems closer to the truth, and our main Pauline letters must follow suit. If Hilgenfeld2) is correct in his view that the *Assumptio Mosis* presupposes the Fourth Book of Ezra, and thus was written later, examining this text will immediately lead us a step further. In any case, the use of an apocryphal text is not a feature that would argue for the very early age of our letters. From Jerome onwards to modern apologists, there has been a cautious effort to deny this possibility and conceal the fact. In contrast, it must be the task of unbiased research to bring this fact to light.

2) Cf. Schürer, Lehrb. der neutestamentl. Zeitgeschichte 1st ed. p. 536 ff. where a whole sample map of conjectures is set out.

3) Clementis Romani epist. 1866. p. 96.

b) The Fourth Book of Ezra

The Fourth Book of Ezra is an apocalyptic writing from later Judaism that shows the greatest resemblance to Christian works of this genre, and therefore, it has been frequently used by Christians. This is evident in the fact that this book has been supplemented with additions by Christian hands, which further specify its messianic prophecies to refer to Jesus Christ—namely, the first two and the last two chapters, and at least the name Jesus for the Messiah in chapter 7, verse 28. This made it possible to append the book to the Latin Bible, and from there it found its way into the Zurich translation, where it is still printed in the editions among the Old Testament Apocrypha.

Christian teachers have highly esteemed this book from the beginning. Clement of Alexandria and Ambrose cited it as Holy Scripture, and passages from it were likely used already in the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. It would therefore be no surprise to find traces of the use of this highly regarded book in New Testament writings. Hilgenfeld1) has spared us the effort of pursuing these traces by already pointing out a number of parallels between this book and New Testament writings. He finds traces of its use in the Apocalypse, the Gospel of Matthew, the Acts of the Apostles, and the first and second Epistles of Peter. Among the Pauline letters, he specifically mentions the First Epistle to the Thessalonians as clearly showing the influence of Fourth Ezra2), but he also finds such traces in the main Pauline letters. The parallels that Hilgenfeld assumes are not all equally convincing. When Fourth Ezra 10:7 calls Zion "mater nostrum omnium" (the mother of us all), it indeed recalls Galatians 4:26, which states: "The Jerusalem above is free, and she is our mother." However, the image is obvious and already contained in the often-used phrase about the descent of God's people from Abraham our father, so it need not necessarily originate from Fourth Ezra. Similarly, the expression "root" in Romans 11:17, which Hilgenfeld compares to Fourth Ezra 5:28 ("you prepared one root above all others," namely the people of Israel, which stands alone among all others), does not need to be derived from elsewhere. The image of the root naturally arises in Romans from the comparison with the olive tree and its branches, both cut off and grafted in. Finally, the parallel between 1 Corinthians 2:9 and Fourth Ezra 10:35-36, 55-56 is unconvincing. We adhere to the earlier derivation from another apocryphal text bearing the name of Elijah, as suggested by Origen and Jerome. However, Hilgenfeld has pointed out one passage where the borrowing from Fourth Ezra is very likely: Romans 10:6-7 — Fourth Ezra 4:8. In Romans, it says: "But the righteousness that is by faith says: 'Do not say in your heart, "Who will ascend into heaven?"' (that is, to bring Christ down) or 'Who will descend into the deep?' (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead)." This has always been thought to use a scriptural reference, specifically Deuteronomy 30:11-14, which indeed follows in verse 8 with "The word is near you." However, the beginning of this reference is not exact. It says, "who will ascend to heaven," but then not "who will descend into the abyss" but "who will cross the sea." Therefore, this use of the Old Testament has always seemed strangely free1), even if it has been cloaked with phrases like "a holy and lovely playing of the Spirit in God's word" (Philippi). But the contrast between ascending to heaven and descending to the abyss is characteristically found in the passage from Fourth Ezra. The angel asks Ezra if he can weigh the weight of fire, measure the blast of the wind, or call back a day that has passed. When Ezra confesses his inability, the angel reminds him that he has only asked him something simple. Had he asked him about the dwelling places in the heart of the sea or the sources above the firmament or similar questions, he might have replied: "I have never descended into the abyss nor into the underworld, nor have I ever ascended into heaven." But now he has only asked about fire and wind, etc., and Ezra has been unable to answer—therefore, he should confess to knowing even less about the ways of God. The words in Fourth Ezra 4:8: "You might have said to me, 'I have not descended into the abyss, nor into the underworld, nor ascended into heaven'" indeed reflect the thought expressed in Romans 10:6-7, that humans can have no knowledge of heaven or the underworld because both are inaccessible to them. This underscores what the Romans passage

emphasizes, that God's word (Christ) cannot come from these places but from within one's heart. Since the Old Testament basis with crossing the sea was not suitable for the present case, descending into the abyss was made from it, taking the dimension of depth instead of breadth, so to speak. This change would be justified for the author of Romans 9-11 if he found it elsewhere in sacred, prophetic scripture, and the passage from the Fourth Book of Ezra provided it. It has, alongside ascending to heaven, descending into the abyss and the underworld, and its use is all the more likely because the expression fits exactly. Romans 10:7 does not say, "Who will descend into Hades," but "into the abyss." The word "abyss" appears in the New Testament only here and in Luke 8:31, and nowhere else in Paul. Therefore, the passage from the Book of Ezra, "I have not descended into the abyss," was very likely used here.

1) Messias Judaeorum, p. LXV.

2) I have attempted to demonstrate a connection between this letter and the Fourth Book of Ezra in the *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 1883, pp. 509-524. What P. W. Schmidt noted in his commentary on the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, 1885, pp. 106-110, actually only addresses the assumption that 1 Thessalonians 4:15 is a precise citation from Fourth Ezra 5:42. However, that was not my intention. Rather, I pointed out that the concern for the fate of those already asleep at the time of the Parousia in relation to those still living occupies a significant space in the Fourth Book of Ezra, establishing a connection between the two writings. I still hold to this view.

1) See Meyer-Weiss in the exegetical handbook on the passage.

However, if this one passage can indeed be explained by knowledge of Fourth Ezra, then the conjecture that some of the previously mentioned, not entirely convincing connections might also be explained this way becomes more tenable. In that case, the Pauline passages showing such use cannot belong to the first century. Despite Hilgenfeld's objections, the investigations by Corrodi, Gfrörer, Dillmann, Volkmar 1), and others have proven that the Fourth Book of Ezra is not, as he claims, of pre-Christian origin and written in 31 BC, but rather of post-Christian origin, likely belonging to the end of the first Christian century. Apart from the plausible interpretation of the three heads of the eagle in 11:1 ff. as the three Flavian emperors—Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian—the statement in 3:1, "in the thirtieth year after the fall of the city," is best related to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD, thus pointing to the end of the century. Hilgenfeld has thankfully brought to light the existing connections between the Pauline letters and this text. He can, with his assumption, maintain these letters as genuine even if they are dependent on Fourth Ezra. We adopt the observations he made and combine them with the now almost universally accepted later dating of the Fourth Book of Ezra. Therefore, those letters must naturally follow and move from the first century to the second. At the same time, the Assumptio Mosis, which Hilgenfeld suggests precedes the Fourth Book of Ezra, and its use in other passages of the main Pauline letters, becomes a new witness for this later dating.

1) S. Schürer, Textbook of New Testament Contemporary History, 1st ed., pp. 549—563.

235

c) Philo

The great Jewish religious philosopher from Alexandria, Philo, has long been recognized as a kindred spirit to Christianity. Tradition also reports2), as it does later with Seneca, that he had close connections with prominent figures of the Christian faith, specifically mentioning that he was intimately associated with Peter in Rome. This is how the Church Fathers tried to understand the significant similarities between Philo's writings and Christianity. The connections between his religious thought and emerging Christianity are indeed undeniable, though there is still no consensus on whether a direct influence must be assumed. This question is particularly important for explaining the Gospel of John. While the theological right dares to derive its new conceptual world, especially the concept of the Logos, from Old Testament premises, the critical school, besides this inner-Jewish preparation, considers a decisive influence of the Philonic system to be quite provable. The Old Testament concept of the "λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ" does not mean the same as the concept of "ὁ λόγος" as simply stated, which the Johannine Prologue employs. However, the view on this side is not that Philo's Logos concept was transferred unchanged into the New Testament thought. Rather, this philosophical concept is first connected with the historical view of the person of Jesus, and the Logos is used to conceptually grasp the dual relationship that this person has to God and humanity. Naturally, the philosophical concept must incorporate essentially new elements. Thus, Philo's Logos, in its transition to the Gospel of John, transforms from a concept into a person, appearing on Earth and accomplishing the historical work of redemption.

2) Bei Eusebius K. G. II. 17,1 und bei Hieronymus, de viris illustr. 11.

236

Thus, any discussion of the influence of Philo's system on Christian theology and the New Testament must also recognize the differences that remain between the two thought systems. Within this limitation, the question arises whether the influence of Alexandrian religious philosophy is evident elsewhere in the New Testament besides the Gospel of John. Such influence is readily acknowledged in some of the later New Testament letters, particularly in the Epistle to the Hebrews. This letter is often described as a form of Paulinism that has been modified under the influence of Alexandrian thought.1) However, it remains to be seen whether the four main Pauline letters also show this influence. The proper approach to arriving at a reasonably certain result is not to compare the thought world of Paul directly with that of Philo. While such a comparison is instructive and reveals a significant kinship between the two, it can only conclude that there is a close resemblance between these two spheres, a point recognized from various perspectives. Bruno Bauer, for instance, described Philo's teachings as a prelude to Christianity, and even Harnack has occasionally referred to Philo as a Christian Church Father. Nonetheless, this approach cannot lead to a definite conclusion. Ideas are fluid and malleable, and given the profound differences between the two thought systems, one could

always argue that the similarities lie in the overall character of the era rather than indicating a direct literary dependence.

1) e.g. Pfleiderer, Paulinismus pp. 324—390. Immer, Neutest. Theologie, pp. 399-418.

237

The latter point is the conclusive one. If it can be demonstrated or at least made very likely that the Pauline letters use expressions and phrases that must have been borrowed from Philo's writings, then a historically significant result is achieved. This would not reduce the Pauline letters to mere plagiarisms—there is no risk of that—but it would confirm that they presuppose Philo and his system both temporally and in content. This is very instructive for understanding their date of origin and overall character. To this end, we do not need to traverse the vast, almost boundless ocean of Philo's writings, as there are already preliminary works available that significantly simplify the task for us.

238

In Siegfried's1) excellent work on Philo, there is a compilation of word and concept parallels to the main Pauline letters on pages 304-309. This compilation contains much valuable material, but the question of whether there is a direct dependence of the Pauline letters on Philo's writings is neither posed nor answered. The author seems to have limited himself to highlighting the similarities and bringing in many things that can help explain the Pauline letters. On the other hand, Bruno Bauer2), in one of his last writings, explicitly investigated the question at hand and concluded that the literary influence of Philo on the Pauline letters must be definitively accepted. Since the material collected in these two works is entirely sufficient for our purpose, we limit ourselves to compiling the most compelling evidence, adding only a few of our own observations at certain points.

1) Philo of Alexandria as interpreter of the Old Testament by Dr. Carl Siegfried, 1875.

2) Philo, Strauss and Renan and early Christianity 1874, pp. 97—118.

There are numerous parallels to the Epistle to the Romans. In the first part of the letter, Romans 1:20 highlights the evidence for the existence of God, evident to everyone, including Gentiles, from creation: "For since the creation of the world God’s invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made." Similarly, Philo speaks of those who, guided by God, ascended in their thinking from the works to the Creator, "from the works infer the Creator."3) Romans 1:23 describes the folly of paganism, which exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal beings: "They exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like a mortal human being and birds and animals and reptiles."1) Philo uses the same expression for the same error, saying that idolatrous Israel forsook the true God and fashioned false gods: "transferring the appellation of the uncreated and imperishable to perishable and created beings," and it even

attributed the honor of the imperishable to irrational animals and plants.2) Similarly, Romans 1:25 states that they "worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator," which is echoed in Philo when he speaks of those "compelled to honor creation before the uncreated."3) Regarding Romans 2:4, "Or do you show contempt for the riches of his kindness, forbearance and patience," Philo's phrase "the abundance of both his wealth and his goodness" seems to have influenced Paul. The agreement is equally striking in the use of Abraham as a type of righteousness by faith. Romans 4:3 quotes Genesis 15:6: "Abraham believed God, and it was credited to him as righteousness," and continues this comparison throughout the chapter.4) Similarly, Philo sees Abraham as a witness to the value of faith in the unseen: "Therefore it is necessarily said, 'Abraham believed God,' in praise of the believer... and it is well said that faith was credited to him as righteousness."5) This agreement becomes even more significant considering that both Romans 4:19ff and Philo refer to the patriarch's faith1), proven in accepting the highly improbable birth of a son long after the natural time of marriage. Regarding the doctrine of sin, Philo, like Paul in Romans 7 and 5:12ff, sees sin as something that resides in the flesh. According to Philo, sin also brings death. The main cause of human moral ignorance is the flesh and dwelling in the flesh: "the greatest cause of ignorance is the flesh and the affinity with the flesh."2) Therefore, sin is inherent in everything born: "to everyone born, even if one is zealous, as far as he has come into being, it is inherent to sin,"3) and the body is called "the dead one born with us."4) Whether there remains a difference in the understanding of sin—where Philo and contemporary philosophers merely see sensuality, while Paul sees a god-opposing principle in man—needs to be examined further. Romans 8:17 states that Christians are "heirs of God," and Philo similarly exhorts the soul: "If you long to inherit the divine goods, do not only leave the land—the body, and the kinship—sensuality, and the father's house—reason, but flee yourself."5) According to Romans 8:29, Christians are to be conformed to the image of God's Son so that he might be the firstborn among many brothers (πρωτότοκος ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς). Similarly, Philo exhorts humans that, even if they are never found worthy to be called God's sons, they should still adorn themselves according to the image of His firstborn, the Logos (κοσμεῖσθαι κατά τόν πρωτόγονον αύτού λόγον). For even if we are not yet worthy to be considered God's children, we are nevertheless children of His eternal image, the most sacred Logos. For God's image is the Logos, His eldest Son: "καὶ γὰρ εἰ μὴπω ἱκανοὶ θεοῦ παῖδες νομίζεσθαι γεγόναμεν, ἀλλὰ τοι τῆς ἀϊδίου εἰκόνος αὐτοῦ, λόγου τοῦ ἱερωτάτου· θεοῦ γὰρ εἰκών λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτατος" (cf. II Corinthians 4:4, "Christ, who is the image of God").1) The difference is that while Philo sticks to the word from Genesis 42:11, "We are all sons of one man," Paul can say, "You are all sons of God" (Galatians 3:26). A particularly notable parallel is found in Philo's description of Israel's historical misfortune and hope for future restoration, akin to Paul's treatment of the apparent exclusion of Israel from salvation in Romans 9-11, ultimately resolved in the future restoration of Israel after the fullness of the Gentiles has come. Philo similarly describes the Jewish people as orphans due to their historical misfortune but asserts that the Lord of all things will have mercy on their orphanhood and desolation because they are dedicated to their Creator and Father as the firstborn of the whole human race.2) If the people are scattered among all nations and sold into slavery, they will one day be freed on a single day as if by agreement.3) As Paul's argument culminates in the image of the olive tree with broken and grafted branches, Philo ends his hopeful depiction with the promise that just as new shoots sprout from cut-off stumps if the roots are not uprooted, restoring the old trees to their former

glory, so will virtue's remaining seeds in souls, though other virtues may have perished, produce the noblest and best among men. Paul's image, with slight modifications, is essentially the same. Since the Christian thinker is concerned not only with the restoration of Judaism but also with the inclusion of Gentile Christians into the old stem, the grafting of new branches needed to be added to the cutting off of old branches. This adaptation indicates reliance on another model, particularly evident from the forced yet necessary transformation in using the noble olive tree to graft wild branches, contrary to usual practice. This alteration is further justified by the use of a similar, though already existing, Philonic comparison going back to Isaiah 11:1. Shortly before the aforementioned passage, Philo uses the image of God dismissing the roots but accepting the new shoot as it, tamed, begins to bear fruit: "dismissing the roots and accepting the new shoot because it changed, tamed towards fruitfulness."1)

3) Philo, de praem. et poen. 7 (Mangey II 415).

1) of life Moys. III. 20 (M. II. 161).

2) of drunkenness 28 (M. I. 374).

3) of dreams I. 14 (M. I. 632).

4) legis Allegor. I. 13 (M. I. 50).

5) Who was div. baeres 18 (M. I. 485. 486).

1) of migration Abr. 9 (I. 442).

2) of the Giants 7 (I. 266).

3) Life of Moses III. 17 (II. 157).

4) of the Giants 3 (1. 264).

5) Who division beer 14 (I. 482).

1) of confusion. ling. 28 (I. 427).

2) on the creation of princes 6 (II. 365, 366).

3) on execrations 8. 10 (II. 435-437).

1) de execrationibus 6 (II. 433).

From the First Epistle to the Corinthians, we highlight the following passages, for which Philo offers striking parallels. In 1 Corinthians 3:1-2, the Apostle says that he could not speak to the Corinthians as to spiritual people, but as to carnal, as to infants in Christ. He gave them milk to drink, not solid food, "I gave you milk, not solid food, for you were not yet able," etc. Similarly, according to Philo, there are souls that have not yet grasped either the state of servitude or that of freedom, but are still naked, like very young children. These must first be nursed by wet nurses, then given tender food instead of milk (ἀντί γάλακτος ἀπαλάς τροφάς), that is, elementary instruction. Thereafter, they should be given stronger food (τάς κραταιοτέρας τροφάς), as represented by philosophy. From there, having grown into men and become strong, they may finally reach the happy goal, which belongs not so much to the philosophy of Zeno as to the saying of the Pythia, namely, to live according to nature (τὸ ἀκολουθοῦν τῇ φύσει ζῆν).2)

2) Quod oinnis probus on 22 (II. 470). The passages to be quoted from this Phionian writing are not affected by the investigation of Obie, Jahrbb. für prot. Theologie 1887 pp. 298-344 and 376-394, according to which § 12 and 13 of this writing originate from a Christian hand.

243

In 1 Corinthians 3:16, the Apostle asks: "Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you?" Similarly, Philo raises the question of what kind of dwelling could be prepared for the King of Kings and the Lord of all things that would be worthy of Him. The answer is that it cannot be made of stone or wood, nor would it be worthy if the entire earth were turned into gold or something more precious than gold and halls were built to receive the guest. Rather, a worthy house for Him is only the well-prepared soul. "A fitting house, however, is the prepared soul." Calling the invisible soul of the invisible God an earthly house is appropriate and lawful.1) Here, the idea that no earthly house is worthy of God is certainly Old Testament in origin (Isaiah 66:1 and other passages), but the agreement lies in the fact that the right house of God is called the soul, forming a clear connection between the two passages.

Furthermore, in 1 Corinthians 7:21-22, the Apostle discusses slavery, stating that it does not matter for Christian salvation. The slave called in the Lord is a freedman of Christ, and conversely, the free man is Christ's servant. Similar thoughts are developed in Philo's work "That Every Good Person Is Free." The wise person is free, regardless of their external status, while the fool is a slave in every situation. God's friends are always free. Citing the verse from Euripides: "Born a slave? Then you have no say," Philo limits this truth to external life and asserts moral freedom in the realm of the spirit for the righteous: "None of the virtuous are slaves, but all are free."2) Doesn't 1 Corinthians 7:21 sound like an answer to Philo's citation: "Were you called while a slave? Do not worry about it"? It is well known that the allegorical interpretation of scripture, so fundamental to Philo's system, is also employed in the Pauline letters. The reason for its use in certain cases, namely to keep overly earthly and common elements away from God's word, is expressed similarly in both. In 1 Corinthians 9:9, Paul quotes Deuteronomy 25:4, "You shall not muzzle an ox while it treads out the grain," and immediately asks, "Is it oxen God is concerned about?" as if it were unthinkable that this command stood in Scripture for its literal meaning. Similarly, when Philo discusses Exodus

22:26, which contains the command not to keep the poor man's cloak overnight as a pledge, he finds it unworthy to attribute such concern for a garment to the lawgiver and such trivialities to the Creator of all things, "attributing human trivialities to the uncreated and imperishable nature, full of blessedness and happiness."1) – An especially striking parallel is found in 1 Corinthians 9:24-25, where the image of the athlete is used, who lives a temperate life and trains to win the race. He does this for a perishable crown. We Christians should run to win the prize, not a perishable crown, but an imperishable one. "They do it to get a crown that will not last, but we do it to get a crown that will last forever." This image of the athlete is particularly familiar to Philo. The efforts made by athletes, who strive only for olive branches and parsley wreaths, should motivate the wise to exert all their strength in the spiritual competition, with the "athletes of physical vigor" contrasted with those "training the invisible mind."2) Elsewhere, he urges to slay desire, the cunning serpent (Genesis 3:3), as a hero: "Set against it the intention to kill serpents, strive through this most beautiful struggle to be crowned in the contest against desire that conquers all others, with the beautiful and glorious crown that no human festival can grant."1) – In 1 Corinthians 10:4, Paul makes a symbolic application in rabbinic fashion of Exodus 17:6, where Moses strikes water from the rock to quench the people's thirst in the desert, saying that this rock was Christ. Similarly, Philo uses Deuteronomy 32:13, where in Moses' song it says: "God made him suck honey from the rock and oil from the flinty crag," stating, "He calls this rock by another name, the oldest of beings, the divine Logos." 2) – Finally, in 1 Corinthians 13:12, the image of seeing now in a mirror, dimly ("δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι"),3) is similar to Philo's statement: "Just as through a mirror, the mind brings forth visions of the acting, world-creating, and all-governing God."

1) de Cherubim 29. 30 (I. 157).

2) Quod omnis probus über 7 (II. 452. 453).

1) de somniis I. 16 (I. 634. 635).

2) Quod omnis probus liber 17 (II. 462).

1) Legis allegor. II. 26 (I. 86). For "ἐχώρησε," other editions have the variant "ἐχαρέσατο," but "ἐχώρησε" would still convey the same meaning. Mangey's translation, "capere potuit," is neither linguistically nor contextually appropriate. The term "χωρεῖν" in the sense of "to grant" sometimes comes very close to the meaning of "to allow," as seen in Plutarch's *Lycurgus*, c. 13: "Ἐπαμινώνδαν εἰπεῖν λέγουσι περί τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τραπέζης, ὡς τὸ τοιοῦτον ἄριστον οὐ χωρεῖ προδοσίαν," where it translates to "non capax est, non admittit proditionem." See also Stephanus, *Thesaurus*, Paris edition, VIII, p. 1804.

2) Quod deterius potiori insid. 31 (I. 214).

3) De decalogo 21 (II. 198).

The parallels to the Second Epistle to the Corinthians and the Epistle to the Galatians are less numerous. Siegfried only mentions two from the former. The first relates to 2 Corinthians 2:16, where the "aroma of knowledge" is divided into "the aroma from death to death" and "the aroma from life to life," similar to Philo's concept of a double hearing of divine commandments: one to the detriment and another to the benefit of the soul: "Some hear the divine doctrines to their benefit, others to their harm and that of others."1) The second parallels 2 Corinthians 3:5: "Not that we are competent in ourselves to claim anything for ourselves, but our competence comes from God." Compare this to Philo's statement on human inability to recognize anything from oneself: "God sends both ideas to the mind and perceptions to the senses, and all accomplishments are not due to our own parts, but to the gifts from Him through whom we also exist."2) For the Epistle to the Galatians, the following parallels are noted: In Galatians 3:16, Paul concludes from the singular form of the word "seed" in the passages of Genesis containing God's promises to Abraham and his descendants that these promises refer to the one true descendant of Abraham, Jesus Christ. Similarly, Philo derives from the singular form "child" in the promise to Abraham in Genesis 17:16 the meaning that the highest is always unique.3) – In Galatians 4:9, it says: "But now that you know God, or rather are known by God," thus attributing the knowledge of God to God Himself as its giver. Similarly, Philo, in a discussion about everything being granted to man by God—body and soul, and that man has acquired nothing by himself—says: "But now that we live, we are rather being controlled than ruling, and we are being known rather than knowing."4) In the same work, Philo also contrasts Abraham's two wives, Sarah and Hagar, as types of higher and lower intellectual attributes and elements of education. He calls Sarah, consistent with her name, the ruler—a symbol of his dominion. However, the son of Hagar, Ishmael, must be driven out5), paralleling the same image in Galatians 4:21-31, though elaborated in a slightly different manner.

1) de mutat. nominal. 37 (I. 609).

2) de confusion. ling. 25 (I. 424).

3) de courage. nominal. 26 (I. 600).

4) de Cherubim 32 (1. 160).

5) de Cherubim 1. 2. (1. 139. 140).

These are some examples of the close connection between the writings of the Alexandrian religious philosopher and the main Pauline epistles. They could easily be multiplied, but for those who have an open eye for such relationships and their interpretation, the given examples will suffice. For those who refuse to be convinced, even many more would not be enough. One might object that, despite all the similarities in views and even in means of expression, there is a deep difference between the two realms. Philo's concept of the Logos, of man, of flesh and spirit, of sin and redemption, is quite different from that of Paul, etc. This is, at least partly, true, but it would only prove something if it had been claimed that the doctrinal system of the Pauline

epistles is nothing but a copy of Philo's teachings. However, apart from perhaps Bruno Bauer, no one has claimed this. The view is that Philo's widely circulated writings are among the elements that influenced the development and even more the literary presentation of the Pauline doctrinal system. It goes without saying that the Christian teacher retains most of what is valuable as his own property, that his entire perspective is far different, deeper, and more religious, that with him we move from the vague mist of floating Philonic ideas to the solid ground of religious facts and historical views presented by the person of Jesus Christ and the development of the Christian community. The difference between the Pauline system and Philo's is the same as that between the Johannine Christ and the Logos concept of the Alexandrian. Nevertheless, an influence of Philo's system on the Pauline system could have occurred, and we believe we have indeed demonstrated that this possibility is in fact a reality.

For it would be a strange coincidence if not only such similar thoughts but also matching images and expressions were found in two roughly contemporary writers without one knowing the other. Especially such a correspondence in rare, far-flung images, as in the previously mentioned trope of the tree with the grafted branches (Romans 11 and Philo's *De execrationibus* 6), which particularly caught Gfrörer's attention at the time, can hardly be explained otherwise than by direct knowledge of one by the other. Which of the two writers read the other is evident from the chronological relationship. Philo is certainly the older; he was already a very old man1) in the year 40 AD when he led the delegation of the Alexandrian Jews to the Emperor Caius, so he must have been born in the pre-Christian era.

> 1) This is evident from the passage in *Legatio ad Caium* 28 (II. 572), where Philo says that, because of his age, he could not interpret the emperor's response as favorably as his more optimistic fellow delegates.

248

Whether an influence of Philo's writings on the historical Apostle Paul can be determined is hard to say. In general, it cannot be denied that during the decades between 50 and 60 AD, the commonly accepted time of the writing of our main epistles, some Philonic ideas and writings could have reached the Apostle. But it is not very likely. If Philo's life probably only concluded around that same time, a certain period would have been required for the spread of his thoughts and works from Alexandria throughout the entire Greco-Jewish world. The manner in which they are used in the New Testament rather suggests that they had already been in effect for a longer time and had penetrated minds. Therefore, the present fact only becomes truly comprehensible if not only the Johannine writings, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the later Pauline letters, but also the main Pauline epistles are understood as monuments of a time significantly later than that of the historical Paul.

249

d) Seneca

The connections of the Roman philosopher Seneca to Christianity have long been noted and investigated. As early as Tertullian 1), he was referred to as "often one of ours" ("saepe noster"). Lactantius 2) also noted his frequent agreement with Christian teachings. Augustine3) explained Seneca's caution regarding the Christian name merely out of fear, and Jerome4) outright called him "one of ours," "Seneca noster." The correspondence between Seneca and the Apostle Paul, mentioned by the last two church fathers, appears to be an older version of the medieval fabrication of the same name that still exists. Additionally, there is the widely accepted mediation of the acquaintance between the Apostle and the philosopher through the latter's brother Gallio, the Proconsul of the province of Achaia, before whom Paul was accused during his stay in Corinth, according to Acts 18:12. Lastly, the legend of the Linus Acts5), which tells of Seneca's meeting with Paul in Rome and their intimate association, all serve as evidence that the similarities between Seneca's writings and the New Testament, especially the Pauline epistles, had been noticed and interpreted according to the tastes of the time since ancient days.

1) de Anima cap. 20.

2) Divin. Institute 1, 5.

3) de civitate Dei 6, 10.

4) Adv. Jovinianum I. 49. — De viris illustribus c. 12. Opera ed. Vallarsi Tom. II.

5) Liui episcopi de passione Petri et Pauli tradita, etc. Bibliotheca max. patrum Lugd. II p. 67-73. See Lipsius, apocryphal Acts II, p. 93 ff.

Recent researchers have also pointed out these connections and made them the subject of thorough investigations. Following some earlier predecessors, four scholars in particular have focused their studies on this subject in our time: two French scholars, Amédée Fleury1) and Charles Aubertin2), and two Germans, Bruno Bauer3) and Johannes Kreyher4), though their conclusions vary significantly. While Fleury and Kreyher concluded that Seneca had drawn from the Pauline epistles, Aubertin found this explanation unlikely and sought to explain the similarity between the two sets of ideas in another way. B. Bauer, on the other hand, reversed the relationship, arguing that the author of the Pauline epistles had drawn from Seneca's writings. For a detailed study of the question in its particulars, one can refer to the aforementioned works. For our investigation, which considers the literary relationships of the Pauline letters not only in this one respect but more broadly, it will suffice to highlight the most notable parallels between Seneca's writings and the Pauline epistles, and then specifically discuss which side holds the priority. Given these various perspectives, what do you think are the most compelling arguments or evidence for determining whether Seneca influenced the Pauline epistles or vice versa?

1) Saint-Paul et Seueque, Recherches sur les rapports du Philosophe with l'Apötre et sur l'intiltration du Christianistne naissaut ä travers le Paganismc, Paris 1852, 2 vols.

2) Sénèque et Saint-Paul, etude sur les rapports supposes entre le philo.
sophe et l'apütre, Paris 1872.

3) Christ and the Caesars, Berlin 1879 pp. 28-65.

4) L. Annaeus Seneca and his relationships with early Christianity, Berlin 1887.

250

The fact that Seneca's philosophy shows numerous connections with Christian teaching would not be enough to assume a closer kinship between the two. For the philosophy of the time, particularly insofar as it belonged to the Platonic development series, had in many points come close to what generally characterizes Christian dogma. It contained a theology purified to monotheism, an anthropology that well knew and used the dichotomy of flesh and spirit, and even an eschatology that exhibited very similar features in terms of the punishment of evil and the reward of good. Our comparison with Philo has already shown that these ideas had penetrated wide circles at the time and represented a kind of common worldview among different peoples. Beyond this generality, only actual literary connections can lead further, and whether such exist or not is first to be determined. From the large number of examples cited by Fleury, B. Bauer, and Kreyher1), we highlight those relating to the main Pauline epistles that seem the most striking to us.

1) a. a. O. in the section: biblical echoes in Seneca's writings, pp. 83-90.

251

In the letter to the Romans, the futility of paganism in worshiping God is described. It is said in 1:23, "They exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like mortal human beings and birds and animals and reptiles." Seneca similarly states, "They dedicate the sacred, immortal, and inviolable gods in the most worthless and immobile material. They give them the appearance of humans, wild beasts, and fish, and some even in mixtures of different forms" [Habitus illis hominum, ferarumque et piscium, quidam vero mixtos ex diversis corporibus induunt 2).](Seneca, *Epistulae Morales*). The Pauline doctrine of the flesh and its correlate, death, also forms a cornerstone of our philosopher's ethical system. Seneca consoles Marcia over the loss of her son by considering that only his body has perished, and that not even a very accurate likeness of him: "These bones you see wrapped in sinews, covered by skin, and the visage, and the serving hands, and the rest of our wrappings, are the bonds and shadows of our souls. The soul is buried under them, obscured, infected, barred from the truth and its own nature, thrown into falsehoods. It contends with this flesh, striving not to be dragged down and overcome by it" (*Ad Marciam*) [haec quae vides ossa circumvoluta nervis, et ob-
ductam cutem, vultemque et ministras manus et cetera quibus involuti sumus, vincula animorum tenebraeque sunt. Obruitur his animus, offuscatur, inficitur, arcetur a veris et suis, in falsa coniectus: omne illi cum hac carne grave certamen est, ne abstrahatur et sidat: nititur illo, unde dimissus est 2)]. Thus, in Romans 7:18, 22, the flesh contends with the spirit and the law in the members with the law in the mind. And if, for Paul, death is not only a natural fate but also a consequence of sin decreed by a divine judgment, if through sin, death spread to all men, and

this is a just condemnation (Romans 5:12, 16), Seneca similarly does not see death merely as a universal fate: "We are all reserved for death," [omnes reservamur ad mortem,] but also depicts it metaphorically as a capital punishment appointed for all, and indeed by a very just decree (*Epistulae Morales?*).1) On the other hand, the spirit is where goodness dwells and true happiness rests, though the philosopher understands it as the natural human spirit, while the apostle refers to the God-given Christian spirit. In this sense, Paul says in Romans 8:13: "If you live according to the flesh, you will die; but if by the Spirit you put to death the misdeeds of the body, you will live." Seneca similarly teaches that true good cannot lie in the pleasures of the flesh: "Consider whether what you call good is indeed such if it is something in which God can be surpassed by man. Let us place the highest good in the mind ... our supreme happiness should not be placed in the flesh" (*Epistulae Morales*) [Considera tu itaque, an id bonum vocandum sit, quo Deus ab homine vincitur. Summum bonum in animo constituamus .... non est summa felicitatis nostrae in carne ponenda 2).] In this unnatural association with the body, the spirit longs for redemption, for a return to where it came from. "We groan inwardly," says Romans 8:23, "as we wait eagerly for our adoption to sonship, the redemption of our bodies," and similarly in 2 Corinthians 5:4, "we who are in this tent (the body) groan and are burdened." Likewise, Seneca speaks of the soul which, burdened by a heavy load, longs to be freed and to return to its origin: "The soul, weighed down by this heavy burden, desires to be released and return to those things to which it belongs. For this body is the weight and punishment of the soul; burdened by it, it is confined, unless philosophy comes to its aid and commands it to breathe and ascend from earthly things to divine ones" (*Epistulae Morales*). [gravi sarcina pressus, explicari cupit et reverti ad illa quorum fuit. Nam corpus hoc animi pondus ac poena est, premente illo urgetur, in vinculis est, nisi accessit philosophia, et illum respirare rerum naturae spectaculo jussit, et a terrenis dimisit ad divina3).] — Romans 8:28 states, "And we know that in all things God works for the good of those who love him," with Seneca offering a parallel: "But as my discourse proceeds, I will show how these things, which seem evil, are not. For now, I say that those things which you call harsh, adverse, and abominable, are, first of all, for the good of those to whom they happen, and then for the good of all whose greater care is God's concern than that of individuals" (*De Providentia*). [sed jam procedente oratione ostendam, quam non eint quae videntur, mala. Nunc illud dico, ista quae tu vocas aspera, quae adversa et abominanda, primum pro ipsis esse, quibus accidunt, deinde pro universis quorum maior düs cura est quam singulorum 1)] And shortly before: "God ... does not pamper a good man; he puts him to the test, hardens him, and prepares him for himself. Why do many adverse things happen to good men? Nothing bad can happen to a good man" (*De Providentia*).[Why do many adverse things happen to good men? Nothing can happen to a bad man.2)] — The admonition in Romans 12:19, "Do not take revenge, my dear friends," corresponds to Seneca's view on revenge: "Revenge is an inhuman word, though it is accepted as just" (*De Ira*). [inhumanum verbum est, ut quidem pro justo receptum, ultio3).] Additionally, the difficult exegetical follow-up to the passage in Romans, "but leave room for God's wrath," finds illumination in Seneca's elaboration on the concept: "Do not be quick to soothe the first wave of anger; it is deaf and mad: give it time. Remedies are effective in the remission. And further: the greatest remedy for anger is delay: let the first heat of anger cool down, and the fog that clouds the mind either dissipate or become less dense" (*De Ira*).[atqui maximum remedium irae dilatio est: ut primus eius fervor relanguescat, et caligo quae premit mentem, aut residat aut minus

densa sit etc 1)]— Finally, Seneca also uses the image of putting on a person, as in Romans 13:14 and Galatians 3:27, which state: "clothe yourselves with the Lord Jesus Christ," he says: "Put on the mind of a great man, and withdraw for a while from the opinions of the common people" (*Epistulae Morales*).[indue magni viri animum, et ab opinionibus vulgi secede paulisper 2).]

2) de superstitionibus, in Augustin de civitate dei VI. 10.

3) Consolatio ad Marciam 24.

1) Nat. Question. II. 59.

2) Epistle 74.

3) Epistle 65.

1) on providence ch. 3.

2) on providence ch. 1. 2.

3) of the wrath of II. 32.

1) de ira, lib. IP 39. 12.

2) Epist. 67.

In the first letter to the Corinthians, there are the images of the body as the temple of the Holy Spirit (6:19) and of the gymnastic contest for the winner's crown (9:24), as well as the spiritual declaration of freedom for the Christian slave (7:22), for all of which we have already found parallels in Philo. These same parallels are also found in the Roman philosopher when he says: "No temples are to be erected for Him (God) with piled-up stones; He must be consecrated in each person's heart" (Seneca, *Epistulae Morales*), [no temples to him (God) are to be built in the height of the stones, but each one is to be consecrated in his own breast'), 3)] and: "A sacred spirit resides within you" (Seneca, *Epistulae Morales*).[sacer intra uos spiritus sedet4).] Further: "Athletes, how many blows do they receive on the face and on the whole body? They endure every torment for the desire of glory, not only because they fight, but to fight: the very training is torment. We too should overcome all things, the reward of which is not a crown, or a palm, or a trumpet announcing our name in silence, but virtue itself, etc." (Seneca, *Epistulae Morales*).[Athletae, quantum plagarum ore, quantum toto corpore excipiunt? ferunt tarnen omne tormentum gloriae cupiditate, nec tantum quia pugnant, sed ut pugnent: exercitatio ipsa tormentum est. Nos quoque evincamus omnia quorum praemium non corona, nec palma est, nec tubicen praedicationi nominis nostri silentium faciens, sed virtus etc.5).] And: "Is he a slave?

But perhaps he is free in spirit; one is mistaken if one thinks that slavery extends to the entire person: the better part of him is exempt. Bodies are subject to and assigned to masters, but the mind is indeed its own master. It is so free and unrestrained that it cannot be held even by this prison in which it is enclosed, preventing it from using its own force and undertaking great things and reaching out to the heavens" (Seneca, *Epistulae Morales*).[Servus est? sed fortaese über animo 6); errat, si quis existimat servitutem in totum hominem descendere: pars melior ejus excepta est. Corpora obnoxia sunt et adscripta dominis, mens quidem sui juris. Quae adeo libera et vaga est, ut ne ab hoc quidem carcere cui inclusa est teneri queat quominus impetu suo utatur et ingentia agat et in infinitum cotnes coelestibus exeat 1).] — When the Apostle exclaims (3:21): "All things are yours!" the philosopher says of the wise man: "Everything belongs to him" [omnia illius esse 2),](Seneca, *Epistulae Morales*); when the Apostle admonishes the members of the body of Christ not to quarrel with each other but to help one another complementarily (12:20 ff.), the philosopher asks: "What if the hands wanted to harm the feet? What if the eyes wanted to harm the hands? Just as all the members of the body agree with each other because the preservation of the whole is in their interest, so people will spare individuals because we are born to be together" (Seneca, *Epistulae Morales*) [quid si nocere velint manus pedibus? manibus oculi? uf omnia inter se membra consentiunt, quia singula servari totius interest, ita homines singulis parcent, quia ad coetum geniti sumus 3).] Even the magnificent hymn to love in chapter 13 has its parallel, not only in Plato's description of Eros, who is neither insulted nor insults, who is stronger than Ares, ruling him and all others, who is wise and master of all arts, who bestows gentleness and dispels wildness, the founder of goodwill, the preventer of ill-will, whose magnificent song softens the minds of all gods and men 4) (Plato, *Symposium*), but also in what Seneca says about humanity, humanitas: "Humanity forbids being arrogant towards companions,... considers no misfortune as alien, but rather views one's own good as that which will benefit someone else the most, and loves it" (Seneca, *Epistulae Morales*). [der humanitas. Humanitas vetat superbum esse adversus socios, ... nullum alienum malum putat, bouum autem suum id maxime, quod alicui bono futurum est, amat 5).]

3) Fragment of Bei Lactantius, divin. he insists book 6. 25

4) Epist. 41.

5) Epist. 78

6) Epist. 47.

1) de beneficiis III. 20.

2) de benef. VII. 8.

3) de ira II. 31.

4) Symposion, p. 196. 197 translated by Schleiermacher.

5) Epist. 88.

255

The second letter to the Corinthians refers to the body as a tent-house that will soon be taken down (5:1ff.)—similar to Seneca's notion that the body is not a home but a temporary lodging ("nec domum esse hoc corpus, sed hospitium" 6)). Paul forbids association with unbelievers because light has no fellowship with darkness (6:14) and advises not even eating with a sinning brother (1 Cor. 5:11)—reminiscent of Seneca's recommendation of Crates' principle: "beware and take careful heed not to converse with a wicked man" ("cave et diligenter attende, ne cum malo homine loquaris") 7). The Apostle is willing to sacrifice himself for his Corinthians (12:15)—just as the philosopher sees the purpose of friendship in having someone for whom he can die, someone he can follow into exile, someone whose death he can face and devote himself to ("ut habeam pro quo mori possim, ut habeam quem in exilium sequar, cuius me morti opponam et impendam") 1). The word "impendere" directly translates to the Greek "δαπανάν," which Paul uses. The depiction of the sufferings and dangers endured by the Apostle in 11:23-28, a favorite theme of the Corinthian letters (1 Cor. 4:9-13, 2 Cor. 4:7-11), does not align well with what we know of his life from the Acts of the Apostles but fits better with similar lists found in contemporary writings. For instance, as B. Bauer2), following Abraham Scultetus, notes in the fourth (alleged) letter of Heraclitus to Hermodorus from the first century AD, it also resembles Seneca's similar accounts. Seneca says, for example, of the wise man: "so the wise man is an expert in overcoming evils. Pain, poverty, disgrace, prison, exile, and all other dreadful things, when they reach him, become mild," and: "what then, you ask: death, chains, fire, and other weapons of fortune will not be feared? No: for he knows that they are not evils but appear to be, he considers all these terrors of human life as mere phantasms." [sic sapiens est artifex doma'ndi mala. Dolor, egestas, ignominia, carcer, exilium, et ubicunque horrenda, cum ad hunc pervenere, mansueta sunt, und: quid ergo inquis: mortem, vincula, ignes, alia tela fortunae non timebit? Non: seit enim illa non esse mala, sed videri, omnia ista humanae vitae formidines putat. Describe captivitatem, verbera, catenas, egestatem et membrorum lacerationes vel per morbum vel per injuriam: et quidquid aliud attuleris inter lymphaticos metus numerat3).] This passage strongly reminds one of Romans 8:35: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?" suggesting that the similarity is hardly coincidental.

6) Epist. 120.

7) Epist. 10.

1) Epist. 9

2) Christus und die Caesaren S. 53.

3) Epist. 85.

256

Finally, in the letter to the Galatians, the image is used in 2:19 that the Christian is crucified with Christ, an image that reverberates frequently in the admonition to crucify the flesh and in the awareness of being crucified to the world (5:24, 6:14, Rom. 6:6). This image naturally originates from the death fate of Jesus, which is reflected in his community. And yet, Seneca also knows this image, though in a slightly different sense, when he says of those who strive for virtue: "those who examine themselves are torn by as many crosses as they have desires" ("hi qui in se ipsos animadvertunt, quot cupiditatibus tot crucibus distrahuntur").1) And the Apostle's admonition: "bear one another's burdens" (6:2) is also derived from the philosopher's principle: "man is born for mutual assistance" ("homo in adjutorium mutuum generatus est").2) Even when Paul declares that salvation through faith alone is incompatible with the observance of Jewish ordinances and fears that he has labored in vain over the Galatians who have begun to observe days and months and seasons and years, he finds a like-minded spirit in the philosopher, who rejects external religious practices and bases worship solely on knowledge, saying: "let us forbid anyone to light a lamp on the Sabbath, for neither do the gods need light nor do men delight in soot; let us ban morning greetings and sitting at the doors of temples: human ambition is captured by these duties. He worships God who knows Him" ("accendere aliquem lucernam sabbathis prohibeamus, quoniam nec lumine dii egent et ne homines quidem delectantur fuligine, vetemus salutationibus matutinis fungi, et foribus assidere templorum: humana ambitio istis officiis capitur. Deum colit, qui novit") 3).--

1) de vita beata 19.

2) de ira I. 5.

3) Epist. 95, 47.

From this series of parallels between the main Pauline epistles—later letters offer just as many—and the writings of Seneca, one can conclude that it is highly probable that one writer knew the other. It is possible to assume for some cases that both, as relatively close contemporaries, independently arrived at the same thoughts, expressions, and images. It cannot be denied that the literary products of an era, even when far apart, must necessarily share a certain similarity, as a particular way of thinking and expression becomes the common expression for the entire period's consciousness. We have found similar metaphorical comparisons in Paul, Philo, and again in Seneca, such as the image of the athlete, the temple of God within us, and the concept of inner freedom amidst external slavery, where each writer could arrive at the literary use we encounter through their observation of daily life. In these cases, the use each makes of the same literary device is unique to them. However, there are also instances of such coincidence in the incidental details that the idea that the later writer absorbed these impressions from the earlier one’s reading constantly reasserts itself. Of course, even in this case, there is no question of slavish dependence. As we have seen with Philo, it is even more pronounced with Seneca: despite all the similarities and occasional direct verbal

overlaps, there remains a fundamental difference between the philosopher's writings and the New Testament, and this difference overwhelmingly favors the latter. There, we find rhetoric that often has a chilly, hollow feel; here, we have the language of religion with its concrete relationships and historical background. There, we have the mature, almost overripe fruit of a worldview that has developed from Plato and the Stoics; here, the burgeoning, advancing life of a new attitude that holds the future. Thus, in our sense, there can be no question of deriving and explaining the new Christian perspective solely from Philo and Seneca; such a view would decidedly contradict the facts. What really emerges is only that the two sets of ideas do not diverge entirely but overlap partially, that one has absorbed the ideas and literary devices of the other and now uses them in its own way—an occurrence that is neither unnatural nor offensive for either party but rather represents a rule of historical development. For instance, Schiller, in his poems, has many reminiscences of expressions and images that belong to Albrecht von Haller, without his poetic fame suffering any loss. Of course, those who wish to meticulously separate Christianity from all other historical phenomena and deny any foreign influence on its origin or development will dispute the applicability of this rule in our case. However, these are non-scientific reasons hindering this acknowledgment, and it would be an unnecessary attempt to engage with them for those who, alongside the divine origin of Christianity, recognize its historical preparation and mediation, considering all related contemporary phenomena as factors in this latter aspect.

259

Which of the two sets of ideas preceded the other is a question that should yield a clearer answer. The possibility that Seneca drew from the Pauline letters can hardly be asserted given the available evidence. While the latest researcher on the subject, Johannes Kreyher, concluded that Seneca was a secret Christian, which would explain his close connections to the New Testament and specifically to the Pauline letters, this faces too many obstacles. Firstly, Seneca's philosophy is quite different from Christianity, and the numerous parallels drawn from his writings exhibit a character distinct from their corresponding New Testament expressions. There is no need to delve into this difference further, as external reasons alone make Kreyher's assumption untenable. When could Seneca have become familiar with the Pauline letters? Seneca died in 65 AD, and his works, of course, date back several decades. At that time, even if one considers all the Pauline letters to be authentic, they were certainly not yet so widely known and disseminated that someone like Seneca could have absorbed and reproduced them. According to the usual assumption, the letters were in the hands of the communities to which they were addressed and only later became known even to the Roman Christians. However, among the minor letters, several, if not all, are products of later Paulinism. Therefore, if Seneca, as Kreyher1) suggests, also used the Epistle to the Ephesians, this is an impossible assumption if this letter does not belong to the Apostle's lifetime. Furthermore, Kreyher claims that Seneca also knew the Gospels, including that of Luke2). This, however, certainly did not come into existence before the end of the first century. Hence, the whole assumption is only plausible if everything scientific research has established about the New Testament's origins is disregarded, and its results are too well-founded in some points to be dismissed without further ado for the sake of a hypothesis that otherwise encounters difficulties everywhere. Kreyher also has to date all of Seneca's writings as late as possible3) to make room for an acquaintance between

Seneca and Paul, against the judgment of the most qualified researchers in this field. Despite all his efforts, he has to acknowledge that five of Seneca's works predate any possible acquaintance with Paul. Among these is "De Ira," from which Kreyher repeatedly draws evidence for Seneca's familiarity with the Pauline letters. On the other hand, he tries to place Paul's arrival in Rome as early as possible, again contrary to the scientific findings on this matter and the New Testament's testimony. He suggests it occurred in 58 or preferably 57 AD.1) Until now, it has been believed that the date 62 or at the earliest 61 for this arrival was relatively certain. It turns out that the change of procurators in Judea from Felix to Festus, mentioned in Acts 24:27, took place in 60 (or more likely 61), as convincingly demonstrated by Wieseler, Anger, and others long ago. Not later, because when Felix was dismissed by the Emperor at the Jews' complaints and summoned to Rome for accountability, he managed to avoid punishment through the intercession of his brother Pallas, a former favorite of Claudius who also wielded influence with Nero initially. Pallas, however, died in 62, presumably poisoned by Nero. That same year, Burrus, the Praetorian Prefect, also died. He seems to be the one referred to in Acts 28:16 (in the Textus Receptus), where the centurion handed over the prisoners to the "stratopedarch," the Praetorian Prefect. After Burrus' death, two Praetorian Prefects were appointed, so the singular term used indicates Burrus, suggesting the year 62 as the latest date for Paul's arrival in Rome. One should not, however, place this arrival much earlier. Felix began his term around 52 AD, had a significant and eventful tenure, and was only recalled around the end of the decade, likely in 60 or 61 AD. This is also supported by Josephus, the Jewish historian, who recounts (Vita § 3) that after his 26th year, he traveled to Rome to intercede for some priests whom Felix had sent to Rome for trial. Josephus was born in the first year of Emperor Caius (37 AD), making his trip in 63 AD. In Rome, he received assistance from a Jewish actor, Alityrus, and through him, met Poppaea, the Emperor's wife, whose help secured the priests' release. Poppaea became Nero's wife in 62, corroborating the timeline. Josephus likely undertook his journey shortly after Felix's departure, making 61 AD the most probable year for this event. Therefore, the reliable sources collectively point to the year 61 or at the earliest 60 for the change between Felix and Festus.1) According to Acts, Paul left Caesarea before autumn since he was in Crete around the Day of Atonement (27:9), wintered in Malta after the shipwreck, and arrived in Puteoli and Rome in the spring. This fits best for the year 62 AD. Acts concludes by stating Paul remained in Rome under mild custody for two years, suggesting his death followed shortly after. This aligns with the likelihood of his death during Nero's persecution of Christians in the summer of 64 AD, fitting well if Felix's departure is set in 61. If Kreyher2) argues that critical scholars favor this date only to preclude Paul's release and thus the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, this is a misjudgment. The date aligns best with Acts and thus deserves preference.

1) a. a. O. p. 90. 91.

2) a. a. O. p. 78—81.

3) a. a. O. p. 112—123.

1) a. a. O. p. 124—127.

1) See the commentaries on Acts, and also in particular Schürer, Lehrb. der neutest. Zeitgesch. 1st ed. p. 303. 308 Note and Overbeck in Schenkel's Bibellexikon, Art. Felix and Festus.

2) a. a. O. p. 127.

If it is the case that Paul only arrived in Rome in the spring of 62 AD, then any influence he might have had on Seneca, reflected in Seneca's writings, is no longer a consideration. Instead, the only remaining assumption is the reverse: the parallels between Paul and Seneca, insofar as they go beyond a certain similarity of ideas, can be explained by the familiarity of the author of the Pauline letters with the writings of the Roman philosopher. This view has been put forward by Bruno Bauer. If the Pauline letters are indeed all of later origin, there is nothing to prevent the assumption that their authors were acquainted with Seneca's works. This becomes even more likely if we consider that, in this case, Rome must certainly be regarded as the place of their composition.

Kreyher1) presents the following counterargument to this assumption: "It will hardly be regarded as more than a curiosity. Aside from the fact that biblical theology is an organic and consistent whole, in which the ideas in question are necessary parts that cannot have been borrowed from elsewhere, and that the Oriental authors of the New Testament were not literati capable of and willing to embellish their works with borrowings from classics, especially Latin ones, one would also have to find our philosopher in the Old Testament, which would astonish even the most advanced critics."

1) a. a. O. p. 98.

All this is of no relevance. As for the last point, Kreyher has indeed provided several passages from Seneca that are supposed to be related to the Old Testament.2) However, upon closer inspection, they reveal little more than some resonances with biblical theology and anthropology, which are naturally to be expected given Seneca's monotheistic standpoint and stoic morals. If there were indeed any literary connections (which seems most likely in the case of the saying "break your bread for the hungry" from Isaiah 58:7, compared with Seneca Epistle 95,51), it would be reasonable to attribute to Seneca some familiarity with certain words from the Old Testament, widely disseminated in its Alexandrian translation. The reverse relationship is, of course, out of the question. In Rome, where there was a large Jewish colony, Seneca could have learned about Jewish teachings and customs quite well. In fact, the same 95th letter from which the above passage is taken shows some familiarity with the Jewish custom of lighting lamps on the Sabbath. The term "sabbata" itself points to Judaism.

The assertion that the New Testament writers were not "literary figures" who would embellish their works with quotations from classical authors is outright incorrect. While they may not have been "literary figures," they did occasionally use a fitting quotation from literature known to them.

For instance, Paul cites the verse from Aratus, "For we are also his offspring," in Acts 17:28, and in the Pauline epistles, we find the iambs of Menander in 1 Corinthians 15:33, "Evil communications corrupt good manners," and the hexameter of Epimenides in Titus 1:12, "Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, lazy gluttons." Why should they not also owe some phrases to their familiarity with Seneca? The assumption that they were "oriental authors" is just that—a presumption. A whole series of New Testament writings were very likely composed in Rome, even though they were written in Greek. Greek was, after all, the language spoken and written by the earliest Christians, even in Rome. Moreover, the coherence of biblical, especially New Testament, theology is also only a postulate. The question remains whether this theology, with all its independence, developed so isolated from the rest of the world that it could not have absorbed inspirations and influences from contemporary thought. Seneca's moral system is, in its own way, a much more coherent whole than the theology of the New Testament, which develops in such diverse doctrinal concepts. In short, the objections raised have no basis, and Kreyher's view is, due to its flimsy chronological foundation, much more of a "curiosity" than the opposing view, which we shall leave as it stands.

2) a. a. O. pp. 72-75.

In this entire chapter, we have mainly compiled what others have already contributed about the connections of the Pauline letters with other contemporary literary works, adding only a few of our own observations. This indicates that the relationship at hand has been partially recognized for a long time and from various perspectives but has not yet been properly utilized. Indeed, the results of examining Old Testament citations as well as the interactions with non-canonical writings all suggest that our letters show a kinship with literary phenomena of the first century. This makes it highly likely that they were written more towards the end of that century rather than its middle, if not at the beginning of the second century. The next step is to gather further data that can guide us to the true time of composition of our letters.

265

Fourth chapter.

Some features of later writing.

If the main Pauline letters were not written by the Apostle himself but only in his name, they would generally adhere to the situation they are set in and express themselves as he might have. However, based on the examples we have of such pseudepigraphic literature, we must expect that here and there the veil will be lifted, revealing a different time and circumstances than those supposed. Thus, the question arises whether we encounter ideas or conditions in our letters that, according to what we otherwise know or must at least assume based on historical probability, do not belong to Paul's time but to a later period.

266

A passage that, in our perception, almost screams that it assumes conditions of a later time, and one that we can only wonder has not been much more noticed than it has been, is 1 Cor. 15:29. Among the arguments for the resurrection of the dead, the custom of being baptized for the dead is mentioned. This custom would be senseless if the dead were not to be resurrected. Thus, the full conclusion must be that there must be a resurrection of the dead, for this custom shows that it is generally acknowledged. The words are: ἐπεί τι ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν; εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν; Here, the practice of being baptized on behalf of the dead is assumed to be existing and generally known, such as children being baptized for their already deceased parents to gain participation in the future messianic salvation expected at the Lord’s Parousia. This is a vicarious baptism through which deceased individuals are incorporated into the Christian community. This concept is so striking for the apostolic time that it is understandable why exegetes from ancient times have tried to interpret it away from the words here. Reviewing the collection of views, for example, in Meyer’s exegetical handbook on the passage, one is truly astonished by the variety of proposed explanations. Epiphanius, followed by Calvin, explained the passage as referring to the baptism of the sick, asserting that "the dead" were actually the dying who had themselves baptized in anticipation of their imminent death. But ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν can hardly mean that. Chrysostom and others interpret νεκροί as "bodies," understanding baptism in reference to the belief in the resurrection of the dead. This too is a misinterpretation. Luther and later interpreters at least mitigate the meaning, suggesting it was not for the dead, but over their graves that people were baptized to strengthen belief in the resurrection. But ὑπὲρ in the sense of "over" does not occur in the New Testament, and baptism in the apostolic age was known to be performed by immersion in water, in rivers, or the sea. We can disregard many of the even more peculiar explanations and reinterpretations by modern scholars. The sentence can only mean what was mentioned above. But how this meaning could be possible in the supposed time setting of the first Corinthians letter is not clear, and this doubt has given rise to all the other interpretative attempts. To suggest that this was a later practice declared a misuse and retained only by heretics, as Meyer-Heinrici1) suggests, is hard to believe. Misuses arise later and do not start at

the beginning. It can be shown, however, that this practice existed in the second century among sects, especially those with an ethnicizing direction. Chrysostom testifies to it among the Marcionites, Epiphanius among the Cerinthians, and Tertullian also knows of this custom. It was a practice later particularly found in Gnostic circles and must have existed for some time among certain Christian directions when the first Corinthians letter was written. The way it is mentioned, in the third person, τι ποιήσουσιν, τι βαπτίζονται, not in the first person that reappears in v. 30 with καὶ ἡμεῖς, shows that the author did not practice this custom himself and that it was not common in his circles. Thus, the whole thing is a view of a practice existing in certain church communities, cited here because of the firm belief in the resurrection it implies, neither recommended nor criticized, but simply stated as a fact. However, the idea that such a practice could already belong to the early Christian period, that it was already well-known to the Corinthian community, which Paul had founded just five years before the letter was written, is truly hard to believe. We are more likely to recognize here an anachronism in which the second-century author falls, projecting contemporary phenomena back into the early days. The only other possible explanation would be that this note was later inserted into the letter. But such an assumption would be purely arbitrary and would altogether deprive us of any possibility of critical judgment. If we can simply declare any passage that contains an unwelcome indication as an interpolation, then indeed, criticism is disarmed, but through a method that judges itself. The passage in v. 29 is so closely connected with v. 30 that it cannot be eliminated, and the usage of ἐπεί (cf. Rom. 3:6, 1 Cor. 14:16) as well as τί καί (cf. Rom. 8:24) is entirely in keeping with the main letters. If, however, the passage belongs in the first Corinthians letter, it must be recognized that it can only be understood under the presumption of a later time and its conditions.

1) a. a. O. — So also Holsten, Evg. des Paulus p. 423.

Similar anachronisms are found in this letter, which contains the most concrete details from the community life. In the instructions about marital relations that fill chapter 7, there is not a particularly high conception of marriage. The principle is established that, to avoid fornication, everyone should have their own spouse, and it is better to marry than to burn with passion (v. 2, 7). Only regarding divorce does the Apostle have an explicit command from the Lord, which is the same prohibition against it found in our Gospels and mentioned earlier. Mixed marriages are allowed since the Christian spouse can save the non-Christian one (v. 16). Generally, everyone should remain in the state they were in when called, for the time is short, and the end is near (v. 20, 29). Finally, there is guidance on virgins, stating that one who marries them does well, but one who does not marry them does better (v. 38). It is particularly striking that in v. 37, the decision to avoid marriage is discussed as if it pertains solely to one's own will, while the context clearly concerns a father's consent to his daughter's marriage. It says in v. 36: If anyone thinks it is not proper for his virgin, if she is past her prime and it must be so, let him do what he wants, he does not sin, let them marry. But he who stands firm in his heart, having no necessity, but has control over his own will and has decided in his heart to keep his own virgin, he does well. Interpreting "to keep his own virgin" as referring to his daughter hardly fits the expression, for the daughter's will should also matter, and the firm decision should be hers, not someone else's.

Therefore, it is understandable that the ancients like Methodius and Epiphanius understood it as referring to the preservation of one's own virginity as an unmarried man. "To keep his own virgin" should be understood as maintaining one's own virginity, similar to the use in Revelation 14:4 and in the language of the Church Fathers, who refer to virginity. This fits better with the plural in "let them marry" in v. 36, which is awkward if understood to mean just the virgin and her suitor. Holsten1) has provided a very noteworthy explanation of this entire passage, suggesting that a later addition might have intruded into the text, although it is no longer possible to cleanly separate it. This is one possible explanation. Another is that in this entire discussion, we are not dealing with the historical Paul but a representative of views that soon gained traction in Christendom, an asceticism reflected in Matthew 19:11–12, which neither Mark nor Luke mentions. Whatever the case, it is certainly possible to agree with the insightful interpreter of the Pauline main letters when he says: "In any case, these words deserve more attention than they have received from exegesis so far." Moreover, the instructions on marriage in this chapter are presented as universally binding norms: "This is what I command in all the churches," it says in v. 17. The thought that the Apostle had already established a unified Christian marital legislation in the communities of Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Achaea is hard to accept. Only after community life had existed for decades could the need arise to issue uniform regulations on such matters.

1) Evg. of Paul p. 305 ff. Note

This marital legislation is evidently also connected with the case discussed with such terrible seriousness in chapter 5, namely that someone had his father's wife. We are not told whether he had her while his father was still alive or after his death, whether he married her, or if he was in an illicit relationship with her. The latter is unlikely since the case was obviously flagrant, suggesting that the individual in question considered the relationship legitimate. In this case, it would be about marrying the stepmother, the wife of the still-living or deceased father. Such a union was strictly forbidden by Jewish law (Lev. 18:8), but some have not unjustly drawn upon the rabbinic principle that conversion to Judaism annuls such familial relationships. Similar convenience in dispensation might have been sought by some upon converting to Christianity. Our passage seems to set a decisive prohibition against any marriage with a stepmother. The case itself is likely hypothetical. The apostle's proposed procedure with this offender is unclear. He intends to deliver him to Satan in a community assembly, absent in body but present in spirit, through the punitive prayer of the Lord (v. 3, 4). He would need to set a specific day for the Corinthians, as, without the benefit of an electric telegraph, they could not know when this spiritual action from Ephesus to Corinth should occur, to which they were to gather.1) The situation is further complicated by the readdressing of the same case in the second letter to the Corinthians, where the one who caused sorrow and should now receive forgiveness after punishment (2 Cor. 2:5–11) and possibly also the one who did wrong (7:12) might refer back to this case. But if the earlier punishment was perplexing, this unexpected leniency is even more so. Instead of the delivery to Satan for the destruction of the flesh to save the soul, the apostle is satisfied with a public rebuke by the community. It looks very much like a retreat. Overall, this gives the impression of a later composition aimed firstly at emphasizing the prohibition of

marriages within forbidden degrees of kinship and secondly at providing guidance on dealing with penitents.

1) B. Bauer, Critique of the Pauline Letters. 2nd part, p. 35.

271

Even the opening theme of the first letter, the factions in Corinth, is far from being as transparent and understandable as it is commonly regarded. The three parties of Paul, Apollos, and Cephas can be conceived, but the fourth, the so-called Christ party, has not become clear despite all the discussions and extensive literature on the subject. Whether these Christians were extreme Jewish Christians or not, whether they boasted of their familial connection with Christ, whether they represented enthusiastic tendencies or, conversely, ultra-conservative ones, all this remains unknown. One can even doubt whether such a Christ party ever existed at all, or whether the phrase "I belong to Christ" (1:12) rather expressed the apostle's own stance that he belonged to Christ alone in contrast to the factions dedicated to human leaders.1) If a party is indeed meant, then the closest assumption, with Baur2), is to connect it with the "belonging to Christ" mentioned in 2 Corinthians 10:7 and, following the explanation given in 2 Corinthians 11:18–23, to understand it as the party of the original apostles. But this is by no means certain. What can be gathered about Apollos from the Corinthian letters does not go significantly beyond what we learn about him in Acts 18:24–28, and the Cephas party in Corinth is also questionable since it must have arisen merely from the name. All of this gives the impression that the factions might be described merely schematically, using well-known names from the apostolic era, and the overall purpose could be a general warning against church divisions, as they were so prevalent in the later period.

1) As Räbiger has recently reaffirmed in his critical investigations on the content of the two letters of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthian community, 2nd edition, 1886.

2) Paulus, 2nd edition, vol. 1, pp. 291 ff.

272

Similar reminiscences also seem to be found in the reports in 1 Corinthians 9:1–6 about the travels of the apostles, the brothers of Jesus, and Cephas with their wives, as well as the practice shared only by Barnabas and the Apostle of supporting themselves through their own labor. One is particularly surprised to hear of such missionary journeys by the brothers of the Lord, who, as nationally-minded Jews, are not easily separated from Palestine. This recalls the reading in Galatians 2:12, "when (James) came," found in codices xBD and in Origen, and the coming of Peter to Antioch, thus the seed of the later widely developed *περίοδοι Πέτρου* (Journeys of Peter), which we already used to help explain Galatians 2:11 in our discussion of the letter to the Galatians. Regarding Barnabas, some commentators find his mention in Galatians 2:13 strange, since he was not personally known to the Galatians, at least in the narrower sense, and this serves as a reason to assume that the reference must be to the communities founded on the first missionary journey in the province of Galatia. Opponents of

this view point to 1 Corinthians 9:6. The Corinthians were just as unfamiliar with Barnabas as the Galatians, yet Paul speaks to them of him. Thus, it is only consistent that, for the same reason that some find the mention of Barnabas in Galatians questionable, B. Bauer1) finds it odd in 1 Corinthians and concludes that the author is simply listing well-known names from the apostolic era.

1) a. a. O. P. 53. - P. above p. 32

273

The practice, for which Barnabas is mentioned alongside Paul as a witness, namely that these two never accepted payment from the congregations but supported themselves through their own labor, is such a favored topic in the Pauline letters that we encounter discussions of it not only here but also in 2 Corinthians 11:7–9, 12:13, Philippians 4:10–17, and 1 Thessalonians 2:9. It is a topic that the Apostle himself would hardly have spoken about so much. If he lived as simply as told in Acts 18:3 and then highlighted a bit rhetorically in the farewell speech to the elders of Ephesus in Acts 20:33–34, he certainly had the sensitivity not to keep bringing it up, even if his opponents might have viewed it differently. The extensive and deliberate treatment of this theme suggests that later Christianity had an interest in having the issue of teachers' support by the congregations regulated by apostolic authority. All these discussions emphasize the right to this support, with the Apostle's self-denying example serving merely as a backdrop. It has recently become particularly clear through the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles"1) how earnestly this issue was addressed in the second century.

1) Didache 11, 2. 4: 6. 12, 3. 13, 1. 2. 3.

274

This also connects with the issue of the collection, another favorite topic of the principal letters, as it is addressed in all of them without exception (Romans 15:25–28, 1 Corinthians 16:1, 2 Corinthians 8 and 9, Galatians 2:10). Here, too, a feature passed down by Acts (Acts 11:28, 24:17) seems to have later gained such importance that it could not be discussed enough. It was a major argument for the Pauline communities in their struggle with the later-emerging Judaism that they could refer to these contributions and thereby somewhat declare themselves equal to the original bearers of the gospel.

Finally, two minor points. The discussion in 1 Corinthians 11:1–16 about men praying with uncovered heads and women with covered heads is hardly comprehensible as being written by a Jewish-born person. The Jew prays with a covered head, as is common in the Orient, and it is not clear why Paul would have deviated from this custom. The idea that a man should stand before God with an uncovered head is rather Greek and seems to have formed the custom in the Gentile Christian communities. The focus here is on the veiling of the woman, and the Jewish custom imposes itself on the Gentile Christian communities because the opposite seemed improper. This is the crux of the matter. However, the instruction in verse 10 that a woman must have "authority" on her head, probably a sign of subjection, because of the

angels—presumably so they would not be tempted when looking down on those praying—is so peculiar that we understand it more easily if it was not the apostle himself but a later figure behind it. In the letter to the Romans, though only in its final chapter, the institution of female deacons already appears. Phoebe, who is commended in 16:1, is a διάκονος of the church in Cenchreae, thus an employee serving a congregation. A female διάκονος is mentioned in the New Testament only perhaps in 1 Timothy 3:11, if that does not refer to the wives of deacons. Such female deacons—later called deaconesses—are otherwise first heard of in the second century, particularly in the famous letter of Pliny to Trajan1), where two ancillae, quae ministrae dicebantur, are mentioned. It is possible that the institution already existed in apostolic times, but why is there no other mention of it? The testimony of the pastoral letters is more of a suspect point, as they also belong to the second century. At least Lucht, in his studies of the last two chapters of Romans, finds that this designation of Phoebe surely points to a later time2), while Volkmar3) sees no issue with it and uses Romans 16:1–2 as his authentic conclusion of the letter. The matter is certainly not easily settled, but given the uncertain nature of these concluding chapters of Romans, anyone is free to consider this part alone as an addition from a later period.

1) Pliny, Epist. X. 97.

2) S. Mangold, The Epistle to the Romans etc. 1884. p. 140.

3) Epistle to the Romans, p. 137.

275

However, these are details that, while capable of drawing attention, are not sufficient to constitute proof on their own. There is still a main point to discuss, which forms an integral element of the system of the principal letters and whose significance no one will dispute, namely, Christology.

276

Pauline Christology takes on a somewhat different form depending on whether it is presented solely based on the main letters or by also including the later letters. In the Prison Epistles, the divine aspect of Christ's person and work is increasingly developed, and features are added that make His significance appear even cosmic. However, this aspect is not entirely absent in the main letters. Christ is described not only as a human descendant of David and Messiah but also as the Son of God, depicted as a superhuman, godlike being. This new and higher existence indeed originates from His resurrection, following the same path by which the Christ image in the Acts of the Apostles ascends from the man of God, mighty in word and deed, to the exalted judge of the living and the dead. But the Christology of the main letters adds a crucial new element. Jesus did not just become the exalted Savior of glory after His earthly life; He already was this before, with the post-existence in divine glory being joined by pre-existence in the same form. That the Pauline main letters contain this doctrine of pre-existence can nowadays be considered established. Passages such as 1 Corinthians 15:47 ("the second man is from

heaven"), 2 Corinthians 8:9 ("though He was rich, yet for your sake He became poor"), 1 Corinthians 8:6 ("Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through Him"), Romans 5:14 (Adam "who is a type of the one who was to come"), and 2 Corinthians 4:4 (Christ "who is the image of God") leave no doubt. Therefore, one can agree with Biedermann1) when he says, "One should no longer try to explain away the pre-existence of Christ from the Pauline letters — we are dealing primarily with the four main letters —" and call it a whim when Beyschlag, in his Christology of the New Testament, refuses to understand the well-known passage about Christ's self-emptying in Philippians 2 in terms of Christ's pre-existence. Similarly, when de Wette1), in his explanation of 2 Corinthians 8:9, interprets "He became poor though He was rich" as referring to Christ's historical life and the renunciation of His inherent power to acquire worldly wealth and dominion, it can only be considered a historical memory. For this, reference can be made to the well-known presentations of New Testament theology by B. Weiss and the Pauline theology by Pfleiderer, who, despite starting from very different perspectives, agree on the result that Paul already had a highly developed conception of the person of Christ, which in many respects borders on the highest New Testament understanding of the same, the Johannine one.

1) Christian Dogmatics 1st edition, p. 237.

1) In the exegetical handbook 3rd edition, p. 239.

It is quite natural that the progressive development of the doctrine of Christ's person had to and did make this step towards pre-existence. Initially, Jesus was understood in His historical manifestation by the circle of disciples. To this understanding was naturally added His resurrection life, after the belief in the resurrected one had become the driving force behind the formation of the Church. From this point, the idea had to reach back to the existence Christ had with the Father before His appearance on earth. For such an existence in divine glory, as befitted the resurrected one, naturally suggested that a similar state existed before His earthly life. Christ, as the resurrected one, had shown Himself only as He truly was and as He had only temporarily ceased to be during His earthly life. Therefore, He must have existed in divine glory even before. Simultaneously, His coming to earth had to be understood as an act of the Father, who sent the Son from heaven to earth, thus as a descent to fulfill the divine plan of salvation, which again presupposed heavenly pre-existence. It was thus quite natural that the next step in the formation of Christological doctrine led to pre-existence. What needed to follow was then the determination of the relationship in which the pre-existent Christ stood to the Father and the further motivation for His assumption of humanity. In Paul's writings, we find only the beginnings of both; it is John who articulates the definitive concept in the idea of the Logos and in the statement derived from it, "the Word became flesh" (John 1:14). The ultimate consequence of this development, which led to the Gnostic movement's logical yet heretical (as declared by the Church) continuation, was that the Christological arc, extending both forward and backward, ultimately lifted the peg of Jesus' human personality out of the earth and the entire Christ became an overhuman being.

The main Pauline letters stand at the point in this progression where, in addition to Christ's resurrection life in heavenly glory, His existence in this glory before His earthly life is also included. When it is said in the cited passages that Christ is the counterpart of the first man, the second Adam, and while the first man was from the earth and made of earthly material, the second is from heaven, it implies that Christ was also in heaven and of a heavenly nature before He came down to earth. And when it is said that He became poor for your sake, although He was rich, it already encapsulates the transition from pre-human to human existence in a similar way to the famous kenosis passage in the letter to the Philippians. That Christ in His pre-human existence extends further back than the existence of the world and that He was the agent of creation will also be difficult to interpret away from the above-cited words of the first letter to the Corinthians, "by whom are all things." Thus, it also applies to His earlier, not only His later, form of existence, that He is the image of God, as the second letter to the Corinthians calls Him. The passage often cited here, 1 Corinthians 10:4, which speaks of Christ as the spiritual rock from which God's people drank during their journey through the wilderness, would not alone necessitate the assumption of pre-existence. It could, considering the figurative nature of the entire passage, be understood as referring to the pre-existence of the principle of salvation in the old covenant. However, taken together with the other passages, it becomes more comprehensible when understood in the literal sense, i.e., assuming that Christ is already thought of as a pre-existent person at the time of the old covenant and engaged in His salvific activity.

279

However, it should not be denied that Pauline Christology still holds to the subordination of the Son to the Father. Passages like 1 Corinthians 3:23, "You are of Christ, and Christ is of God," 11:3, "The head of every man is Christ ... and the head of Christ is God," and the concept in 1 Corinthians 15:28 that at the end, Christ, after all things have been subjected to Him, will also subject Himself to God, so that God may be all in all, clearly express this. The strong emphasis on the distinction between the "Son of David according to the flesh" and the "Son of God declared with power by the resurrection from the dead" in Romans 1:3-4 shows that there is indeed an awareness of the difference between the human appearance of the Messiah and His subsequent divine glory. The question then arises regarding Paul's view on the incarnation of the Son of God, especially whether he considers Christ to have been conceived by a human father or whether this conception by the Holy Spirit is assumed, excluding a human father. Unfortunately, a completely definitive answer cannot be given due to the lack of explicit statements on this in the Pauline letters. There are only two passages from which one can roughly infer the opinion of the letters on this question, and even these do not lead to a certain result. The first is the aforementioned passage at the beginning of the letter to the Romans. If Christ is called the Son of David according to the flesh here, and His divine Sonship only appears with the resurrection from the dead, one can indeed assume that a truly human birth of Jesus is by no means incompatible with this. As a descendant of David, Jesus could have been born as the son of Joseph according to the genealogies of the Gospels. But it is not explicitly stated, and, as in the Gospels, a fatherless conception of Jesus could also be included. The other passage is Galatians 4:4, where it says that when the fullness of time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, to redeem those under the law, so that we

might receive adoption as sons. There is no doubt here that "born of a woman" can be said of any human being, and this statement, according to Old Testament (Job 14:1) and New Testament (Matthew 11:11) usage, especially in connection with the submission to the law, a predicate of lowliness, is well compatible with the idea that Jesus was the son of a human father as well as a human mother. But it should not be denied that the idea of supernatural conception can also be associated with this. Not because only the mother, not the father, is mentioned, but because the subsequent two statements are in a correlative relationship to the first two: "to redeem those under the law" forms the contrast to "born under the law," and thus "so that we might receive adoption as sons" to "born of a woman." But then the statement of human lowliness in the birth from a woman stands against the statement of divine majesty in the appointment to sonship. Christ is born of a woman so that we might be adopted as sons of God; thus, He Himself, from whom this effect emanates, is the Son of God, and this is the other half to His human birth. This brings us back to the same idea as the passage in Romans, and it still remains undecided whether Christ's appearance in humanity, alongside the natural factor of birth from a woman, does not also include the supernatural factor of conception by the Holy Spirit. The latter becomes more probable if one adds a Johannine passage, namely John 1:12-13: "To all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave the right to become children of God, who were born not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God." Here, the sonship of believers is clearly described in the same way as the sonship of Jesus is to be thought of: birth from God, not by earthly factors. This is also ambiguous. Just as believers are children of human parents but sons of God in spirit, Jesus can be thought of as the son of Joseph (John 1:46) but the Son of God in spirit. However, the expressions "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man" are set in such a way that they obviously allude to the infancy narratives of the synoptic Gospels, and one can reconcile their statement of fatherless conception of Jesus with this Johannine view. Accordingly, it becomes highly probable that, while John does not explicitly teach the miraculous birth of Jesus, he does implicitly assume it. Thus, it will be with Paul as well. Both John and Paul, through speculative exposition of Christ's divine side, offer infinitely more than what is merely stated by the supernatural birth alone. Therefore, it is understandable that this notion recedes into the background and is more left to the popular consciousness of the congregation, while doctrinal progress takes another direction. However, it is forbidden to assume that Paul did not know the whole notion because the similarity of his statements with the Johannine ones is so significant. For no one would want to claim that John, in terms of timing, could not have had knowledge of this idea.

282

If this is indeed the case, then we must say that the Pauline Christology does not particularly strike us as simple and archaic. Assuming the main letters were written between 55 and 60 AD, they should have an older character than those of the Synoptics, which almost no one dates so early, and yet the opposite is true. In the Synoptics, Jesus, despite his supernatural birth reported by Matthew and Luke, is essentially human, and the higher side of his appearance only emerges in his Messianic consciousness and the associated ability to perform miracles and signs. Specifically, there is at most a very slight trace of the pre-existence notion in answering the question of whose son the Messiah is (Mark 12:35-37 and parallels). When the answer, "the son of David," is refuted by citing Psalm 110:1, where David calls the Messiah his Lord, the idea

can hardly be that the Messiah need not come from David but rather that the Messiah is something higher than merely David's son; David already called him his Lord, so he is rather God's son, which implies that he has always been so in God's plan. However, this is only a very faint trace of the pre-existence doctrine, while otherwise, the Synoptics do not reveal a speculative view of the divine in Christ. But in Paul, the latter is the main issue, and pre-existence is already established and explicitly taught, and the chronological position of this stage of Christological development must be determined accordingly.

Judging by the usual historical standard, it is certainly very unlikely that such a developed Christology originates from a contemporary of Jesus. Those who have no difficulty attributing the Johannine Christology to a direct disciple of Jesus may judge differently, but those who do not share this view should seriously consider whether such an assumption is possible. If it is clear that the Pauline Christology lies between the Synoptic and Johannine, more inclined towards the latter, is it not forced to assume that Paul progressed so much further in development than the Synoptics who followed him? Rather, should we not recognize that the Pauline Christology is later than the Synoptic? It is argued that Paul's development took a unique course since he did not interact with Jesus personally like the other apostles but suddenly became a preacher of Christ from being a persecutor. Holsten, in particular, has emphasized this difference in his writings, describing Paul's genesis of Christian consciousness as forming his gospel purely through reflection on the basic facts of the Messiah's cross and resurrection, without historical attachment to the historical Jesus and his circle of disciples. In this scenario, a significant doctrinal leap is more understandable. However, we have already raised doubts about this view during the investigation of the Galatians letter and shown that this letter artificially constructs this development path in contrast to Acts to make the Pauline gospel entirely independent of human influences. The historical Paul likely did not develop in such isolation; reliance on the existing apostolic circle was too natural and self-evident to be completely set aside. As depicted here, Paul's development might resemble how a German professor constructs a philosophical system in his study, but this conception does not belong in the living flow of history. The detachment of Pauline Christology from tradition is rather a sign of its later origin, and the awareness of its later dating seems to be inherent in it. The statement, at least, "even though we have known Christ according to the flesh, yet now we know Him thus no longer" (2 Corinthians 5:16), is best understood to refer to the earlier external perception of the Messiah in his earthly nature, which for advanced Christians has now been replaced by Christ, who is the Lord, the Spirit (2 Corinthians 3:17). This earlier perception was shared by the historical Paul, as it was the view of his entire time. This historical Paul, who very likely, if he indeed grew up in Jerusalem (Acts 22:3), witnessed the crucifixion of Jesus and thus probably had at least a fleeting impression of his historical person, for it is entirely arbitrary to remove him from Jerusalem during Jesus' catastrophe without any evidence, just to keep him from any external contact with Jesus. The apostle of the main letters, however, completely distances himself from the historical person of Jesus; he is purely a dogmatist, and for this reason, we judge that he is not the apostle himself.

So we come to the conclusion that the Christology of the main letters only becomes understandable when one gives up the notion that it comes from a contemporary of Jesus. This impression is further strengthened and brought to a head by considering a passage that goes far beyond the other Christological statements of the Pauline letters, namely Romans 9:5: "Theirs are the patriarchs, and from them is traced the human ancestry of the Messiah, who is God over all, forever praised! Amen." We are well aware that a number of commentators translate this passage in such a way that the statement "who is God over all" does not refer to Christ but to God. For this, it is only necessary to place a period after "according to the flesh" and take "who is over all" as a relative clause preceding the subject "God." The fact that this interpretation is very common can be seen from the fact that this punctuation is also adopted by the modern editors Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, while only Westcott-Hort remain uncertain. Hence, Baur1) can say, "There should hardly be any dispute among interpreters anymore that Romans 9:5 does not call Christ God." However, the newer commentators are not entirely unanimous. While de Wette tends toward this explanation and Meyer fully supports it, and a whole series of exegetes before and after them consider it to be the only correct interpretation, among the most recent commentators, there is a tendency to return to the old church interpretation that refers to Christ. This conclusion is reached by B. Weiss2) in his revision of Meyer's handbook, and also a very thorough recent monograph by H. Schultz,3) whereas Grimm and Harmsen4) have recently defended the reference to God. In any case, the matter is still disputed. Without conducting a detailed exegetical investigation here, we can briefly formulate our judgment that, given the form of the sentence, hardly anyone would have thought of a different reference than to Christ if the content were not objectionable. It is certainly possible to justify an interpretation contrary to the grammatical structure afterward, but the impression remains that one would not have arrived at these reasons on their own. For the placement of the participial clause with the relative is unusual in doxologies, and if the sentence referred to God, then at "blessed," the verb would likely not be missing; it should read, by analogy to Romans 1:25, "is" or "be," since otherwise, a misunderstanding would be unavoidable. An entirely analogous sentence with "who is" is also found in 2 Corinthians 11:31: "The God and Father of the Lord Jesus, who is to be praised forever, knows that I am not lying," and there, "who is" refers back to the preceding subject "God." In our case, however, "Christ according to the flesh" stands first, and "who is, etc." will thus belong to it. The addition is also motivated by the preceding "according to the flesh," which, like Romans 1:3, naturally drives the corresponding contrast, the high divine dignity of Christ, which is blurred if "who is" belongs to the following. The overwhelming probability, based on the whole structure of the sentence, is thus in favor of the older interpretation, and hence it is that more rationalist commentators like Usteri and Rückert, and even de Wette either outright support it or tend toward it. But then it is certainly correct that the passage says something quite unusual about Christ, which otherwise is not found in Paul, for he is nowhere else directly called "God," at least not in the main letters. B. Weiss's remark that this concerns only the predicate "God," without the article, does not help much because even without the article, "God" is otherwise not used for Christ. It first appears in the place cited by Bretschneider in the lexicon, in Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, chapter 61, where it says of the Logos, "sometimes called Son, sometimes Wisdom, sometimes Angel, sometimes God." The latter thus already occurs here in the letter to the Romans, and in this, we recognize another element that assigns the Pauline Christology to a later time. Christ, who is

above all, God blessed forever — such words are not spoken by a witness from the first century; this word can only be understood in the post-apostolic period. Not even in the remaining content of the main letters does it find a parallel, and it thus also stands alone in these, as those who have always taken offense at it must admit. However, the section Romans 9-11 stands isolated in other ways; it has a different style than the first part (1-8) and the third part (12-14) of the letter to the Romans. It is consistently held in a somewhat rougher manner, especially in its rather external use of scripture. It may be one of the later pieces that, as will be shown, compose the main letters.

1) Paulus, II. p. 263.

2) Exegetical Handbook, 6th edition, p. 435 ff., where the literature is also cited.

3) Jahrbb. für deutsche Theol. 1868. pp. 462—506.

4) Zeitschrift für wissenschaftlichl. Theol. 1869 pp. 311—322. 1872 pp. 510—521.

Thus, the Christology, and in particular the statement in Romans 9:5, is one of the features that argue for a later date of composition for the Pauline main letters. The question now arises: is such a later date of composition possible based on what we otherwise know? Are the main letters not already so securely attested in the first century that their composition by Paul is beyond all doubt? This question requires a special investigation.

Fifth Chapter.

External Testimonies.

The question of external testimonies that can prove the existence of the main Pauline letters is naturally one of the most important questions that must be raised in the course of a critical examination like the one we have undertaken. Our reasons for the later date of composition of the main Pauline letters may otherwise be as convincing as possible, but a single reliable testimony that these letters existed in the first century would overthrow them all. Because against a genuine document that would prove this, internal criticism could not prevail. Therefore, it is necessary to seriously address this question, regardless of whether the result is desirable for us or not. On the other hand, it can also be demanded that only genuine, reliable testimonies be brought forward as evidence and that the general appeal to "unanimous church tradition" be treated for what it is worth. The estimation of this church tradition usually goes far too far, and even scholarly theologians who should know better still like to speak of this venerable testimony of church antiquity. But that is nothing other than an appeal to witnesses who are neither old nor impartial nor capable enough to decide the matter. When asked who the witnesses of this unanimous tradition of church antiquity are, one usually receives the answer: Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and such men. But all these belong only to the end of the second or the beginning of the third century, and their testimony is therefore already far too late—quite apart from everything else—to have the required weight in such questions. With full justification, Schmiedel 1) has noted: "It is necessary to amend the endlessly repeated statement that this or that New Testament writing is already attested by (for example) Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria, to say that it is first attested by these men." With Irenaeus indeed begins the period of firm canon formation; from him onward, one finds almost all the writings of the New Testament not only attested but considered inspired and used by the church as writings of the apostles and apostolic men for determining the Christian doctrine. But just because these men attribute a writing to this or that apostle, it is by no means thereby proven as authentic by external testimonies. Given a gap of more than a hundred years, they lack immediate knowledge, and indirect knowledge is always uncertain and subject to doubt, especially in an era where lack of criticism was common and pseudonymity practically the basic rule of literary production in the religious field. One should therefore not be dazzled. At first glance, the "unanimous testimony of church antiquity" seems a very impressive size, but upon closer inspection, it shrinks more and more, and in the end, it turns out to be nothing more than the opinion prevailing in Catholic church circles, as it had formed in the last decades of the second century. However, it should be clear to a Protestant, due to the teachings of their church, that this opinion is not highly valuable. Therefore, even if so much "church antiquity" claims the composition of this or that writing by this or that apostle, it is initially only a judgment that needs to be examined to see whether it stems from historical knowledge or dogmatic interests, and if the former, whether the knowledge is drawn from good sources that reach up to the fact itself. Only if this is shown with sufficient certainty according to the principles of historical research can

such a testimony be regarded as decisive. Hence, we will not be misled in our case by the church tradition that, naturally, very soon attributed the composition of the main letters to Paul. We know that the same tradition, with equal certainty, attributed not only these but also all other Pauline letters, with the sole possible exception of the Letter to the Hebrews, to the apostle. Whoever feels bound to this tradition may also accept it concerning the smaller Pauline letters and accept them all. But those who do not— and in this case, concerning one or another of the smaller letters, every researcher in this field who does not blindly follow the apologists — should also not attach too much weight to the tradition concerning the main letters. For us, it proves initially, as already said, only the opinion that had formed in church circles at the time of their first representatives, but whether this opinion was correct or not must first be determined by investigation.

1) Article Canon in Erseh and Gruber's Encyclop. p. 330, quoted in Holtzmann, Introduction 2nd ed. p. 216.

289

It is quite different, however, with the question of whether the existence of a document from a certain point in time can be securely established through external testimonies, regardless of whether the judgment associated with these testimonies about the author is justified or not. In this case, it must be conceded that if a testimony is found from which the existence of a New Testament document at the time it belongs can be derived, all grounds for doubt must be silenced. But even in this case, it must be demanded, first, that the testimony itself be sure and clear enough to refer to the document in question, and second, that the document serving as evidence is itself reliably dateable. Only when these two criteria are met can there be talk of a truly convincing external testimony. Regarding the first of the two established points, it is clear that mere similarity in thoughts and expression should not be neglected, but it should be carefully examined to determine whether it is not just a deceptive appearance. It is better to have a verbatim agreement and even better to have a formal citation that names the document and its author. As for the second point, we possess almost no dated documents from early Christianity, and very few that can be securely dated, so that in most cases we are dependent on conclusions drawn from the available evidence, which naturally always have some degree of uncertainty. Considering that absolute certainty requires the concurrence of both criteria, it becomes understandable that much less can be achieved with such external testimonies than one might think, since usually one or the other leaves something to be desired.

290

Applied to our specific case, we must therefore ask ourselves the question: since when can acquaintance with the Pauline main letters be found in other literary documents of early Christianity? In this context, we do not need to delve into the testimony present within our New Testament itself. For even if acquaintance with the Pauline main letters can be sufficiently demonstrated there, the writings that show this acquaintance are themselves not secure enough regarding their date of composition to be of decisive importance here.

For example, if the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles were dependent on the main letters, as is generally assumed, then these letters would indeed belong to the first century. For much later than the beginning of the second century, the Luke writings cannot be dated, and thus the main letters must belong to the first century. However, according to our findings above, at least the author of the Letter to the Galatians was already familiar with the Luke writings, which indicates that this letter, preceding the others by only a short period, must belong to the second century. Because the Luke writings fall into this period, not only due to their relationship to the other two synoptic Gospels but also because they know and use the works of the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus. This observation, sufficiently established by the studies of Holtzmann, Krenkel, Hausrath, Keim, and others1), provides a solid point for determining the literary relationships of our New Testament writings, which is all the more valuable due to the lack of other reliable data. Accordingly, we can take these Luke writings as the starting point. Partly contemporaneous with them or slightly earlier, but partly later, especially regarding the Letter to the Galatians, is the origin of the Pauline main letters. Following them are the smaller Pauline letters, whose dependence on the main letters is clearly evident. Even the Thessalonian letters are no exception. The Pastoral letters form the conclusion of this series, which can be considered a generally accepted view. Regarding the remaining New Testament letters, I believe that they also presuppose the Pauline main letters and have no substantial objections to the position assigned to them by the Tübingen School. Thus, the Letters of James and the First Letter of Peter will not be placed before but after Paul, while the Johannine letters, due to their relationship with the Gospel, determine themselves, and the Letters of Jude and Second Peter appear as the last creations of this type that found inclusion in our New Testament canon. Only the Letter to the Hebrews remains doubtful. In its present form, it is beyond doubt, in my opinion, that it is written in the manner of the Pauline letters and, notably through its conclusion and the mention of Timothy (13:23), aligns with the Captivity Epistles. But the question is whether this letter form was only added later, with an originally purely treatise-like composition being reworked into a letter. In the core of the Letter to the Hebrews, there are indeed clear connections with the Pauline main letters, such as the mediation of the law by angels (2:2 cf. Gal. 3:19), the expressions στοιχεῖα (5:12 cf. Gal. 4:9) and ἱλαστήριον (9:5 cf. Rom. 3:25), the image of milk and solid food (5:12-13 cf. 1 Cor. 3:2), and the citation from Deut. 32:35 in a form different from the Septuagint (10:30 cf. Rom. 12:19). However, the significance of these expressions is mostly quite different in the Letter to the Hebrews than in the Pauline main letters, and the reverse relationship of dependence is not entirely excluded. Thus, Scholten1) explains: "That the author read the Pauline letters does not become completely certain." This point is, therefore, subject to further investigation. But even if the Letter to the Hebrews presupposes the Pauline letters, as Holtzmann1) and many others assume, and which also seems more probable to me, it does not follow that these must belong to the first century. For the Letter to the Hebrews has long ceased to be generally recognized as a reliable document of this period, and the argument that it must have been written before 70 because it presupposes the existence of the Temple cult has become invalid since it was realized that not the actual Temple but the ideal scriptural image of the Tabernacle is always in the author's mind, and that the present tense in which these matters are discussed must be understood as "the present

tense of the prescription." Thus, this letter itself has become questionable as a product of the first century and receives its terminus ad quem of its time of writing only through the Letters of Barnabas and First Clement, which will be discussed later.

1) Holtzmann, in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie 1873, pp. 85–93, 1877, pp. 535–549, 1880, pp. 121–125. — Krenkel, in the same journal 1873, pp. 441–444. — Hausrath, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, 1st edition 1874, vol. III, pp. 424ff. — Keim, Aus dem Urchristentum 1878, pp. 1–27. — On the other hand, especially Schürer, in Hilgenfeld 1876, pp. 574–582, and Nösgen, Studien und Kritiken 1879, pp. 521–540. — My own examination of this question has fully confirmed and extended the view put forward by Holtzmann. I count about 40 passages in the Gospel of Luke and Acts combined that more or less certainly indicate acquaintance with Josephus.

1) Historical-critical Bijdragen, p. 95.

1) Textbook of New Testament. Introduction, 2nd edition, p. 332.

293

Finally, concerning the Apocalypse, it would indeed presuppose the Pauline Hauptbriefe according to the previously widely held view of the critical school. This would be the case if it were true that its seven letters were polemic against the Pauline direction or even if the false prophet mentioned in 13:11 ff. were aimed at the Apostle Paul himself and his teachings and followers, as Volkmar2) has assumed. However, this interpretation has recently become increasingly unlikely since, according to Volter3) and others, the seven letters are considered the latest part of the Apocalypse. This view is also accepted by others4) now. If so, all previous assumptions about the relationship to the other New Testament writings fall away, and the whole question requires thorough revision. Therefore, the Apocalypse cannot be used to prove the existence of the Pauline Hauptbriefe in the first century for the time being. The same applies to the previously discussed New Testament letters, whose dates of composition are still so uncertain that nothing definitive can be deduced from them. Their placement will instead be determined by the dating of the Hauptbriefe, so everything remains in limbo for now. Therefore, within the New Testament, external evidence for the early existence of the Pauline Hauptbriefe cannot be found.

2) Commentary on the Revelation of John, p. 205 ff.

3) The Origin of the Apocalypse, 2nd edition, p. 170 ff.

4) S. Weizsäcker, The Apostolic Age, p. 510. Pfleiderer, Early Christianity p. 318 ff. Vischer, The Revelation of Job, 8. 34.

294

We thus turn to the early Christian literature outside the canon, specifically to the writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers.

1. The First Letter of Clement

The most important among these writings is undoubtedly the so-called first letter of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians. In it, there is definitive evidence not only for the existence of two of the Pauline Hauptbriefe (main letters) but also for their acceptance at that time as letters authored by the apostle himself, specifically the first letter to the Corinthians and the letter to the Romans. Our letter contains, alongside many other clear references, (1) a literal borrowing from the letter to the Romans and (2) an explicit citation of the first letter to the Corinthians, including the author's name.

1. The borrowing is found in Chapter 35,5 1), where the author raises the question of how one can attain the promised blessings of God and responds with an exhortation to seek what is pleasing to God and to cast away all evil: "Having cast away from ourselves all unrighteousness and lawlessness, covetousness, strife, malice and deceit, whispering and backbiting, hatred of God, pride and arrogance, vanity and inhospitality." This is, with slight modifications, the list of vices of paganism as found in Romans 1:29-32, where the order of the items is so similar that it cannot be a coincidence: "filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malice; they are gossips, slanderers, haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, etc."
2. The citation is found in Chapter 47,1ff: "Take up the letter of the blessed Apostle Paul. What did he first write to you at the beginning of the Gospel? Truly, under the guidance of the Spirit, he wrote to you concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos, because even then factions had arisen among you." This refers to the topic treated in 1 Corinthians 1:12, where each one says, "I am of Paul, I am of Apollos, I am of Cephas."

Given these two examples, it is probably unnecessary to delve into the numerous other traces of knowledge of the Hauptbriefe to confirm that...

1) The text of this and the following quotations according to the edition of the Apostolic Fathers by v. Gebhardt, Harnack and Zahn, 1875—78.

1 Clem to Cor. 32:2	=	Rom 9:5
1 Clem to Cor. 34:8	=	1 Cor 2:9
1 Clem to Cor. 37:5	=	1 Cor 12:12ff
1 Clem to Cor. 49	=	I Cor 13

1 Clem to Cor. 61,1	=	Rom 13:1

...clear evidence of the author's familiarity with the Pauline Hauptbriefe, as the earlier examples provide all the certainty one can demand in such matters and place the issue beyond all doubt.

It is therefore certain that at the time the first Clement letter was written, the Pauline Hauptbriefe, specifically the Romans and the first Corinthians, were not only known but also recognized and held as authoritative letters from the Apostle. But what is this time? It cannot be directly determined from the first Clement letter itself, as it does not provide a clear reference point; rather, it must be deduced through combination and inference.

The opinion of most scholars today is that the letter was written in the last years of the first century, probably under Domitian. This view is particularly supported by the older work of Lipsius1), as well as the latest editors of the Clement letter, von Gebhardt and Harnack2), in the Prolegomena, where the proponents of this view are fully listed. The reasons for this are: the still relatively simple church constitution, the absence of Gnostic influence in the letter, the relation of the sufferings of the Roman community described in it to the Domitian persecution, and some passages that assume that contemporaries of the apostles and elders appointed by them were still alive at that time. However, these reasons are not compelling. Some of them have already been aptly refuted by Volkmar1), and more could be said against them. The simpler constitutional conditions consist in the fact that bishops and deacons are mentioned, but not yet a "bishop" in the later sense. However, this is also found in the "Didache" and in New Testament writings such as the Philippians and the First Letter of Peter, which are also dated to the second century by some scholars. The whole letter demands strong church authority and already acknowledges that there is conflict over the name of the episcopacy (44, 1). It argues for the irremovability of church officials (44, 4) and criticizes the Corinthians for dismissing proven leaders without reason. The claim that Gnosticism had not yet emerged in the West at the time of the letter is also difficult to prove. It is only true that there is no extensive polemic against Gnostic views, but it is too much to say, as von Gebhardt and Harnack do, that there is no refutation of those who teach differently. Indeed, the troublemakers in Corinth are combated from the viewpoint of church order, but their insubordination likely originated not just from character flaws but from differing views, as indicated by the example of the factions in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians mentioned in chapter 47. When it says that Paul, Cephas, and Apollos were at least attested apostles or apostolic men, whereas now the congregation is rising against the presbyters over one or two unknown persons, it suggests that factionalism and faction names indicating different standpoints had crept in again. And these difficulties must have been present not only in Corinth but also in Rome, as 7, 1 indicates that the Roman community faced the same danger and struggle. Finally, regarding the Domitian persecution of Christians, the issue is still too obscure to draw many conclusions. Later Christian writers are the first to speak of such a persecution, whereas from Dio Cassius, we only learn that Flavius Clemens, a cousin of the emperor, was executed for atheism and deviation to Jewish customs. If one listens only to the Roman sources, there was no Christian persecution under Domitian; if one listens to the Christian sources, this persecution extended far beyond Rome, as according

to Hegesipp, the grandsons of Judas, as relatives of Christ, were summoned from Palestine to Rome and questioned, and according to Eusebius, perhaps also Irenaeus, the apostle John was banished to Patmos at that time.1) In this case, one cannot say that only Rome was affected by the persecution, and the analogy with the depiction in our letter falls apart. Moreover, it is only the description in chapter 1 that presupposes persecution raged in Rome and for this reason, the community was delayed in assisting the Corinthians, among whom discord had broken out. What is heard further about persecutions in chapters 5 and 6 is so general and rhetorical that, after the examples of the apostles Peter and Paul, no specific events are pointed out. It is said only in broad terms: "a great multitude of the elect, even women, have had to endure death through the power of evil passion." There is no particular reason to think of the victims of Nero's persecution in relation to the Danaids and Dircae (6, 2). No one has yet been able to explain what the suffering of the Christian Danaids entailed, and it was much later that the martyr Blandina died in a manner similar to Dirca, bound in a net and thrown by the horns of a raging bull (Eusebius, Church History, V. 1.56).

1) de Clementis Romani ad Corinthios epistula prima, Lipsiae 1853,

2) Vol. I. S. LIX. LX of their edition of the apostol. Fathers.

1) In the very remarkable treatise on Clement of Rome and the immediate aftermath, Tübingen theological yearbooks 1856, pp. 287—369.

1) Eusebius hist. eccl. III. cap. 17-20.

From this, it is clear that the entire arena of debate here is unstable ground, that the indications within the letter itself are not precise enough to allow for a definitive dating without the assistance of other factors. The inclination to favor the time of Domitian arises particularly because Clement of Rome, to whom the letter was later attributed by the church, belonged to that period. However, even proponents of this dating no longer claim that he was the author of the letter, as the letter clearly presents itself in the address as a communication from the congregation in Rome to that in Corinth and has nothing personal about it. The association with Clement of Rome is only a later opinion from a time when an entire literature had gathered around this name, and a first hint of this may be found in a passage in Hermas (Vision II. 4, 3) where a Clement is mentioned, tasked with handling correspondence with foreign congregations. At that time, our letter would have been seen as a model of such correspondence. Thus, it belongs to the vicinity of Hermas, long after Domitian's time. Given this situation, it should not be surprising that other scholars have arrived at a much later dating for the Clement letter. Volkmar, in his already mentioned treatise, dates it around the year 125, and he has been largely agreed with by Baur, Schwegler, Zeller, Holtzmann, and many others1). Hausrath2) even suggests that the letter was "at the very least written after Trajan." Recently, Loman1) has also briefly discussed this point, concluding that Volkmar's dating of the letter

around 125 is still too early and must be pushed down to around 150. In this case, the testimony of the letter cannot confirm that the Pauline epistles existed in the first century.

1) The relevant writings are listed in the edition by Gebhardt and Harnack, p. LVIII.

2) Neutest. Zeitgesch. 1st ed. III. p. 99 Aiun. 5.

1) theological Tydschrift 1883, pp. 14—25.

299

Since the internal evidence within the letter itself is not sufficient to accurately determine its time, it is best to approach the entire question from a different perspective. Which New Testament writings does our letter know aside from the Pauline epistles, and from when is its presence in the ecclesiastical literature itself attested? Answering this question will hopefully lead us to more definite results.

Regarding New Testament writings, 1 Clement to the Corinthians does not explicitly mention any aside from the Pauline epistle to the Corinthians, but just as the use of certain passages indicates familiarity with the Letter to the Romans, the use of other writings might suggest knowledge of other New Testament scriptures. As for the Gospels, the letter quotes Jesus' words multiple times (13:2; 46:8) in a form that does not entirely match any of our synoptic texts but appears as a recollection that combines elements from them, including Luke. 2) However, Luke is not to be dated before the beginning of the second century. Among the letters, the Epistle to the Hebrews is used extensively and unmistakably, as is generally acknowledged. Notably, chapter 36 clearly uses Hebrews 1. The use of 1 Peter is also undeniable. The saying "love covers a multitude of sins" (49:5) is identical to 1 Peter 4:8, while the underlying proverb (Proverbs 10:12) in the Alexandrian translation is rendered quite differently. Additionally, the long quotation from Psalm 34:12-18 (22:2-6) also appears in 1 Peter 3:10-12. We believe that 1 Peter is rightly assigned to the time of Trajan or later, as the depiction of the persecution of Christians in 4:15-16 closely matches what Pliny (Epistles X.97) writes in his letter to the emperor.

2) S. Volkmar, Origin of our Gospels p. 64. 137.

300

Therefore, dating the First Epistle of Clement to 125 or later becomes increasingly likely. This dating would be fully confirmed if the dating of the Book of Judith provided by Volkmar in his mentioned treatise and in his Handbook of the Old Testament Apocrypha (1860) proves to be accurate. This book is well known to the author of our letter, as he cites Judith and her deeds alongside Esther as models and shining examples in 55:4-5. This reference to the Book of Judith is the earliest mention we have, making it not improbable that the book was written shortly before the epistle. Hitzig1) had already suggested that the Book of Judith was a Jewish

work from the post-Christian period, associating the fortified city of Bethulia besieged by Holofernes with Bether or Bitther, which the Romans besieged and captured during the Bar Kokhba revolt. Volkmar dates it slightly earlier, thinking of the war led by Lusius Quietus against the Jews under Trajan in 118 AD. His view has been supported by Baur, Hausrath, and others, though it has also met with significant opposition from Hilgenfeld, Lipsius, and Fritzsche2). It is not possible to thoroughly investigate who is correct here, but it is noteworthy that this popular Book of Judith is neither mentioned by Philo nor Josephus, but is first attested as existing by the Epistle of Clement, suggesting a late date of origin.

1) Johannes Marcus p. 165.

2) The relevant writings are listed in the edition by v. Gebhardt and Harnack p. LVIII, to which reference is made for the sake of brevity. The most important counter-writing is that of Lipsius, Zeitschr. für wissenschaftlich. Theol. 1859.

"These characteristics place our Epistle of Clement fairly deep into the second century. Additionally, we must consider how early its existence is attested by other writings. Three primary testimonies are relevant here: those of Hegesippus, Dionysius of Corinth, and Irenaeus.

Hegesippus's testimony is not directly preserved but is known through Eusebius, who quotes extensively from the lost work of this Palestinian defender of tradition. The relevant passage is in 'Church History' IV. 22.1-3: 'Hegesippus has left a very comprehensive record of his views in the five books of his Memoirs that have come down to us. He relates how he met with many bishops during his journey to Rome and received the same doctrine from all of them. He then mentions the letter of Clement to the Corinthians and adds: "The church of Corinth remained in the correct doctrine until Primus became bishop in Corinth. I was with them when I traveled to Rome, and I stayed with the Corinthians for a considerable time, during which we rejoiced in the correct doctrine. But after I arrived in Rome, I followed the succession up to Anicetus, whose deacon was Eleutherus. Anicetus was succeeded by Soter, and Soter by Eleutherus. In every succession and in every city, it is maintained as the law and the prophets and the Lord direct."'1) In this passage, Hegesipp thus mentioned his journey to Rome, which passed through Corinth, and the time of this journey can be fairly accurately determined from the given succession of the Roman bishops. Anicetus was bishop from 154 onwards, Soter around 167, and Eleutherus from 175 to 189.1)

1) The text, according to Dindorf, reads: ὁ ph οὺν Ἡγήσιππος ἐν πέντε τοῖς εἰς ημάς ἐλθοϋσιν ὑπομνήμασι τής (δίας γνώμης πληρεστάτην μνήμην καταλέλοιπεν, ἐν οίς δηλοῖ ὡς πλείστοις ἐπισκόποι; συμμίσειεν, αποδημίαν στειλάμενος μέχρι ‘Ρώμης, καί ὡς ότι τήν αυτήν παρά πάντων παρείληφε διδασκαλίαν, ἀκοΰσαί γέ τοι πάρεστι μετά τινα περί τής Κλήμεντος πρός ΚορινΟίου: ἐπιστολής αύτώ είρημένα ἐπιλέγοντος ταΰτα· χαΐ ἐπέμενεν ή ἐκκλησία ή Κορινβίων ἐν τώ όρΗω λόγω μέχρι Πρίμου ἐπι- σκοπεύοντο; ἐν Κορίνθω· οΐς συνέμιξα πλέων είς ‘Ρώμην, καί συνδιέτριψα τοΐς Κο- ρινθίοις ήμέρας ίχανάς, ἐν αίς συνανεπάημεν τώ όρβώ λ«ίγψ. γενόμενος δέ ἐν ‘Ρώμη διαδοχήν ἐποιησάμην μέχρις

Ἀνικήτου, ου διάκονος ήν Ελεύθερος, καί παρά Ἀνι- κήτου διαδέχεται Σωτήρ με#’ δν Ελεύθερος, έν έκάστη δέ διαδοχή χαΐ έν έκάστη πδλει οΰτως έχει ώς ό νόμος κηρύσσει καί οι προφήται καί δ Κύριος. [='Now Hegesippus, in the five books of memoirs that have come down to us, has left a very comprehensive record of his views. He relates how he met with many bishops during his journey to Rome and received the same doctrine from all of them. One can hear him mention some things about the letter of Clement to the Corinthians and adding these words: "The church of the Corinthians remained in the correct doctrine until Primus became bishop in Corinth. I was with them when I traveled to Rome, and I stayed with the Corinthians for a considerable time, during which we rejoiced in the correct doctrine. But after I arrived in Rome, I followed the succession up to Anicetus, whose deacon was Eleutherus. Anicetus was succeeded by Soter, and Soter by Eleutherus. In every succession and in every city, it is maintained as the law and the prophets and the Lord direct.'"]

1) See Lipsius, Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe 1869, p. 190 and Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie 1874, p. 205f. The usual assumption for the start of Anicetus' term is indeed 156. However, since the date for Polycarp's martyrdom, 155 A.D., can now be considered fairly certain, Anicetus, whom Polycarp visited in Rome (Euseb. K. G. V. 24, 16), must be placed no later than 154, if not earlier. See also the counterarguments by G. Uhlhorn in Herzog’s Realencyklopädie 2nd ed. XII, p. 105.

302

Eusebius understands Hegesippus to mean that he arrived in Rome during Anicetus' episcopate and stayed until the episcopate of Eleutherus, as he explicitly states in IV. 11, 7 in reference to our passage: "Thus, Hegesippus records that he came to Rome during the time of Anicetus and remained there until the episcopate of Eleutherus." Similarly, Jerome (De viris illustr. 22) interpreted the passage. However, modern scholars have suggested that this is a misunderstanding by Eusebius and that Hegesippus' words should be understood as indicating that he arrived in Rome before Anicetus, possibly during the episcopate of his predecessor Pius (141–154), and stayed there until Anicetus. But this interpretation of the passage is entirely untenable. It either relies on the conjecture "διατριβήν" instead of "διαδοχήν" in the phrase "καὶ γενόμενος ἐν Ῥώμη διαδοχήν ἐποιησάμην μέχρις Ἀνικήτου," or on an even more arbitrary interpretation of the term "διαδοχή" to mean something akin to "residence." Heinichen included the conjecture "διατριβή" in his edition, and Harnack2) asserted it as the correct reading. However, in the entire context of Hegesippus' text, it is always about the "διαδοχή," the uninterrupted succession of bishops from the apostles, which ensures the purity of doctrine. The subsequent phrase "ἐν ἑκάστη δὲ διαδοχή" unmistakably refers back to the preceding "διαδοχήν ἐποιησάμην."

2. Patres apostolici I, p. XXVIII.

303

On the other hand, it is also not feasible, as Hilgenfeld1) suggests, to read "διαδοχή" and yet interpret it as if it were "διατριβή" by adding "ἀποδημίας." A "διαδοχή ἀποδημίας" should mean a continuous absence, but "διαδοχή" in this context certainly cannot mean that, especially since the word frequently appears in the sense of succession. Rather, the older interpreters like Pearson and Routh are correct in understanding the passage to mean that Hegesipp recorded the succession of the Roman bishops down to Anicetus. The latter2) translates, with a detailed refutation of the conjecture "διατριβή," as "successionis tabulam confeci usque ad Anicetum," and recent scholars like Lipsius3) and Jess4) rightly interpret it the same way. The only remaining question is whether Hegesipp meant he formally compiled a bishop list or, as Schwegler5) suggests, he merely inquired about the succession.

1) Journal for Scientific Theology 1876 “Hegesippus”, p. 1!) 1 Anin.

2) Reliquiae sacrae I. p. 242 f.

3) Chronology of the Roman Bishops, p. 5.

4) Journal for Historical Theology 1865, p. 9f.

5) Post-Apostolic Age I p. 355.

For us, this question is irrelevant, and what is solely important is that according to this passage, Hegesipp came to Rome under Anicetus, and not already under Pius. Whether he then, as Eusebius understands him and also Lipsius assumes, remained in Rome under Soter and Eleutherus, and thus stayed there for about ten years and more, or whether he only mentions Soter and Eleutherus subsequently after he had long returned to his homeland, is likewise irrelevant for us. What is certain is only that he wrote his *Hypomnemata* under Eleutherus, so around 180.

The question now is, how old is Hegesippus' testimony for the first Clement letter? Unfortunately, Eusebius did not also transcribe the relevant passage, but only reported its content. Therefore, one does not know whether Hegesipp attributed the letter to Clement Romanus, or if only Eusebius did this. Moreover, Eusebius himself could not possibly have understood this Clement to be Flavius Clemens, the cousin of Domitian; his Clement (K.G. III, 15) is described as the third successor of Peter, becoming Bishop of Rome in the twelfth year of Domitian, 92 or 93 AD, but dying only in the third year of Trajan (III. 34), around 100, and thus cannot be identical with the Clement killed by Domitian. Harnack1) also sensibly judges that it remains doubtful whether Hegesipp already attributed the letter to Clement.

') Fathers apostolici I. S. XXVJII.

Furthermore, one does not know how early Hegesipp read the Clement letter. Harnack constructs the course of events as follows: Hegesipp came to Corinth during the time of Pius, read Clement's letter there, continued to Rome, and upon returning home, wrote his memoirs. He concludes that according to this testimony, the letter was evidenced in Corinth around 140-150 AD. We have already seen that Hegesipp's journey does not fall under Pius but under his successor Anicetus, thus not 140-150, but between 154 and 167, a full 10-20 years later. And it is not explicitly stated in Hegesipp's testimony that he read this letter in Corinth at that time. The matter could indeed be such, but Eusebius's report only reliably indicates that Hegesipp knew the letter at some point. That he mentioned it during his stay in Corinth could merely be because the letter was addressed to the Corinthian church and had ended the earlier unrest there. Thus, the mention of Corinth could simply lead to the mention of the letter, even if Hegesipp only came to know it later in Rome or when he wrote his book at home. However, even if it were so, and Hegesipp had already read the Clement letter during his journey to Corinth, in no case does this testimony lead us earlier than 150-160 AD, which is not even the time of Hadrian, let alone Domitian.

The second witness is Dionysius of Corinth. His testimony has also been preserved solely by Eusebius. Eusebius mentions him immediately after the section on Hegesippus in *Ecclesiastical History* IV.23, noting that many letters from this Corinthian bishop exist in a collection he possesses. Eusebius highlights some noteworthy content from these letters. One letter is addressed to the Lacedaemonians, another to the Athenians, another to the Nicomedians, to Gortyna in Crete, to Amastris in Pontus, to the Knossians with a reply from Bishop Pinytos praising Dionysius but also requesting that he not write too childishly, and finally, one to the Romans, which Eusebius believes is addressed to Bishop Soter of Rome (167-175). This is certainly a misunderstanding by Eusebius because in the quoted words from the letter, Soter is already called "your blessed bishop" (IV.23.10), indicating he must already be deceased. Eusebius shares some of the content from this letter to the Romans. Dionysius praises the Roman custom of assisting other communities with advice and aid. He then speaks of Clement's letter to the Corinthians, showing that it had long been read during services in the Corinthian church. Dionysius states, "Today we have spent the holy day reading your letter, from which we can always draw edification whenever we read it, just as from the earlier one written to us through Clement." Dionysius also laments the falsification of his own letters. Finally, Eusebius mentions another letter from Dionysius addressed to a certain Chrysophora.

This information from Eusebius's account of the Corinthian bishop's letters is crucial for us. It is clear that at the time of Dionysius, not only the first but also the second letter circulating under Clement's name was known in Corinth and read during services. Furthermore, Dionysius accepted this letter as having been written by Clement. However, as already indicated, the letter from Dionysius to the Romans dates from after the death of Roman Bishop Soter, who held office until 175, meaning it was written after 175. This testimony only proves the opinion held in Corinth about Clement's letter after the mid-second century, and this opinion may be as historically inaccurate as other claims made by Dionysius about earlier times. Dionysius also

states, in the same letter to the Romans, that the apostles Peter and Paul together founded the Corinthian church first, then the Roman church, and died as martyrs in Rome together (reported by Eusebius II.25.8). This latter claim is so evidently unhistorical that no modern scholar takes it seriously. If Dionysius is so poorly informed about the origins of his own community, his knowledge about the composition time of Clement's first letter is likely no better. Therefore, we should not overestimate the significance of his testimony beyond what it indicates about the period it belongs to. Consequently, Gebhardt and Harnack1) seem to place little weight on this testimony either.

1) Fathers apostolici I. S. XXIX. note 5.

306

The third witness, Irenaeus, tells us the same as the other two, but even more explicitly. The relevant passage is found in *Against Heresies* III.3.3, quoted in Greek by Eusebius in *Ecclesiastical History* V.6.4. Here, Irenaeus lists the Roman bishops up to Eleutheros (175-189), who was his contemporary, as follows: the apostles (Peter and Paul) handed over the episcopate to Linus, who was succeeded by Anencletus, and then, as the third bishop after the apostles, Clement, who had known the apostles. During Clement's time, a severe dispute arose in the Corinthian community, prompting the Roman community to send a peace-making letter to restore their faith. Irenaeus thus corroborates, like the other two witnesses, the tradition that this letter dates back to Clement's time. However, he does not explicitly state that Clement himself wrote the letter, and what he does say is derived from the letter itself. Therefore, his testimony holds no more weight than that of the other witnesses.

307

So, what can be learned from these three witnesses essentially boils down to the fact that, from around 160 AD onwards, our letter was known in Corinth and elsewhere, and was more or less directly attributed to the Roman bishop Clement. The rest of the content of these testimonies consists of views and opinions of these Church Fathers, to which one must not readily give credence, as they all have the interest of defending the tradition and elevating writings that represent the ecclesiastically correct doctrine as high as possible, ideally into the immediate vicinity of the apostles. Thus, the first letter of Clement, with its sober, practical content aimed at unity in the church, found favor in the eyes of these Catholic Fathers, and they supported the opinion that had placed it close to the apostolic era. However, this opinion cannot be considered authoritative for historical research without examination, and the examination conducted has shown that it is hardly tenable, and that the first letter of Clement, in fact, presupposes a series of writings that themselves must be assigned to the second century. The true time of composition of the letter is likely to be derived from the fact that, as has already been mentioned, in the Shepherd of Hermas, there is an allusion to a Clement whose office it was to handle the correspondence of the Roman community with other cities.1) This will simultaneously serve as the earliest trace of the existence of the Clementine letter and the clarifying indication about the emergence of the tradition attributing its authorship to a Roman Clement. Not the Clement whom Domitian executed, whose Christianity is altogether doubtful, but a later Clement

who lived at the time of the composition of the Shepherd of Hermas and to whose letter to Corinth this already refers. The Shepherd of Hermas, according to the unambiguous testimony of the Muratorian Canon Fragment, was written: "while his brother Pius was occupying the chair of the church of the city of Rome," that is, between 141 and 156. Therefore, our letter must have been written in this period or shortly before, and thus it cannot rightly be cited as a witness from the first century for the Pauline letters. This assumption is also supported by the extensive use of our letter in Polycarp's letter to the Philippians, which, assuming its authenticity, must be dated around 150, although recent discussions suggest that this letter is unlikely to be fully authentic in its entirety.

> 1) Vis. II. 4, 3 πέμψι ούν Κ λήμης (τό βιβλαριδΐίν) είς τάς έξω πόλεις, έκείνω γάρ έπιτέτραπται. [=Vision II. 4, 3: "Therefore, let Clement send it to the cities abroad, for this has been entrusted to him."]

However, if the First Epistle of Clement was written around 140, it would closely follow the Pauline First Epistle to the Corinthians. The author of the Clementine letter would have regarded the Pauline letter as genuine and apostolic, referencing it as an ancient text, although it preceded him by only one or two decades. This conclusion is supported by comparing both letters, which, despite their differences, show significant similarities, indicating that they address similar circumstances. The Pauline First Epistle to the Corinthians condemns the divisions within the Corinthian church, a rebuke that is similarly found in the Clementine First Epistle to the Corinthians (chapters 1-3, 45-48, 57, and 60). Paul observes that the Corinthians had become indulgent and arrogant (1 Cor. 4:6-8), while the Clementine author refers to their earlier state with the words from Deuteronomy 32:15 (chapter 3:1), portraying them as rebellious and attributing the church's unrest to this attitude. Paul combats doubts about the resurrection of the dead in chapter 15 of his letter, doubts that are difficult to understand within the context of the early Christian community, even in Corinth. The Clementine letter similarly seeks to reinforce the doctrine of resurrection through various examples from sacred and secular analogies (chapters 24-27), indicating that this teaching needed to be re-emphasized. Paul insists that everything in the church should be orderly, addressing conduct during prayer and the Lord's Supper (chapter 11) as well as spiritual gifts (chapters 12-14). The Clementine letter also emphasizes that the lives of Christians should follow a fixed order, mirroring how God governs the world (chapters 20, 21), and stresses order in church office administration, urging everyone to give thanks to God according to their specific role (chapters 40, 41). Paul's letter aims to respond to queries from the Corinthian church, conveyed partly through returning delegates (16:17, 1:11) and partly through written communication (7:1). Similarly, the Clementine letter is delivered by delegates from Rome to Corinth, including a Fortunatus in both instances (1 Cor. 16:17, 1 Clem. 65:1). Thus, the Clementine letter closely follows the Pauline letter to the Corinthians, even imitating its form, a relationship easily understood if both belong to the second century and originate from similar circumstances. Consequently, the examination reinforces the conclusion that the First Epistle of Clement does not preclude dating the Pauline First Epistle to the Corinthians as we have. And the same applies to the Second Epistle of Clement, which is so self-evident that we

do not need to delve into it further. According to general consensus and the previously mentioned testimony of Dionysius of Corinth, it was written after the first epistle. The latest editors1) also explain it as a homily dating between 130 and 160 (likely closer to the latter date). Therefore, this second epistle does not serve as evidence for the antiquity of our principal letters, even though it heavily utilizes them.

1) Fathers apostolici, ed. Gebhardt etc. I. S. LXX111.

2. The Epistle of Barnabas.

We first ask whether this text, written in the spirit of Christian Alexandrinism and closely related to the New Testament Epistle to the Hebrews, is familiar with the Pauline letters, and then from what period it might originate.

A definite answer to both questions is hard to give. Unlike the First Epistle of Clement, this text does not contain an explicit citation from a Pauline letter, and even the mere silent use of such letters can be suggested but not confirmed with certainty. Lardner1) has already collected some passages that show similarities to the principal letters, and more such parallels can be found, but the overall relationship does not amount to compelling evidence. For instance, the metaphor of the temple of God in spirit, which we ourselves represent, appears in Barnabas 6:15, 16; 8:10, and resembles passages in 1 Corinthians 3:16, 6:19, and 2 Corinthians 6:16. However, we found this metaphor already in Philo and Seneca, and other Christian writings from the second century also feature it frequently, indicating it belongs to the broader era rather than specifically to Paul. Similarly, the use of the Old Testament example of Abraham, his faith, and his promise in Barnabas 13 strongly recalls Romans 4 and Galatians 3 but is too common to be conclusive evidence. Expressions like περίψημα in Barnabas 4:9 compared to 1 Corinthians 4:13, συνερχόμενοι for the gatherings of the Christian community in Barnabas 4:10 compared to 1 Corinthians 11:20, πνευματικοί in Barnabas 4:11 compared to 1 Corinthians 2:15, κομίζεσβαι for receiving reward and punishment at the world's end in Barnabas 4:12 compared to 2 Corinthians 5:10, έν αύτφ πάντα και δια αυτού from Jesus in Barnabas 12:7 similar to δι' ού τά πάντα και ημείς δι' αυτού in 1 Corinthians 8:6, and καινοί έγενόμεθα for the new life of the Christian in Barnabas 16:8 compared to 2 Corinthians 5:17 — all these make the connection more plausible, showing clear parallels. However, there are also differences that suggest a mechanical use cannot be assumed. Thus, whether the Epistle of Barnabas is familiar with the principal Pauline letters remains undecided; it cannot be definitively denied as Loman1) suggests, nor can it be firmly affirmed. However, we find the affirmative answer more probable.

1) Credibility of the evangelical history, translated by Bruhn 1750, vol. 11, p. 13.

1) theological Tydschrift 1882 p. 461.

In this latter case, it is important to ascertain the time period to which this document belongs. Only an uncertain indication can be given by its dogmatic character. The letter opposes Judaism and interprets the Old Testament symbolically in terms of Christian teachings and practices, and it seems to precede the Gnostic movement. However, this does not yield any definitive conclusion. A more promising clue appears to be the apocalyptic passage in chapters 4, 4-5, where Daniel's prophecy (7:24, 7:8) about the ten kings and one who will come after them and humble three kings is applied to the present, apparently with the belief that the time of the last king has come and the end is near. But it is difficult to use this passage correctly. It is unclear from where to start counting the kings and how to interpret the one who is to humble three kings. If one follows the analogy of the well-known explanation of the image in the Johannine Apocalypse (17:10) and begins with Augustus, one can proceed without issue up to the fifth, Nero, but then it becomes uncertain whether to count the three emperors of the interregnum (Galba, Otho, Vitellius) or not, and if so, whether to count all three or only two since Vitellius was not recognized in the East. Counting all of them leads to Titus, who does not fit the description here. Counting two leads to Domitian, whose period seems too early, not counting them leads to Trajan, or if the one who humbles three is to be included among the ten, it leads to Nerva. Finally, if the three are added to the ten, it results in Nerva, Trajan, and Hadrian, as Volkmar1) suggests. Recently, Loman2) proposed an explanation that assumes Nero as the fourth beast of Daniel and counts the ten horns from him: 1. Galba, 2. Otho, 3. Vespasian, 4. Titus, 5. Domitian, 6. Nerva, 7. Trajan, 8. Hadrian, and 9 and 10 the two others who, along with Hadrian, are expected to be overthrown by the forthcoming small horn. But this calculation also has its drawbacks3), so it is best to refrain from using this passage to determine the time period.

1) Handbook of the Apocrypha, Judith 131 ff., also Origin of the Gospels p. 143 ff.

2) theological Tydschrift 1884, pp. 182—226: de Apocalypse van Barnabas.

3) van Manen, theol. Tydschrift 1884, pp. 552ff. Reply by Loman ibid. p. 573.

But there is another passage that can be better utilized, namely 16:4. It speaks of the Jews' hope that their temple will be rebuilt as a foolish one. The true temple of God is the renewed and sanctified human being. The Jewish temple had long been desecrated and was almost to be considered pagan. God's house is the heaven, etc., so the hope of the Jews is futile. Then it refers to a word roughly corresponding to Isaiah 49:17: "Behold, those who destroyed this temple, they will rebuild it." It says further, "Because of the war, it was destroyed by the enemies, and now they themselves and the servants of the enemies will rebuild it." This can only be taken literally; thinking of a symbolic rebuilding of the temple is impossible. Thus, it must be interpreted as follows: At the time when the Letter of Barnabas was written, it was in the process of fulfilling this prophecy. The temple was supposed to be rebuilt by the Jews with the help of the Romans, who had previously destroyed it under Titus. History tells us that indeed, Hadrian, especially at the beginning of his reign, showed favor to the Jews, and from Dio

Cassius, we learn that he actually began the construction of Jerusalem. During this endeavor, however, his attitude towards the Jews changed, and after the Jews' failed attempt at revenge during the Bar Kokhba revolt, Jerusalem was rebuilt as Aelia Capitolina, and the temple was turned into a temple of Jupiter.1) When this change in the emperor's disposition occurred is not precisely known, nor is it clear whether the plan to rebuild the Jewish temple belongs to the beginning or the end of his reign. The matter seems to have dragged on for a long time, prompting the Jews to the insane revolt due to their ultimate bitter disappointment. Starting from this information, one can confidently place the Letter of Barnabas under Hadrian's reign (107-138), but the exact details remain to be determined. Volkmar suggests the beginning of this period, while Loman has returned to the previously often proposed dating towards the end of Hadrian's reign. The latter seems more likely to us, precisely because the passage in the Letter of Barnabas cannot possibly mean that the temple of the Jewish God would indeed be rebuilt in earnest. The entire chapter is full of bitter irony towards this Jewish hope, which to Christians appears long outdated by the new spiritual temple of God. Thus, verse 4 can only be understood as bitter irony: there you have it, your hope is being fulfilled, but how! You and the builders of your enemies will rebuild the temple! This could only be said when Hadrian's intention no longer pleased the Jews when they were effectively duped, thus at a time when it was heard that the temple would now become a pagan one.1) Therefore, the letter belongs to the last years of Hadrian, around 130, perhaps even, as Loman suggests, 135-138. Even the otherwise so conservative recent editors of the Apostolic Fathers2) leave the period from 71-132 open for this letter, leaning more towards the end of that period but ultimately settling on the date 120-125. The letter already knows the Gospel of Matthew, as evidenced by the citations "I have not come to call the righteous but sinners" (5:9 = Mt. 9:13), another "Many are called, but few are chosen" (4:14 = Mt. 22:14), and the discussion of whether Jesus is David's or God's son (12:10-11 = Mt. 22:43ff.). Finally, this is also consistent with the relatively late attestation, which can be reliably traced only from Clement of Alexandria onwards. Thus, this document belongs to a period when, according to our assumption, the Pauline Epistles were already in existence, and if it is assumed that they were used, we have no objection.

1) In addition to the above-mentioned writings by Volkmar, see also Hausrath, N. T. Zeitgeschichte 1st ed. III p. 507ff.

1) According to Völter (Jahrbuch für protestantische Theologie, 1888, pp. 108–144), sections 16.3 and 16.4 are indeed later additions and therefore not useful for determining the time of composition. However, sections 4.4 and onward are considered part of the original letter. We find the separation of components as proposed there too precarious to determine the position of the letter based on it.

2) v. Gebhardt and Harnack, Patres Apostolici I, p. LXVIIIff.)

3. The Shepherd of Hermas.

It is also doubtful whether the author of this work knew the Pauline epistles. Lardner3) cites only six passages, which are also not very convincing. The latest editors4) judge that Hermas does not show knowledge of the Pauline letters, except for the Epistle to the Ephesians, which he probably read. However, they include Zahn's judgment, which suggests that Hermas certainly knew the Epistle to the Ephesians and probably the two Corinthian letters. A glance at the existing correspondences indeed shows that, besides some insignificant parallels, there is also agreement that can hardly be coincidental. We highlight a few examples: compare Hermas, Vision I 1,6 Mandate 1,1, "God ... created out of nothing," with Romans 4, 17 "God ... who calls into being that which does not exist"; Vision III 3, 2 "do not cause me any more trouble" with Galatians 6, 17 "from now on let no one cause me trouble"; Vision III 8,9 "renewal of spirits" with Romans 12, 2 "renewal of the mind"; further, the entire discussion about marital relations and the question of divorce in Mandate IV with 1 Corinthians 7; the already familiar image of the Holy Spirit dwelling in us in Mandate V 1,1, Similitude V 7,1 with 1 Corinthians 3,16, Romans 8,9; Mandate VI 4, 5 "they will live for God" with Romans 6,11, 14, 8 "alive to God"; Mandate X 1,2. 2,4 on sorrow leading to death and sorrow leading to salvation with 2 Corinthians 7,10; Similitude IV. 4 the fate of the nations and the sinners in the future world, with Romans 2,12ff.; Similitude V. 6, 4 the power that Christ received from his Father, with 1 Corinthians 15, 27; Similitude IX 12, 2 the pre-existence of the Son of God with 1 Corinthians 10,4; Similitude IX, 13 the image of putting on (clothing) with the analogous expression Romans 13,14, Galatians 3,27; Similitude IX 16, 2 the condition for entering the Kingdom of God, with Romans 6,6; Similitude IX 22,2 the foolishness of the wise, with Romans 1,22, 1 Corinthians 1, 20ff.

There are definitely connections, but the agreement is rarely so striking that one would be forced to think of literary borrowing. Nevertheless, it is not unlikely that a certain influence of the Pauline letters on the author of the Shepherd did occur. At least some of the above examples seem as compelling as those provided by Zahn and others from the Epistle to the Ephesians, leading to the assumption that Hermas was familiar with this letter. The passages are Mandate III, Iff. 4, Similitude IX, 13, 17, 18 compared with Ephesians 4,4, 25, 29, 30. The first place speaks of truth and the duty not to let any untruth come out of one's mouth, as emphasized in Ephesians 4,25, 29: "Speak the truth each one of you with his neighbor" and "let no unwholesome word proceed from your mouth"; the latter place speaks of grieving the spirit as in Ephesians 4,30 "Do not grieve the Holy Spirit" and of the unity and purity of the church, as in Ephesians 4,4 "One body and one spirit." But even here, the agreement is not such that mere similarity in thought could not have brought it about. Both writings are characterized by a strong and developed ecclesiastical concept, but why should this not have been expressed by several authors around the same time?

3) Credibility etc. Vol. II p. 75 ff.

4) by Gebhardt, Harnack and Zahn, Patres apostol. III. p. LXXIV.

However, one can still assume the knowledge of the main Pauline letters and also the letter to the Ephesians. The era to which the Shepherd of Hermas belongs is a rather late one, in any

case, an era when the Pauline main letters must have been available under all circumstances. The passage from the so-called Muratorian Fragment, a Latin list of the canonical sacred writings from the last decades of the second century, already mentioned above (p. 308), assigns the Shepherd to its time of composition quite conclusively. The passage reads in full: "The Shepherd was written by Hermas very recently in our times, in the city of Rome, while Pius, his brother, was the bishop of the chair of the church of the city of Rome. Therefore, it ought indeed to be read, but it cannot be published in the church among the people, neither among the complete number of prophets nor among the apostles until the end of times."1)

1) Lines 73—79 of the fragment.

The way the Hermas book is discussed here shows that the author of this canon did not equate it with the recognized holy scriptures. Hence the reservation against its public ecclesiastical use, and thus the indication regarding the time, which aims to dispute its claim to antiquity, such as the descent from the Hermas mentioned in Romans 16:14. Such information (cf. the similar one of Irenaeus regarding the Johannine Apocalypse, which was seen only under Domitian according to Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History III. 18.3) is always particularly credible. The tendency of the Church Fathers was to date all ecclesiastically correct writings as early as possible, while those somewhat questionable in this regard were dated as late as possible. In the latter case, they sometimes inadvertently revealed secrets that were carefully preserved regarding correct writings. Therefore, there is no reason to doubt this information, which also agrees with the external attestation of the Shepherd starting only with Irenaeus. Consequently, the date of composition of the Shepherd can be set between 141 and 157. Indeed, it appears from the Shepherd itself that at that time the Roman church did not yet have a single bishop but was led by presbyters, while the Muratorian Fragment designates Pius as the bishop of the Roman church. But the author of the fragment spoke according to the understanding of his time, just as Irenaeus1) did, who already established a monarchical bishop list of the Roman church starting from the apostles. Pius must have been one of the bishops and probably the most influential among them. Therefore, if the testimony of the Shepherd's book is relevant to the Pauline main letters at all, it cannot guarantee their existence long before the middle of the second century.

1) In Eusebius, K. G. V. 6, adv. haer. III, 3.

———————

The remaining writings, which are counted among the so-called Apostolic Fathers, are not relevant for our purpose. They all belong to a time period even later than that of the three discussed. The writings of Polycarp, including his letter to the Philippians and the account of his martyrdom, date after the mid-second century, as Polycarp died as a martyr on February 23, 155. 2) It is not pertinent to our inquiry whether Polycarp's letter is authentic, interpolated as Ritschl and Volkmar suggest, or not. The letters of Ignatius, which extensively quote and praise

Paul, are evidently inauthentic and are likely to be dated around 160 AD.1) It is also questionable if the letter to the Magnesians belongs to the second century at all. Finally, the fragments of Papias are silent about Paul and also belong to the middle of the century. More important for us, however, are some other second-century writers whose relationship to Paul's letters is also instructive. So, first...

2) See Egli, altchristliche Studien, Zurich 1887 p. 75.

1) So Volkmar, last 1876, overview and index to the canonical synopsis, p. 28.

4. The Didache (Teaching of the Twelve Apostles)

This ancient Christian text, discovered a few years ago, has a highly debated precise date. However, based on its content, it certainly aligns with the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. The Didache does not quote any passages from Paul's letters, and according to Harnack2), there isn't a single place in it where the use of these letters is evident. Nevertheless, some connections are present, and according to Holtzmann3), it is likely that the author was familiar with some of Paul's letters. Such connections include Didache 10:6, "maranatha," which, apart from I Corinthians 16:22, does not appear again in the entire early Christian literature, and the "spiritual food" of the Eucharist in Didache 10:3 compared with I Corinthians 10:3-4. While some clear connections with the Thessalonian letters are irrelevant here, it is noteworthy how the Didache expresses views that conflict with Paul's words, as if correcting Paul. For instance, the directive in Didache 11:7 advises against testing or judging a prophet speaking in the spirit, to avoid the unforgivable sin against the Holy Spirit: "Do not test or judge a prophet speaking in the spirit," whereas Paul in I Corinthians 14:29 states, "Let two or three prophets speak, and let the others weigh what is said," and the "discernment of spirits" in I Corinthians 12:10 is considered a gift. Furthermore, regarding meat sacrificed to idols, the Didache opposes Paul's allowance of it and prohibits its consumption outright: 6:3 "Be very careful with idol sacrifices, for it is the worship of dead gods." Thus, it stands on the same ground as the Acts of the Apostles and most writings of the second century.

2) The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles 1884 p. 87. — The Apostles' Teaching and the Jewish Two Ways 1886. p. 10.

3) Introduction to the New Testament 2nd edition p. 113.

In contrast to these quite clear signs of familiarity with Paul's principal letters, the further examples recently put forth by Wohlenberg1) need to be set aside, as they are even less certain to suggest dependence of one text on the other. For instance, Didache 4:8 "If you are partners in what is immortal, how much more in what is mortal" only vaguely resembles Romans 15:27 "For if the Gentiles have come to share in their spiritual blessings, they ought also to be of

service to them in material things." Similarly, the expression in Didache 5:2 "clinging to what is good" sounds only very generally like Romans 12:9 "cling to what is good," and the phrase "watchful not for good but for evil" there might fleetingly remind one of Romans 16:19, with its contrast between good and evil. However, it is not necessary to consider this as a definite borrowing, though it cannot be entirely ruled out either.

1) The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles 1884 p. 87. — The Apostles' Teaching and the Jewish Two Ways 1886. p. 10.

Except for the last three references, all the interactions belong to the second part of the Didache (chapters 7–16), which is now recognized as the more recent section. Regarding the age of this text, a straightforward answer cannot be provided; it can only be stated that in its current form, it must be younger than Barnabas and Hermas2). Therefore, the use of our letters in it does not affect our main question. It is simply to be noted that the Pauline letters, whose use in the Didache is still probable, could not have held the same level of authority at the time this text was written as they did later. Indeed, they may not have been universally and openly recognized as apostolic. In this respect, this document serves as an important witness for our overall conclusion.

2) Introduction to the New Testament 2nd edition p. 113.

5. Justin Martyr

The writings of this Christian philosopher and apologist are particularly important for our investigation, as they leave no doubt about their authorship, at least regarding the most significant among them, and can be dated with sufficient accuracy. There is no doubt that Justin's two main works, the First Apology and the Dialogue with the Jew Trypho, belong to the reign of Antoninus Pius, Hadrian's successor (138–161), since the Apology is dedicated to this emperor, and the Dialogue refers back to the former (Justin says in chapter 58, "I speak to Caesar in writing about this step"). However, the exact dates can be determined more precisely. While earlier scholars often placed the Apology at the beginning of Antoninus' reign in 138, Volkmar1) showed that this date is too early and that the Apology should be dated to 147, which best fits the birth date of Christ indicated within it ("about 150 years ago" in Apology I, 46), although this can still be considered a rough estimate. The Dialogue with Trypho follows the Apology, around 150, so Justin's literary activity can be placed between 140 and 160. This timeframe has gained increasing recognition and can now be regarded as relatively secure. Keim1) has even proposed dating the First Apology to the last years of Antoninus' reign, 155–160, but his reasons do not seem very convincing. Therefore, the assumption of 145 to 150 as the most likely period seems most credible.

1) Tübinger theol. Jahrbb. 1855, about the time of Justin the Martyr; origin of the addition p. 89ff.

1) History of Jesus of Nazara I. 8. 138.

Even though Justin cannot be considered a very early witness, his testimony carries significant weight due to its content and form. His manner of referencing the Gospel accounts in his writings is well known for its implications regarding the age and ecclesiastical standing of our Gospels. He does not cite any Gospel by the author's name but refers to them as "memoirs of the apostles." His usage is so free that it indicates there was no established sacred wording yet. While his writings often align with our Synoptic Gospels, he also cites Gospel sayings not found in them, which must have been drawn from an apocryphal Gospel. Justin is even less scrupulous in using the Gospel of John. Although he knows and uses it, as evidenced by multiple instances, he never cites it by name. Furthermore, in his depiction of Jesus' life, he consistently follows the Synoptic Gospels, disregarding John's divergences, from which he only borrows isolated sayings. This relationship has led to the valid conclusion that our fourth Gospel existed during Justin's time but had not yet gained widespread acceptance. It was still seen more as a personal interpretation of Jesus' life than an apostolic document. Similarly characteristic is Justin's relationship to Paul's letters. That he knows and uses them can hardly be doubted anymore after recent discussions. Following investigations by Otto, Overbeck, and Tjeenk-Willink, A. Thoma1) has subjected this relationship to a thorough examination. To avoid merely listing what has been said, we prefer to refer to this easily accessible work and highlight only a few key passages that undoubtedly show Justin's familiarity with the Pauline Epistles. The Old Testament example of Abraham's faith, which we already encountered in the Epistle of Barnabas, appears in Justin's writings in such terms that the borrowing from Paul, which remains questionable in Barnabas, can hardly be doubted. In *Dialogue with Trypho* chapter 13, Justin states that Abraham was justified by his faith while still uncircumcised: "έν ακροβυστία ών διά τήν πίστιν ήν έπίστευσε τψ θεψ έδικαιώθη καί εύλογήθη ώς ή γραφή σημαίνει· τήν δέ περιτομήν είς σημεΐον ... έλαβεν," which closely follows the expressions in Romans 4:9-11: "έν περιτομή δντι ή έν ακροβυστία (έλογίσθη); ούκ έν περιτομή άλλ' έν άκροβυστία, καί σημεΐον έλαβε τής περιτομής," and Galatians 3:9: "οί έκ πίστεως εύλογοΰνται συν τψ πιστψ Αβραάμ." Furthermore, Justin compares Christ to the Passover lamb in *Dialogue* chapter 111: "ήν γάρ τδ πάσχα ό Χριστός ό τυ&είς ύστερον," similar to Paul in 1 Corinthians 5:7: "καί γάρ τδ πάσχα ήμών έτύθη Χριστός." Additionally, the comparison of the Easter purging of leaven with the renunciation of evil is present in *Dialogue* chapter 14: "τούτο γάρ έστι τδ σύμβολον τών άζυμων ινα μή τά παλαιά τής κακής ζύμης έργα πράττητε," which parallels 1 Corinthians 5:8: "ώστε έοοτάζωμεν μή έν ζύμη παλαιά μηδέ έν ζύμη κακίας καί πονηριάς." Justin also uses the image of the body and its members to describe the church in *Dialogue* chapter 42: "πολλών άριθμουμένων μελών τά σύμπαντα έν καλείται καί έστι σώμα· καί γάρ δήμος καί έκκλησία πολλοί τδν αριθμόν όντες άνθρωποι ώς έν όντες πράγμα τή μια κλήσει καλούνται καί προσαγορεύονται," which aligns with 1 Corinthians 12:12: "καθάπερ γάρ τδ σώμα έν έστιν καί μέλη έχει πολλά, πάντα δέ τά μέλη τού σώματος πολλά όντα έν έστιν σώμα, ούτως καί ό Χριστός." Finally, an almost direct quote can be found in *Dialogue* chapter 47: "ή γάρ χρηστότης καί ή φιλανθρωπία τού θεοΰ καί τδ άμετρον τοΰ πλούτου αύτού τόν μετανοούντα άπο τών αμαρτημάτων, ώς δι' Ιεζεκιήλ μηνύει, ώς δίκαιον καί αναμάρτητον έχει," which corresponds to

Romans 2:4: "ή τού πλούτου τής χρηστότητας αύτού καί τής ανοχής καί τής μακροθυμίας καταφρονείς, άγνοών δτι τό χρηστόν τοΰ θεοΰ είς μετάνοιαν σε άγει;" It is worth noting that Justin's reference to Ezekiel does not mean a similar Old Testament phrase but rather a related thought from Ezekiel 33:11-20, which states that God does not desire the death of the sinner but that he should turn from his ways and live.

1) Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie 1875 pp. 385 to 412, where the other literature is also listed.

These examples suffice to firmly establish Justin's knowledge of the main Pauline Epistles. We can thus only agree with Thoma when he formulates the result as follows: "It emerges that:

1. Justin indeed knows Paul very well; he has used him extensively and in detail. The consequences of this observation are all the more interesting:
2. Nevertheless, the usage is not as extensive as one might expect.
3. In Justin's use of the Apostle, it is significant and peculiar that Justin captures neither the spirit nor the essence of Paul. Instead, he weakens the Pauline keywords, blunts the points of arguments, rationalizes and pelagianizes Pauline thought, and often presents Paul's statements in a rather superficial and bizarrely twisted manner.
4. Paul is never named; for Justin, he is not an apostle like the Twelve, and his writings are never cited. For Justin, they are not ecclesiastical books like the apostolic memoirs."

Thus, alongside Justin's precise knowledge of Paul, there is a noticeable silence about him, and to explain this, Thoma, like others before him, resorts to using Justin's ecclesiastical stance toward Paulinism as a motive. It must be admitted that an intense aversion to Paul and his doctrine could have had such a result, but would Justin then have so eagerly read and used the writings of this man who was not an apostle to him? Based on the analogy of what we see, for example, with Papias, it would be more likely that Justin would not have engaged with Paul at all. Therefore, it is worth considering whether another motive for this silence can be thought of, namely the fact that when Justin wrote, the Pauline Epistles were not yet universally acknowledged and regarded as the writings of an apostle in the church but only held this status in likeminded circles, as in that of the first Epistle of Clement. Thoma himself has stated what becomes apparent upon closer reflection: Justin treats John just as he does Paul1), or rather, Paul as he does John. Just as he uses the fourth Gospel but does not equate it with the others nor ever designates it as the work of an apostle, he does the same with the Pauline Epistles. He would not have remained silent about John if he had found the Gospel circulating as his work; he had nothing against him and celebrates him as a prophet who foretold the future in the Apocalypse and proclaimed the millennial kingdom2). If he remains silent about his Gospel, it is simply because it was still too new and lacked sufficient authority at that time. Is it not arbitrary to resort to such a completely different explanation in the analogous case with Paul, as is usually done? According to our findings, Justin's silence in this case also has the same reason: the Pauline Epistles are not yet ecclesiastical books; they are interesting literary phenomena that one can read and even use but are not yet something to be publicly endorsed. That differing

ecclesiastical positions also played a role can be accepted as a supplementary motive. Like the Didache, Justin knows of Christians who permit eating food sacrificed to idols and responds to Tryphon's accusation about this by pointing to Christ's prophecy of the coming of false prophets and false apostles1). While we do not claim that Justin considered Paul a false apostle, he is thinking rather of the Gnostics, whom he then enumerates. However, the Pauline liberality in assessing this issue may have seemed dubious to him, giving him all the more reason to look at Paul's writings but not to make common cause with them. This is what emerges from examining Justin's position on the Pauline Epistles and what would have emerged long ago if one had not been blinded by the firm belief in the authenticity of the main epistles, failing to see here what had long been recognized in the analogous relationship with John.2)

1) a. a. O. p. 557.

2) Pial. c. Tryph. c. 81.

1) Dial. c. Tryph. c. 35.

2) See Loman, theological Tydschrift 1882 pp. 312—328.

6. The Clementines.

Under the same name to which the two letters of Clement of Rome, listed among the Apostolic Fathers, are attributed, a whole literature has been written. Part of this literature still exists in the two works, the Clementine Homilies and the Recognitions. A peculiar phenomenon immediately comes to light. While the first letter of Clement explicitly refers to Paul and is composed in a Pauline sense, these two writings completely ignore the Apostle to the Gentiles and instead celebrate Peter as the Apostle to the Nations. Moreover, in both texts, there are individual elements that have long been interpreted as allusions to the Apostle Paul, revealing the greatest hostility towards him. This indicates that the name Clement became a banner under which very different content found coverage.

We first inquire about the traces of knowledge of the main Pauline Epistles present in these writings. Only one such trace can be identified with certainty: the polemical use of the Epistle to the Galatians in the 17th Homily of the Clementines. As Baur1) demonstrated some time ago and as has been accepted and further elaborated by Schwegler2) and the entire critical school, this passage portrays and vehemently opposes none other than the Apostle Paul under the guise of the magician Simon. In the 17th Homily, there is much that undoubtedly refers to Paul and the Epistle to the Galatians. The homily begins with the early morning of a new day. Simon the Magician gives a new speech against Peter very early, even before Peter is present. He develops his doctrine of two gods, claiming that Jesus himself said, "One is good, God," which implies there is another who is not good, namely the Creator of the world. He also sometimes calls God "the Just," showing his own inconsistency. Simon argues that the claim made by Jesus' disciple (Peter) yesterday, that the clarity of physical sight is better than visions3), is incorrect; rather, visions are divine, whereas ordinary sight is merely human (Hom. XVII 1–5).

1) e.g. Paulus, 2nd edition I. p. i>7. 148.

2) Post-Apostolic Age I. p. 364 ff.

3) According to the conjecture of Clericus, with the edition by Dressel, instead of ένίργεια, one should read ένάργιια, which gives a fuller meaning. Hom. 17,5.

326

Simon's speeches are reported to Peter by Zacchaeus, who had listened to them. Peter then sets out himself and refutes Simon by explaining what Christ truly taught about God (6–13). Simon interrupts him, saying that Peter should first answer whether visionary sight is not better than ordinary sight, as the latter does not produce immediate conviction, whereas the former, the vision, directly imparts belief in the divine. Peter responds that visions always involve uncertainty; an evil spirit can also manifest in them, and it is not always possible to distinguish divine from demonic visions. Even the ungodly can have visions (14–18). "If then our Jesus appeared to you in a vision and revealed himself and spoke with you, he did so in anger as an adversary, speaking to you through visions and dreams or even outward revelations. But can one be made wise in doctrine through a vision? And if you say it is possible, why did the Teacher (Jesus) personally interact with awake people for a whole year? How should we believe you even if it were so that he appeared to you? Indeed, why should he have appeared to you when your disposition is the opposite of his teaching? If you were deemed worthy of that vision and discipleship for an hour and became his apostle, then proclaim his words, interpret his statements, love his apostles, and do not argue with me, who was with him. For against me, the firm rock, the foundation of the church, you have risen as an adversary. If you were not an adversary, you would not revile and slander the proclamation that comes from me, preventing me from finding belief in what I say, having heard it personally from the Lord, as if I were not deserving of belief and judgment. Yes, if you call me judged, you accuse God who revealed Christ to me and despise the one who blessed me for this revelation. Yet, if you truly want to assist the truth, learn from us first what we learned from Him, and if you become a disciple of the truth, then become our collaborator" (Hom. XVII. 19).

327

There is no doubt possible here; this entire passage only makes sense if it refers to the Apostle Paul. Regarding Simon Magus, against whom this polemic is ostensibly directed, it cannot be said that he had a revelation of Jesus. This clearly pertains to the Christ-appearance that Paul experienced, which he describes in Galatians 1:15-16: "when it pleased God... to reveal his Son in me," and the vision is precisely the same one Paul references when he says, "Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" and "last of all, he was seen by me also" (1 Corinthians 9:1, 15:8). There is even such a literal contact with the Epistle to the Galatians that the very expression used by Paul to describe Peter's behavior in Antioch is taken up here and used as an accusation: "If you call me condemned," says Peter here, which can be compared with Galatians 2:11: "When Cephas came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face, because he stood condemned."

328

From this, it follows that the Clementine Homilies know and quote the Epistle to the Galatians, even though they never mention its author by name. For determining the date of composition of the Epistle to the Galatians, this does not have great significance since it is widely acknowledged that the Homilies belong to the second half of the second century at the earliest. They are already familiar with the Gospel of John, as the story of the man born blind (John 9:1-12) cited in the 22nd chapter of the 19th Homily cannot be doubted. The current form of the Homilies is generally dated to the time of Marcus Aurelius, with Volkmar1) placing them around 175-180, Holtzmann2) stating "not before the middle of the second century," and Hilgenfeld 3) suggesting 161-180, in agreement with most modern scholars. Harnack has even suggested that the final redaction might have occurred in the third century, and Lipsius4) is also convinced that the Clementines in both redactions belong to the third century. Therefore, the use of the Epistle to the Galatians in the Homilies does not argue against its later composition.

1) Origin of the Gospels. P. 137.

2) Introduction to the New Testament. 2nd edition. P. 102.

3) Introduction, p. 43.

4) Apocryphal Acts II. P. 38 Antn.

329

However, there are investigations connected to these Clementines that reach much earlier times and whose results could indeed challenge our conclusions, depending on how they turn out and are utilized. It is very likely that the Clementines in their current form have evolved from a series of earlier similar writings, and their original foundation thus extends far beyond the middle of the second century, possibly even to apostolic times. Depending on whether this foundation is seen in the figure of the Gnostic heretic Simon or in the historical Apostle Paul in his struggle against Judaism, their relationship to our New Testament literature must be judged differently. If the Gnostic image is older, there is nothing in this literature that would shed new light on the apostolic conflict between Peter and Paul. However, if the Pauline image is older, it suggests that this literature elaborates on the conflict described in Galatians 2:11 ff., thereby providing new validation for this conflict as a cornerstone of apostolic-church development.

This latter view was particularly established by Lipsius, first in his "Sources of the Roman Peter Legend" from 1872, and more recently in the "Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles," Vol. 2 from 1887, pages 37-69. Since some important points in the latter presentation have undergone changes, it is advisable to initially adhere to the latest version of this view. The literary-historical origin relationship of the Clementine Recognitions and Homilies, according to Lipsius, should neither be considered as Hilgenfeld1) saw it—that the Recognitions form the basis of the Homilies—nor as Uhlhorn previously assumed, that the Recognitions were based on the Homilies. Instead, both are derived from an older document that is partly more faithfully preserved in the Recognitions and partly in the Homilies. This older document is believed to

have evolved from various even older layers, with an ultimate foundation in a sharply anti-Pauline polemic from early times. The "Clementine Recognitions" and the "Homilies" are based on "Clementine Anagnorisms," which in turn are based on "Petrine Kerygmas" in ten books, the content of which is still available in Recognitions III, 75. Whether these were based on an even older document that could be designated as "Acts of Peter," in which the Syrian debates between Peter and Simon and the Roman final catastrophe, with Simon's fall from heaven at Peter's prayer, were combined into a whole, cannot be proven, according to Lipsius. However, he still maintains that this anti-Pauline polemic, if not as a document, formed the nucleus of the whole. Although the Kerygmas of Peter, thus the third oldest layer, are dated by him to the years 150-160, the anti-Pauline legend certainly leads to the first half of the second century, if not even earlier.1)

1) The Clementine Recognitions and Homilies, 1848, see also Introduction p. 42 note 2.

1) ibid. p. 54.

This view of the matter contrasts with the other perspective, which sees the origin of this entire literature in the Simon legend and regards the anti-Pauline polemic as a later addition, possibly introduced by the author of the 17th Homily.

In such an exceedingly difficult and convoluted issue, it is unreasonable to expect us to provide a thorough investigation here and in passing. It will suffice if we briefly address what is directly related to our main task.

That the Clementines, in both forms that have come down to us, are based on older foundations should not be denied. The extremely anti-Pauline section in Homily 17 is so isolated in its context that it can hardly have originally belonged to this whole. A clear external indication of this is found in XVII5 (line 5 of the Dressel edition), where Simon says: "Thirdly, his wise disciple yesterday (ἔχθες) affirmed that physical clarity is better than ecstatic vision," etc. This is at odds with what we find in the 16th Homily, which contains the speeches of the previous day, where we search in vain for this argument.1) It seems that a section from another text has been incorporated here. Furthermore, it is striking that in the *Recognitiones*, which have only come down to us in the Latin version by Rufinus, there is also a clear allusion to Paul, but not to the Apostle; rather, it refers to the still unconverted persecutor of the Christian community. In *Recognitiones* I, 70, it is recounted how James, the revered bishop of the Jerusalem church, had already persuaded the people to be baptized when a hostile man, homo quidam inimicus, accompanied by a few others, forced his way into the temple, loudly shouted to hold back the people, and caused a tumult in which no one could understand a word. How he furiously attacked the believers with a firebrand torn from the altar and instigated a general massacre, even throwing James down from the highest steps and leaving him for dead. In the following chapter 71, it continues with how the believers picked up James and took him home, where they spent the night in prayer, intending to escape to Jericho the next day. There, on the third day, they received news from Gamaliel that the hostile man had received a mission from the high

priest Caiaphas to persecute all who believed in Jesus, and to go with letters to Damascus to carry out the same work there. After thirty days, he really did pass through Jericho on his way to Damascus.

1) This has already been noted by Hilgenfeld (clementin. Recognit. p. 259) and Lipsius (Quellen der Petrussage p. 36 note).

The report ends here, and the narrative returns to Clement, who is sent to Caesarea, where Simon Magus has appeared as a dangerous heretic. It is noteworthy that Saul and his conversion are not mentioned further in the entire book. It is thus evident that this section too may have been taken from an older source.

When we ask about the age of this source, the answer is not very favorable to it. The depiction of Saul in the *Recognitiones* is clearly dependent on our Acts of the Apostles. It takes from it the detail that the hostile man went with a few into the temple (Acts 21:28), the description of the tumult where no one could understand anything (21:34), the motive that the priests closed the doors (21:30), and the figure of Gamaliel, who appears as a quiet friend of the apostles (5:34). Furthermore, a feature from the martyrdom of James reported by Hegesippus seems also to have been used. When the *Recognitiones* states: "A hostile man attacked James, threw him down from the highest steps, and, believing him to be dead, neglected to further punish him," it strongly resembles Hegesippus' account in Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* II 23)1), where James is placed on the wing of the temple amid great tumult, and when he refuses to deny Christ, he is thrown down, and although not yet completely dead, he is further stoned and then beaten to death with a club. This report, however, does not extend beyond the middle of the second century. Just as this anti-Pauline piece is related to Hegesippus and the Acts of the Apostles, so the sections in the Homilies related to the Galatians Letter are dependent on it. We have no objection to other features in the Homilies that can be seen as anti-Pauline being traced back to this foundational text, as Lipsius lists a whole series in the cited section of the *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* (pp. 44–46).1) Certainly, the term *ἀνθρωπος ἐχθρός* in the letter from Peter to James preceding the Homilies, chapter 2, could indeed refer to the same hostile person as in the *Recognitiones*. The overcoming of Simon by Peter in Antioch at the end of the Homilies could be a Judaistic response to the depiction of the apostolic conflict in the Galatians letter, although the evidence is not as strong in these points as in the passage of the 17th Homily that we started with. However, this does not substantially alter our understanding of the age of this anti-Pauline text. It reaches back to the Acts of the Apostles and the Galatians letter. But the Gnostic story of Simon also reaches back to the Acts of the Apostles. In Acts 8:9–24, the developing image of the Gnostic heretic is unmistakable; he is described as "the power of God that is called Great." There is nothing about Paul in this portrayal. Indeed, this designation of Simon cannot be understood without assuming a source that had already depicted this heretic before the Acts of the Apostles. Thus, it seems more likely that the original image of Simon simply represents magic as an opponent of Christianity and the miracle-working apostolate that preaches it, and that the Cypriot magician Simon, mentioned by Josephus in *Antiquities* XX 7,2, who was a contemporary of Paul, provided the name for the entire development. While Lipsius previously

considered Simon Magus in the Acts of the Apostles to be fictional, he has now retracted2) his opposition in this regard, and Hilgenfeld also judges similarly now.3) Therefore, the whole matter can be understood in this straightforward manner. From the historical Simon Magus of Josephus emerges the one in the Acts of the Apostles, and from him comes the Gnostic heretic primarily opposed by the Clementines. This heretic takes on the features of Paul as depicted in the major epistles during the time when Pauline doctrine merges with Gnosticism in Marcion. In this case, the anti-Pauline polemic of the Homilies rather serves as evidence for the late composition of the major epistles, specifically the letter to the Galatians.

1) This is also acknowledged by Lipsius, Sources of the Roman St. Peter's Saga, p. 27.

1) See also Hilgenfeld, Heretic History of Early Christianity, p. 166.

2) ibid., p. 50.

3) The Heretic History of Early Christianity, p. 184.

Loman1) has shed new light on this issue, as it seems. He points out that the anti-Pauline polemic in the Homilies is specifically directed against the Paul of the Marcionites, and Lipsius2) also acknowledges this in this particular case. The Marcionite Paul, as we previously demonstrated, is closest to the Paul of the letter to the Galatians. Therefore, the polemic is particularly directed against this letter. This makes the most sense if the letter to the Galatians was written shortly before Marcion and was made the focal point of his anti-Judaistic views, as is well known. The previous view on the relationship of the anti-Pauline polemic in the Homilies to the New Testament was based on the assumption that the major epistles, especially the letter to the Galatians, were genuine. If one removes this assumption, one might find the matter simpler and more natural. One fully understands such a polemic when it is directed against a movement belonging to the recent past and partly still to the present, rather than against documents that had been in use in the church for 100 years and for which the Roman Clement himself was considered the most ardent apologist. A calm, unbiased consideration of this and other points raised by Loman might lead to a different conclusion than the one previously considered certain. However, there are still many unresolved questions that will require further investigation.

1) theological journal 1883, pp. 25—47.

2) a. a. O. p. 39.

Moreover, it should be noted that there must have been a narrative of Peter's travels, thus a Petrine Acts of the Apostles, preceding our letter to the Galatians. We have seen that the statement in Gal. 2:11, "When Cephas came to Antioch," necessarily implies that the readers were already familiar with this journey. No one recounts something for the first time with the phrase: "when Peter came to Antioch." There must therefore be an Acts of the Apostles that

predates this, which initially followed the same course as our Lucan account, but later, when Peter disappears from it (Gal. 2:12, 17; 15:11), reported on his further travels and also brought him to Antioch. However, no conflict with Paul would have occurred there, or if there was one, it was only in the slightest hint. The escalation of this encounter and its use in party interests was then the concern of both the letter to the Galatians and the developing Clementine literature.

335

7. Marcion and Gnosticism

A very important witness to the existence of Paul's letters is Marcion, the ultrapaulian Gnostic, who is also of great significance for the history of the New Testament canon. His system1) touches upon Pauline thought in some respects, representing an extreme development of it. The Pauline statement that the law is no longer the will of God since Christ's coming is further intensified by him into the assertion that the law was never the will of God, at least not of the supreme and good God, but only of the subordinate one who is also the creator of the world. Consequently, Marcion stands in extreme opposition to the Old Testament; he not only denies its continued validity, as claimed by Jewish Christians, but also rejects that it was a precursor to Christianity, as Paul saw it. For him, it is rather something absolutely different from Christianity that cannot claim attention in any way, either directly or indirectly.

1) See its latest and, to me, most just presentation and appreciation in Harnack, Dogmengeschichte, pp. 7—214.

336

This principle means that, of the writings that make up our New Testament, only those that were approximately in accordance with Marcion's views or could at least be adapted with some modifications could be recognized and used by him. Therefore, it is understandable what the Church Fathers, who opposed Marcion and from whose reports we learn about his views, say about him: that he only accepted and used the Gospel of Luke and ten Pauline letters, excluding the Pastoral Epistles and the Letter to the Hebrews, and that these were in a form that he had edited. Just as he removed everything from the Gospel of Luke that referenced the Old Testament as the root of Christian revelation, he also removed from the Pauline letters what connected them to the Old Testament. For example, in the Galatians letter, which he placed at the forefront and valued highly, he removed the reference to the faith of Abraham (Gal. 3:6 ff.). Tertullian1) asserts this with the words: "But also when he adds (the Apostle): 'for all of you are children of faith' (Gal. 3:26), it is shown what heretical industry has erased, namely, the mention of Abraham, etc." According to the same Church Father, of all the Pauline letters, only the one to Philemon preserved its brevity from Marcion's corruption,2) while most and the strongest alterations were made by him to the Letter to the Romans3), which naturally appears due to this letter's strong reliance on the Old Testament. Tertullian also explicitly testifies that Marcion rejected the two letters to Timothy and the one to Titus, stating that he could provide no other reason than that Marcion's penchant for alteration extended to the number of letters1). This judgment, as we will see, should be taken with caution.

1) Adv. Marcionem V. 3.

2) Ibid., 21.

3) Quantas autem foveas in ista vel maxime epistola Marcion fecerit auferendo quae voluit, de nostri instruinenti integritate parebit. ibid 13.

1) Affectavit, opinor, etiam numerum epistolarum interpolare, ibid 21.

337

From this situation, it is at least certain that Marcion was already familiar with the majority of the Pauline letters, including not only the earlier main letters but also the later ones up to the Prison Epistles. There is no doubt about this, because although the polemic conducted primarily by Tertullian, and further by Epiphanius, and to some extent by Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria against Marcion, may be full of bias and distortion, it is still too specific on this point to be completely unfounded. Tertullian, in particular, goes through in the fifth book of his work against Marcion, from the Letter to the Galatians to the Letter to Philemon, all the Pauline letters that Marcion exploited in his "Antitheses" according to his peculiar system, thus establishing for us at least beyond doubt that these letters were available in Marcion's time.

The time can be quite precisely determined. Justin Martyr treats Marcion as a contemporary2), Tertullian does not investigate the exact year of Marcion's departure but states it is notorious that he was the "Antoninianus heretic" under Pius3). Irenaeus refers to the Gnostic Cerdo as his teacher, placing him under the bishop of Rome Hyginus, which implies that Marcion must have begun his activity under his successor Pius. This does not contradict the statement that Marcion "succeeded him and became influential under Anicetus" (the successor of Pius), as this only marks the peak of his doctrine's flourishing.1) From these details, it emerges that Marcion's arrival in Rome falls during the reign of Antoninus Pius (the wordplay of Tertullian evidently refers to him and not to the Roman bishop Pius), so after 138. The mention of the Roman bishop Hyginus (137–141), Cerdo as Marcion's predecessor, and Pius (141–154) and Anicetus (154–167) for Marcion himself, also points to this time period. Thus, Marcion had a long career that might have spanned from 140 to 170 in the West 2). His main activity would more likely fall under Anicetus than Pius, so after 150, but from 145 his influence in Rome might have become noticeable. If he knows ten Pauline letters, it indicates that their composition must have been earlier, but one should be cautious not to draw overly broad conclusions, as if these letters had already been widely available and generally recognized for a long time.

2) Apol. I. 2G ός xal νῦν έτι έστί διδάσκων, 58 και νῦν διδάσκει.

3) Adv. Marcionem L 19.

1) Adv. haereses III. 4, I. 28, Greek in Eusebius, K. G. IV. 11. 1, who, however, gives only the beginning of the passage.

2) See Clemens Alex. ed. Sylburg p. 325 (.Strom. VII): σβύτη; νειοτίροϊϊ σονεγένετο. The contemporaries mentioned are Basilides and Valentinits.

338

The question of how the so-called canon of Marcion, consisting of an evangelium similar to Luke and ten Pauline epistles—the first example of New Testament canon formation we know of—relates to the broader issue has been discussed often and in various ways. First and foremost, it is worth asking whether the church fathers are correct in accusing Marcion of distorting the New Testament writings he used and suppressing others. Marcion himself seems not to have been aware of such distortions; on the contrary, he claimed to represent what was genuine and true. Tertullian3) remarks about Marcion's Gospel: "I declare my own to be true, Marcion his. I affirm that Marcion's is adulterated, but my own is genuine."

3) Adv. Narcioem IV. 4.

339

Who among us will determine this, if not the course of time? Marcion’s designation of the Epistle to the Ephesians as the Epistle to the Laodiceans seems to have been made as if he were the most diligent investigator, through which irony acknowledges the honest intention of the accused. In some respects, it is hardly doubtful that Marcion acted at least without malice. For example, if he did not include the Pastoral Epistles in his collection, it is unlikely that he rejected them because of their anti-Gnostic content, which Tertullian does not even say about him, but simply because they were not yet known to him, as they were likely written around the same time. Furthermore, if the Epistle to the Ephesians was called the Epistle to the Laodiceans by Marcion, as Tertullian1) states, it is well known that the address of the letter lacks the designation of the place “in Ephesus” in some of the earliest witnesses, and thus Marcion’s designation of the letter is a conjecture that may be placed alongside the assumed ecclesiastical one. The reading οὐδέ πρδ; ὡραν (Galatians 2:5), which Tertullian2) also accuses Marcion of falsifying, is the one that is still generally read in the New Testament text today and is considered correct by almost all with few exceptions. Whether Marcion's Gospel was a revised version of Luke or an earlier form of this canonical Gospel was, as is well known, a matter of scholarly debate for a long time, and the question went through various stages, during which the view that the case should be decided in the latter sense almost prevailed, as recently discussed in Ritschl’s work "The Gospel of Marcion and the Canonical Gospel of Luke" from 1846. Since then, particularly through Volkmar’s article in the Tübingen Theological Yearbooks of 1850, expanded in the larger work "The Gospel of Marcion" from 1852, as well as through Hilgenfeld in his critical studies of the Gospels from 1850, the opposing view has regained dominance and has also been adopted by Baur and Ritschl themselves. Nevertheless, it should not be forgotten that this view does not simply agree with that of Tertullian and Epiphanius. There can be no talk of a "falsification" of Luke because Luke himself is not an original work but has arranged his gospel history subjectively from the sources in the same way that Marcion did with his Vorlage.

At that time, every church writer had and exercised the right to adapt and shape the historical tradition for their purposes. The outcry about falsification raised by the church fathers is thus an unjust accusation that arose from later Catholic ecclesiastical consciousness and judged the earlier freedom from that perspective. Moreover, it is not determined that, in some respects, at least in certain readings, Marcion's Gospel might have preserved the earlier form compared to our current Luke, as the aforementioned proponents of the current view, including Scholten1), assume.

1) Adv. Marcionem V. 17: Ecelesiae quidem veritate epistolatn istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad I.aodicenos, sed Marcion et titulum ali- quando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator. Nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad mnnes apostolus scripserit dum ad quos- dam etc.

2) Ibid., 3.

1) The Pauline Gospel p. 53.

340

The situation is similar with regard to Marcion's relationship to the Pauline Epistles. Although it is generally undoubted that he indeed edited these letters extensively to suit his needs, the question arises whether the text of the letters that Marcion had was not older and better than the version we read now, or whether some of his supposed omissions might actually refer to passages where interpolations have occurred. At least, this question should not be considered entirely resolved, and recently, van Manen2), a fervent opponent of Loman, published a study on Marcion's letter to the Galatians in the Dutch theological journal. This study concludes that Marcion has as much right to be heard in the question of the original text of the letter as his opponents and the more recent witnesses of the text, and that he may well have preserved the original text of the letter more faithfully in many respects.

2) theological journal 1887. pp. 382—404 and 451—533.

341

Marcion was certainly guided by the conviction that original Christianity had been distorted and corrupted by the reintroduced Jewish elements, and he sought to substantiate and justify this belief through a kind of historical criticism that often reminds one of the fundamental views of the modern Tübingen school. Starting from Galatians 2, where Paul reports his discussions with the original apostles and emphatically emphasizes his independent position relative to them, Marcion argued for a conflict between the apostle to the Gentiles and the Jewish apostles, aligning himself entirely with the former. According to him, Paul alone was truly a Christian apostle, while the Twelve fell back into Judaism. Therefore, the task was to restore Pauline teaching to its purity and to eliminate anything that contradicted it. This purpose was the focus of his entire life's work: his establishment of an independent theology that openly proclaimed the break with Judaism regarding the doctrine of the other God of the Old Testament, and an

independent church that enjoyed a fairly substantial growth and persisted long beyond the death of its founder, despite the fact that Marcion's moral teachings, in contrast to those of other Gnostics, were very strict, with ascetic demands progressing to a complete rejection of marriage, and did not spare the people. The same purpose was served by the so-called Marcionite canon, the selection and editing of those writings that showed the greatest affinity with the doctrine of the new church. Thus, it included ten of the Pauline letters that Marcion found and included in his collection, but only after a fairly extensive revision.

342

There can be no doubt that Marcion considered these letters to be those of the Apostle Paul. But did he conclude this based on historical evidence? Just as little as anyone else of his time. He likely regarded them as genuinely Pauline, but his judgment was fundamentally based on dogmatic reasons, like that of all his contemporaries. Because these letters seemed to him to reflect the spirit of Paul, he accepted them and agreed with the prevailing opinion of their authorship by the Apostle. He had no knowledge of the process behind the creation of these letters; by the time he arrived in Rome around 140, they were already in existence and regarded as Pauline by the community, so he included and used them without examining their authenticity with the tools of modern critical science. Therefore, his handling of them does not necessarily affirm their authenticity. Consider that among these ten were letters that modern criticism has almost universally declared as inauthentic for a long time, such as the Epistle to the Ephesians, which certainly could not have been written before the Gnostic period of the second century. Marcion also accepted this letter, newly established according to modern criticism, as Pauline. If nothing follows from this for its authenticity, neither does it for the others, including the Epistle to the Galatians, which, as the principal letter against Judaism1), stood out to Marcion primarily because of its content. And despite the fact that these letters were considered by Marcion as documents of the pure Pauline teaching, he did not hesitate to further purify them and to remove many things he alleged had been inserted from Judaism. This indicates that even then, freedom was maintained with respect to writings accepted as apostolic and that their authenticity was judged more according to dogmatic than historical criteria.1)

1) Tertullian adv. Marcionem V.

1) For information on Marcion's relationship to the Pauline letters, see also Loman, theological journal 1882, pp. 302—311.

343

The use Marcion made of the Pauline letters can hardly serve as proof of their authenticity, as we find similar letters in use among his intellectual relatives, the Gnostics of other systems, around the same time. It has often been noted that especially the First Epistle to the Corinthians is extensively used in Gnostic literature. Heinrici 2) has conducted a special study on this. It is not surprising that this letter was particularly welcomed by the Gnostics, as it notably aligns with their principles in a striking way, such as in the discussion of σοφία ἐν τοῖς τελείοις (1 Cor. 2:6ff.), the power of the πνεῦμα to explore all things, even the depths of God (1 Cor. 2:10), and the

distinction between Pneumatics and Psychics (1 Cor. 2:14), where the term ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος stands out, which is found only here in Paul.

Accordingly, we encounter the Pauline main letters among the Gnostics whose teachings are discussed in the Philosophumena of Hippolytus3). The dating of this remarkable work can be determined quite accurately. In Book VII, 33, it says: "In those days, the Marcionist Prepon made an attempt against Bardesanes the Armenian by composing writings about the sect." Thus, a work addressed by Prepon to Bardesanes is described as a contemporary occurrence. The Gnostic Bardesanes, according to recent research by Hilgenfeld (Bardesanes, der letzte Gnostiker, pp. 11-19, Ketzergeschichte, pp. 517ff.), lived from 154 to around 220 or later. Therefore, the Philosophumena could have been written around 222. In this polemical work, there are numerous citations or references to the main letters. For example, the long passage from Rom. 1:20-27 1) is quoted verbatim and attributed to Paul, as well as 2 Cor. 12:2-4 2), and also Rom. 5:3, 14; 8:19; 1 Cor. 2:3, 4; 10:11; Gal. 3:28; 4:26; 6:15. In the section about the Naasseni, 1 Cor. 11:32 is cited once3), and in the section about Justin, 1 Cor. 2:9 is cited three times4), along with a reference to Gal. 5:17 5). Basilides is said to have cited Rom. 5:13, 14; 8:22; 1 Cor. 2:13; 2 Cor. 12:4 6), and the Valentinians made use of passages like Rom. 8:11, 16, 25; 1 Cor. 2:14 7). Since these Gnostic systems are among the earlier forms of Gnosis and Basilides specifically lived around 130 in Alexandria, these would indeed be very early testimonies to the existence of our Pauline main letters.

2) Die Valentianische Gnosis, Berlin 1871. See in Meyer's exeget. Handbuch 1881, p. 10.

3) Ed. Duncker and Schneidewin, Göttingen 1859, the citations refer to the page numbers of this edition.

1) pp. 138, 64-140,84.

2) pp. 158, 71-76.

3) pp. 178, 7.

4) pp. 216, 24-26. 222,50.51. 230.77-79.

5) pp. 226, 98, 99.

6) pp. 370, 80, 81 374, 71-73. 372.23. 24,374.53. 54.

7) pp. 286, 9. 10. 284, 79. 80. 284, 70-72.

However, upon closer examination, the high antiquity of such citations proves to be merely an illusion. The following points should not be overlooked:

1. The manner in which heretics are portrayed in the Philosophumena often raises doubts about whether their claims and the scriptural passages used to support them come from the original leader of the school or from later followers of the same. For example, when certain sayings are attributed to Basilides and Valentinus with the formula φησίν, this does not prove that they themselves actually made these statements. The same φησίν appears among the Naassenes, Perates, and also the Valentinians, who, as entire schools, could not have spoken as a single person.1)

1) See also Holtzmann's remarks on this φησίν, introduction. 2nd ed. p. 136 note 1.

2. The citation formula φησίν in the Philosophumena is sometimes used in such a way that it is impossible to attribute it to the named heretic himself. For instance, according to VI. 14 2), Simon Magus is said to have used a citation from the First Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11,32), introduced with φησίν, whereas the context shows that it is rather the Simonian followers who are being referred to, with their opinions being introduced interchangeably with φησίν or ὁ Σιμών λέγει, as well as with expressions like ὅταν λέγωσιν and similar.

3. The citations also concern New Testament writings whose post-apostolic authorship is almost universally accepted by modern criticism. For example, VII. 26 attributes a citation from the Epistle to the Ephesians (Eph. 3, 3. 5.) to Basilides 3), and similarly, the Naassenes are noted in V.8 for knowledge of Eph. 2,17 4). Notably, both Basilides and the Naassenes, as well as the Perates and generally the earliest Gnostics in the Philosophumena, have a number of citations from the Gospel of John5). While these do not prove the use of this Gospel by Basilides himself, they similarly do not prove the existence of the Pauline Hauptbriefe before 120.

In fact, the status of the Pauline Hauptbriefe in relation to the testimony of the Philosophumena is no different from that of the Fourth Gospel. Defenders of the authenticity of the latter have pointed with great zeal to its use among the earliest Gnostics. However, those arguing for its inauthenticity have not been misled by this, but have shown that the Philosophumena only truly prove the use of such texts in the more developed Gnostic systems from the mid-second century onward, while for Basilides and others, this is merely illusory. We consider this criticism to be successful and apply it analogously to the Pauline Hauptbriefe, whose use in the Philosophumena proves no more and no less than that these letters were read and acknowledged in later Gnostic schools.

2) pp. 244, 90.

3) pp. 374, 51. 52.

4) pp. 156, 57. 58.

5) pp. 360, 38—40. 150, 55—57. 172, 5-7. 192, 52—54 and others.

8. The Muratorian Fragment

This fragment, discovered by Ludovico Muratori and published in 1740, lists the canon of the Western church as it existed in the late second century. The exact time of its origin cannot be determined precisely, but the phrase *nuperrime temporibus nostris*, used to describe the writing of the book of Hermas under the Roman bishop Pius (141–154), can be related to the decades 170–190 based on known analogies1). This also aligns with the assumption of the Montanist and Gnostic movements. It is natural that the fragment knows all the Pauline letters given the time it belongs to; however, one might be surprised by the way these letters are introduced. They are listed in great detail twice, as if the purpose was to explain and justify their number. First, the letters to the Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans are briefly but fairly accurately characterized in terms of their content and purpose. Paul had reproached the Corinthians for divisions, prohibited circumcision to the Galatians, and clarified to the Romans the relationship to the Old Testament and that its principle was Christ. It was deemed unnecessary to discuss these matters in detail2). Then follows a new enumeration of the letters, organized by the communities to which they were written, following the pattern of the seven letters to the churches in the Apocalypse. Paul, like his predecessor John, wrote only to seven communities by name: 1. Corinth, 2. Ephesus, 3. Philippi, 4. Colossae, 5. Galatia, 6. Thessalonica, 7. Rome. He wrote twice to the Corinthians and Thessalonians because they needed admonition. Although he wrote to individual communities, his message was meant for the whole church spread over the earth. For John also, in the Apocalypse, speaks to all through the seven churches. Finally, the private letters to Philemon, Titus, and Timothy are mentioned. Though they originated purely from friendship, they were honored due to their importance for the church order of the Catholic Church. A letter to the Laodiceans and another to the Alexandrians are also mentioned, both invented under the name of Paul according to Marcionite heresy, and other such things which cannot be accepted by the Catholic Church. For it is not right to mix gall with honey.

1) Irenaeus: σχεδόν litt τή; ήμετέρας γενεά; πρό; τι» τέλει τής Δομετιανοΰ άρχή; from the Apocalypse, Euseb. K. G. III. 18, 3.

2) The text seems to be corrupted in line 46. It should read: de quibus singulis non necesse est a nobis disputari. The ü written non may easily have been omitted before neeesse est and the meaning requires the negation.

This manner of discussing the Pauline letters does not give the impression that it concerns a firmly established fact long accepted by everyone. For example, Hilgenfeld1) argues that it reveals the need to justify the inclusion of these 13 Pauline letters. Similarly, Holtzmann2) finds it noteworthy that the justification of the Pauline letters is presented as if illuminated by an original apostle. Furthermore, Loman3) has pointed out the great similarity in the introduction of these letters with that of the Johannine Gospel, which likewise could not be sufficiently recommended as apostolic and canonical by the author of the list. The argumentation in both cases appears to be as forced and ineffective as in the other. John appears with the letters of

the Apocalypse as the predecessor of Paul, which certainly betrays a curious chronology. There are mentions of spurious Pauline letters, while the genuine ones are distinguished only by the remark that the Pauline letters themselves indicate which ones they are.

1) Introduction p. 103.

2) Introduction 2nd edition p. 148 and note 7.

3) Quaestiones Paulinae, theol. Tydschrift. 1883 pp. 47—50.

It is evident from the fragment that, in its time, recommending canonical works, including writings like the Johannine Gospel and the Pauline letters, was not considered superfluous. The mention of spurious Marcionite Pauline letters indicates the connection of the Marcionite movement, which has its roots in the Epistle to the Galatians, with the composition of the major letters. As testimony to the existence of the latter, the Muratorian list is insignificant, as mentions of them occurred by its time and even much earlier. However, due to the nature of these mentions, it is of importance, as it confirms the observation we have made several times that the testimony to the major letters is approximately on the same line as that of the Johannine Gospel.

The result of our investigation has been that, as de Wette1) suggested in his time, the Pauline letters, including the major letters, do not stand any better in terms of external validation than the Johannine Gospel. There are no testimonies for them from the first century; testimony begins only with the First Clementine Letter, though already in a very specific manner, at least concerning the Letter to the Romans and the First Letter to the Corinthians. However, there is no reason not to date the composition of this letter to around 130. There is no specific information about the Letter to the Galatians in it. Further, though less clear, traces of familiarity with the major letters are found in the Epistle of Barnabas, which we also date to around 130, and in the Shepherd of Hermas, written between 141 and 154, with some also in the Didache, though these are not very certain. In Justin's writings, knowledge of these letters is present, but the relationship to them is as peculiar as with the Johannine Gospel. In the Clementines, there is a clear reference to the Letter to the Galatians, but it cannot be proven that the section in which this occurs dates back to the first century; rather, it suggests a connection between the Letter to the Galatians and the Marcionite movement. This connection is also evident in how Marcion used these letters, though his recognition of the Apostle Paul as their author did not prevent him from further adapting their text to suit his purposes. Among the Gnostics, whose systems Hippolytus opposed at the beginning of the third century, we also encounter the Pauline letters, but this evidence is only for the later Gnostic schools from Marcion's time onward, which also used the Johannine Gospel. Finally, in the Muratorian Canon, the parallel with the external testimony of the Johannine Gospel is completed, as the Pauline letters are similarly introduced and their significance for the Catholic Church is explained.

1) Compare the sentence in the introduction § 109a: In this respect (namely the external authentication) our Gospel (that of John) is not worse, indeed better, than the first three and than the Pauline writings.

349

This result will indeed be challenged. It will be argued that relatively early testimonies, such as the First Clement and Marcion, presuppose a much earlier tradition regarding the major letters, suggesting that the recognition of these letters, in order to be expressed so definitively at that time, could not have been a relatively recent fact but must have been established decades earlier. However, if one envisions the process generally as involving spurious apostolic writings gradually coming to be recognized as apostolic over a long period, by a time when knowledge of their origin had already been forgotten and a different opinion had gradually formed in the community, one does not fully grasp how the process must have actually occurred. It should not be forgotten that writings like the New Testament letters, from the beginning and through their addresses, explicitly claim to be authored by the apostles whose names they bear. These are deliberate forgeries, undertaken in the spirit of that era and of the early church literature by those who intended to serve Christian truth and the church. If the endeavor succeeded, there was no need to assume a long period during which opinions about their authenticity could form; rather, it had to occur immediately within the circles where the new literary phenomena were welcomed, while opposing circles expressed their dissent by rejecting them. With the victory of the orthodox-church party, the opinion of the apostolic origin of such writings also prevailed, and dissent gradually became the private opinion of a heresy. Therefore, it is not necessary to assume a long dark preparatory period for the emergence of such writings; rather, as Renan has noted somewhere, the first traces of the emergence of such writings in ecclesiastical literature usually also indicate their date of composition quite precisely.

350

It is related that there is no need to imagine the emergence of our New Testament literature over such a long period as suggested by recent criticism. According to this view, the formation of the New Testament would have required over a hundred years, from the Letter to the Galatians in 55 AD to the Second Letter of Peter after 150 AD. Such a protracted literary process contradicts all analogy. When a national literature begins to flourish, new works do not appear every ten years; rather, new forms emerge close together, like spring bringing forth a thousand new flowers. Similarly, the New Testament writings, despite their individual differences, show significant uniformity as a whole and would have been produced within about 50 years, from the end of the first century to the middle of the second century. Initially, the synoptic gospels, based on earlier works, would have appeared, followed by the Acts of the Apostles and the letters. The components of this literary chain would overlap, with many writings emerging almost simultaneously over several decades. There is no reason to assume that the Pauline letters, once the foundational tone was set with the Letter to the Romans, could not have been written in relatively quick succession, perhaps between 120 and 140 AD, allowing Marcion to collect and use ten of them as apostolic. Thus, instead of the previously assumed prolonged development of New Testament writing, a more acute timeline would emerge, addressing a

concern rightly raised by the apologetic side against the critical results. The earlier view that the New Testament was created from Paul to John, approximately from 50 to 100 AD, proves to be more reasonable overall than the view previously held by critics. It is just that the entire process needs to be shifted down by about 50 years, taking place instead in the second century rather than the first.

351

Chapter 6

The main Pauline letters and the original Christianity

The assumption that the main Pauline epistles do not originate from the Apostle himself but belong to the second century will always face the objection that they, by form and content, appear to be the work of such a powerful personality, as could only be expected in the creative early days of Christianity, within the circle of the apostles themselves. This impression is well-founded. In the New Testament, we have no other writings in which such a powerful and original religious thought is expressed as in these, for the majesty of Jesus' evangelical words, which stand unique and unattainable, belongs to a different domain. However, the conclusion drawn from this impression is disputable. It states: because these letters are so incomparable, they must have been written by an apostle. But who tells us that only the apostles were such original thinkers? Must Paul, who had no direct contact with Jesus, be the powerful systematic thinker behind the Epistle to the Romans just because he paved the way for Christianity in the Gentile world? Is it impossible for one or more such personalities to appear in later times? Again, the example of the Gospel of John saves us from hasty conclusions. How long was it said that such a work, the true intimate and tender main gospel, the heart of Jesus, could only come from the disciple who lay on Jesus' breast, and it was entirely unthinkable that it could originate from the second century, a time whose productions stand far below it and cannot be compared with it. Yet Brückner stated in the introduction to de Wette's commentary: "but the Christian view of the Evangelist presents itself as so high and yet immediate that no monument of Christian development of the second century even remotely approaches it." Nevertheless, the critical school, judging with rare unanimity on this point, has not hesitated to push the origin of the Gospel of John into the second century and find it comprehensible there. Those who hold firmly to the authenticity of this Gospel may protest against our assumption that the main Pauline letters belong to the same period. We cannot blame them, for they judge consistently by the principle: The highest can only originate from an apostle. But if their opponents do not refrain from reasserting the same argument they gave up in the case of the Gospel of John in this analogous case, it lacks consistency. The example of the fourth Gospel teaches that the highest could still emerge in the second century, and if it had to be considered unique before because no other writing from the same time reached its greatness, it now loses this isolated position with the approach of the equally majestic and yet so differently constituted main Pauline letters that preceded it shortly.

353

We will have to get used to the idea that no apostle wrote anything, just as Jesus himself did not. Given their historical position, the apostles were certainly more men of action than men of writing. The main Pauline letters, with their heavy intellectual content, are not well suited to be viewed as the work of a man who was constantly on the move, traveling from one place to

another, working on his trade during the day, and in the evening gathering slaves and common folk in some secluded room to explain the Scriptures to them and build them up in Christ. They look more like the deep intellectual work of a thinker who, standing at the pinnacle of the education of his time, looks beyond into a new, more glorious world of faith and love and is able to provide it with the necessary foundation through a deep understanding of the Greek Old Testament, as well as the appropriate elaboration through a clear insight into the human heart and life. This explains the early perception of the difference between the apostle's personal appearance and his letters. Already in the second letter to the Corinthians, it is said (10:10): "His letters are weighty and forceful, but in person he is unimpressive and his speaking amounts to nothing."

354

However, this feeling of improbability would naturally not be decisive; things may still be as previously thought, for the truth is not always probable. But other reasons are decisive: internal difficulties that arise in the interpretation of all four main letters and cannot be resolved on the current path. Despite the extensive and diligent work on explaining these four letters, after solving all the difficulties that could be addressed, there remains an unexplained and inexplicable residue.

Regarding the letter to the Galatians, the first part of our investigation attempted to demonstrate this. With the letters to the Corinthians, we have already highlighted some specific issues of this nature. In particular, these letters' introductory questions have not been satisfactorily resolved to this day. In his introduction, Holtzmann, after addressing all other points, lists no fewer than twelve questions concerning the mutual relationship between the two letters, over which the discussion still fluctuates undecidedly. To clarify the historical circumstances of these letters somewhat, a series of assumptions are made to accommodate the existing divergent indications. One such attempt, which aligns with others in many points and offers some unique perspectives in others, is as follows:

1. Paul works with Silvanus and Timothy for about two years in Corinth (Acts 18:11, 18; 1 Cor. 2:1ff., 3:1ff.; 2 Cor. 1:19).
2. He writes a (lost) letter to the Corinthian congregation (1 Cor. 5:9-11).
3. He sends Timothy and some others from Ephesus to Corinth, who are to depart before Easter 58 and return to Paul by Pentecost (1 Cor. 4:17; 16:10f.; Acts 19:22).

355

4. Before Timothy arrives in Corinth, three delegates from the local congregation (Stephanas, Fortunatus, Achaicus) arrive in Ephesus (1 Cor. 16:17).
5. Based on the received news and the questions presented to him, Paul writes the so-called first (actually second) letter to the Corinthians.
6. As he announces in this letter (16:2-8; cf. Acts 19:21), he travels through Macedonia to Corinth. He finds the situation there highly unsatisfactory (2 Cor. 12:21; 13:2). Since the

collection did not meet his expectations, he postpones his trip to Jerusalem and returns to Ephesus.

7. The sad experiences he had in Corinth prompt him to write a new letter [also not preserved] to the congregation (2 Cor. 2:3f.; 7:8,12), in which he anticipates a third visit (1:15f.). Titus, accompanied by a brother (12:18), delivers this letter, finds a satisfactory reception in Corinth (7:13-15), and promotes the collection work (8:6 προενήρξατο).
8. Paul travels through Troas, where he awaits Titus in vain (Acts 20:1ff.; 2 Cor. 2:12f.), to Macedonia, where Titus arrives with new news from Corinth (2 Cor. 7:5ff.).
9. As a result of this news, Paul writes the so-called second (actually fourth) letter to the Corinthians, which Titus and two other brothers deliver (2 Cor. 8:6,16,18f.,22; 9:3,5).
10. Shortly afterward, Paul himself comes to Corinth for the third time (Acts 20:2).

The attempt presented here is one of many made to understand the situation of the two Corinthian letters based on the indications contained within them. It originates from Krenkel and is certainly not worse than all the others; it does not go as far in hypothesis-building as, for example, Hausrath, who claims to have found the supposed letter between 1 and 2 Corinthians in the section 2 Cor. 10-13, placing it before the beginning of the second letter. Nevertheless, one only needs to look at the above list of necessary or advisable auxiliary assumptions for understanding the Corinthian letters to recognize how much arbitrariness, boldness, improbability, and even impossibility it contains. For example, that Paul, having just written the first Corinthian letter, quickly sets out and travels to Corinth himself, is hard to understand. He could have settled everything better orally. This journey to Corinth also contradicts the Acts of the Apostles, which does not mention such a journey but depicts Paul as active in Ephesus during that entire period (Acts 19). It is assumed solely to give certain expressions in the second letter their due, expressions that can also be understood differently and are contradicted by other specific statements, such as in 2 Cor. 1:23, where it is explicitly denied that Paul came back to Corinth, οὐχέτι ἦλθον εἰς Κόρινθον. It is also hard to understand that we have two Corinthian letters while two others from the same period, which must have been equally important, have disappeared without a trace, even if the Corinthians had no reason to "put them behind the mirror." Then they should not have shown the first received letter either, which could not have been very flattering for them (5:1,6). Thus, the entire airy hypothesis-building resembles a tower placed on a few bricks, which must collapse under its weight, bringing it down as well.

356

Of course, it is true that without such assumptions, one cannot do justice to the existing difficulties of these letters.1

> 1 This is also shown, in my opinion, by the latest attempt to get along without such intermediaries, as Heinrici undertook in "Das 2. Sendschr. an die Korinthier" (1887), p. 53 ff., only all the more clearly.

357

There are contradictions between the two letters and within each of them that do not allow one to be satisfied with the usually assumed course of events borrowed from the Acts of the Apostles. It is true that the mission of Timothy, which is repeatedly mentioned in the first letter, does not even find a hint of resolution in the second letter, but rather, a similar assignment to Titus is carried out. It is true that the indications in the second letter that Paul intends to come to Corinth for the third time suggest a trip that must have taken place between the two letters if one understands the words as they are usually understood. Furthermore, it is true that where the second letter speaks of the events that preceded it, the tone does not align with what is reported in the first letter, that the deep sadness with which the earlier letter is said to have been written (II Cor. 2:4) cannot be properly detected in the first letter, and that the case of the incestuous man, as treated in the second letter, does not quite match the corresponding section in the first letter. Finally, it is decidedly true that the last part of the second letter, chapters 10-13, suddenly takes on a completely different tone and does not fit with what precedes it. All of this can provoke attempts to balance these incongruities with auxiliary assumptions, and such attempts can argue in their favor that we do not know nearly everything that happened at that time, and that the apparent incomprehensibilities actually suggest that events transpired in this way.

But this situation must raise the question of whether we are not simply groping in the dark with our conjectures and hypotheses, and whether the matter is actually far simpler. Might the foundation of the historical situation be the account in the Acts of the Apostles, which is merely expanded and varied in different ways? Might the missions of Timothy and Titus, similar to those in the Deutero-Pauline letters, be part of the narrative framework? And might the repeated comings of the Apostle, as we previously noted, partially refer to a spiritual coming, specifically through the letters? Most notably, we must ask whether these letters are composed of a series of individual pieces of different origins. In the second letter, the seams between the three parts (1-7, 8-9, 10-13) are so poorly integrated that there is no real coherence, which justifies the attempts to separate the third part, which begins anew with "Now I, Paul, myself" (10:1), from the letter and consider it independently. This section could very well have been created on its own, as a model of Pauline apologetics against the Judaizers, while the first part continues certain themes from the first letter, particularly those concerning Christian knowledge and life in the Spirit. The middle section, dealing with the collection for the saints and the sending of Titus, serves as a connective link. In the first Corinthians letter, a similar but even longer series of individual pieces has been combined into a whole, addressing themes related to various aspects of community life. That not everything is of one piece becomes evident from certain contradictions that emerge upon closer inspection. For example, in 14:33-34, women are absolutely forbidden to speak in the church, and this is presented as a general rule in all churches. On the other hand, 11:5 presupposes that women can pray and prophesy, and clearly in the church, since otherwise the command that they do so with covered heads and the reference to the observing angels would make no sense. Similar contradictions appear between the two letters. The eschatological discourse in the first letter, chapter 15, is rooted in Jewish tradition and fits well with its notion of the resurrection of the flesh, the visible return of the Lord, and the Messianic kingdom on earth, akin to the Judeo-Christian apocalypse. In the second letter, however, 5:1-5 presents a much more spiritual concept, suggesting an immediate transition of the soul to heaven after death, where its glorified body is kept ready—a notion that

aligns more with Platonic than Old Testament ideas. This discrepancy has led to varied interpretations of Paul's view of the soul's state after death, and the difference persists in later Pauline letters, where Philippians 1:23 aligns with II Corinthians 5:1, while I Thessalonians 4:15-17 aligns more with I Corinthians 15. Another more external contradiction exists between I Corinthians 9:6-15, where Paul states he never accepted payment from the churches, and II Corinthians 11:8-9, where he admits receiving support from the Macedonian churches.

1 Unquestionably, one such piece is the small section in 2 Corinthians 6:14 to 7:1, which must have entered the letter from elsewhere. See the note on page 160, where among the proponents of this view, Emmerling, Holsten (The Gospel of Paul and Peter, p. 387), Frauke (Studies and Critiques, 1884, p. 5448*), Baljon, and Heinrici (The Second Letter to the Corinthians, pp. 329ff.) should be mentioned. As I see in retrospect, Hilgenfeld and Franke had already entertained the idea of linking 1 Corinthians 5:9 to this piece. It seems to me that it reveals the same hand as Romans 9-11, particularly in the similar external and cumulative manner of using the Scriptures.

1 ') This contradiction is also highlighted by Courdaveaux in "St. Paul d'après la libre critique en France" (1886), where he also points out the inconsistencies between 2 Corinthians 1:23 and 13:1, 1 Corinthians 16:5, and 2 Corinthians 1:15. (Theological Literature Journal, 1887.)

These are indications that suggest different circumstances for the origin of the Corinthian letters than what is usually imagined. They are hardly works made in one go, but rather gradually developed fragments of Pauline literature that were eventually edited into letters.

The most challenging problem, however, is presented by the Epistle to the Romans. Understanding its historical prerequisites has been a significant task for modern scholarship, which has invested its best efforts without having yet provided a truly satisfactory answer. The traditional assumption that the Roman Christian community and therefore the readership of this letter was Gentile Christian was opposed by Baur, who argued that a historical understanding of the letter is only possible if the opposite is assumed. Baur suggested that Paul wanted to introduce his gospel to the Jewish Christian Roman community, which could only have contained a minority of Gentile Christians at most. The second part of the letter, chapters 9-11, previously considered peripheral, was seen by Baur as the core of the whole, dealing with the demonstration that Israel's temporary exclusion from salvation lies within God's plan and does not contradict His universal salvific plan or His promises in the Old Testament. According to Baur, Paul wanted to convince the Romans of this insight inherent in his gospel, preparing the ground with the exposition in chapters 1-8. Understood in this way, the letter was placed among the historically comprehensible documents intertwined with the apostle's life work, whereas before it had to be seen merely as a compendium of Pauline dogmatics. Baur's view gained considerable support and seemed poised to become dominant. However, subsequent developments showed that this position could not be maintained. Initially, attention had to be paid to the repeated explicit statements, especially at the beginning of the letter (1:6, 13), which

identified the readers as born Gentiles and counted them among the Gentile Christians—statements inadequately explained by Baur. Accepting these statements as they stood meant acknowledging that Gentile Christians were indeed addressed at the beginning and in 11:13. On the other hand, it could not be denied that the entire argumentation of the first part was aimed at a consciousness still entangled in Jewish Christianity. To reconcile these opposing indications, Baur's view had to be revised. This revision was initially suggested by Beyschlag in 1867, who proposed that the readers were born Gentiles who had accepted Christianity as Jewish proselytes. With greater success, Weizsäcker in 1876 demonstrated the Gentile Christian character of the Roman community, introducing the motive that Paul aimed to counter the imminent intrusion of Judaizing agitation into the community. This new explanation found significant favor and still dominates scientific discourse, although Baur's older view, as well as the initial apologetic stance of the letter's purely doctrinal purpose, still persist alongside it. This revised view is certainly correct insofar as it demonstrates the Gentile Christian character of the Roman community from the letter itself and other information we have about the community. However, it seems less successful in its second proposition—the assumption of a defense against incoming Judaism—since, except for perhaps 3:8, there is no trace of similar polemics against Judaizing opponents in the entire letter, which fills the letters to the Galatians and Corinthians. That particular verse is far too general to serve as sufficient evidence. Thus, it remains unexplained how Paul could write to a Gentile Christian community in such a manner, and even more so, how such disparate elements can exist together in a single letter without resolution. The opening (1:1-16) explicitly addresses Gentile Christians; the first main section (1:16-8:39) can only be understood if the entire argument is seen as directed at a consciousness still immersed in Jewish Christianity; the second main section (9-11) is clearly written for Gentile Christians but deals with a question of utmost interest regarding their relationship to the people of the old covenant; the third main section (12-14) also appears directed at a Gentile Christian community, with the "weak in faith" possibly, but not certainly, being Jewish Christians. Thus, the letter provides not one but two to three different answers to the question of whether its readers were Gentile or Jewish Christians, depending on which part of the letter is considered. These sections are loosely connected. Chapter 9 begins something entirely new after the formal conclusion of 8:39, with no connection to the preceding part. Similarly, 12:1 introduces the exhortation section, so these are three pieces that stand independently and are not intimately connected. The second section, chapters 9-11, even reveals a different hand than the first, using a much more superficial scriptural argument and presenting the entire argument and language in a coarser manner. The last two chapters, 15 and 16, were already considered later additions to the letter by Baur, a view that has gained much support. Chapter 16, in particular, is considered by many critics, even those of moderate positions, to be either entirely or partly unrelated to the letter. Internal reasons are complemented by ancient testimony, with the closing doxology (16:25-27) appearing after chapter 14 in several old sources, and Marcion omitting the two chapters entirely around the mid-second century. The repeated closing formulas (15:33, 16:20, 24) also suggest that this part of the letter grew gradually to its present extent, a point Volkmar convincingly demonstrated in his commentary on Romans (1875). But one must go further. Not just the closing part, but the entire letter grew gradually from individual pieces. The three main parts appear as individual treatises: chapters 1-8 discuss the Christian principle in relation to Old Testament salvation

history; chapters 9-11 deal with the apparent contradiction between God's promises to Israel and the current exclusion of this people from Christian salvation; chapters 12-14 present a moral exhortation concerning Christian duties, especially community obligations regarding civil authorities and an ascetic minority within the community. These three sections were united into one work and framed as a letter with an introduction and likely an original conclusion now lost. Subsequent additions, chapters 15 and 16, were made, and finally, in the late second century, the letter took the form in which we now read it. Similarly, the Corinthian letters likely developed this way, especially the second letter with its three clearly distinct parts offering an instructive parallel to the Epistle to the Romans.

363

Thus, the Pauline letters, which have been considered works of a single author, must rather be seen as the products of a school, and it is necessary to understand them as such. Indeed, the criticism has already partially regarded them as works of a school since, in denying that some or all of the smaller letters were by Paul, it did not deny the common thread that connects them all. The so-called inauthentic Pauline letters were considered works of later Paulinism. For us, the major letters have now also taken on the same position, and the entire series of 13 or 14 Pauline letters will need to be understood as the literary outcome of the development of Paulinism.

However, extending the concept of the Pauline school to the four major letters may be countered by the argument that these letters appear too unified in content and expression, particularly in linguistic style, to not be the work of a single author. This indeed presents a difficulty. Some of the smaller letters have been claimed by critics to be inauthentic because they lack the genuinely Pauline linguistic characteristics found in the major letters, and this argument is one of the strongest against the Pastoral Epistles. Yet, those who defend the authenticity of most of these smaller letters have pointed out enough Pauline language in them to diminish the weight of opposing observations. For example, whether the Epistle to the Philippians gives rise to attacks in this regard is a question still debated, as seen in the recent discussion between Holsten and P. Schmidt. This suggests that the unity of linguistic style across the Pauline letters is not something from which too much should be inferred. While the four major letters indeed show significant consistency in this respect, this does not necessarily prove they are the work of the same author. Instead, they primarily form a special group with largely consistent thematic and linguistic features, distinct from the smaller letters. That such a group need not be the work of a single writer is demonstrated by a comparable example within the New Testament itself. In the Johannine writings—the Gospel and the three letters—we see a similar group that sharply differs in content and form from all other writings. The Johannine style is so characteristically unique that it cannot be confused with any other. These four writings all bear these marks prominently. Nevertheless, according to modern criticism, they are unlikely to be the work of one and the same writer. Despite all their similarities, the first letter has peculiarities in doctrine that distinguish it from the Gospel. The two smaller letters attributed to the Presbyter do not originate from the author of the larger one. This is another example of the work of a school—one that, in general, teaches and writes consistently, but shows differences in specific instances. Just as the Johannine writings point to a Johannine school, the same can be

true for the Pauline letters. The differences among them, and even within them, are significant. The major group of four large letters is distinct from the group of the Captivity Epistles, which share common features; the Thessalonian letters have specific characteristics in common, and the Pastoral Epistles are similarly inseparable as a whole, yet distinct from the other letters. The major letters themselves contain sections that diverge so markedly that they can hardly be from the same hand. We have already seen that Romans 9-11 cannot be from the same author as chapters 1-8, and other sections show such differences that the idea of multiple contributors has been suggested before. It is interesting to hear the perspective of a self-described layperson who nevertheless deserves to be called a Doctor of Theology if he is not already one. He writes in the Protestant Church Newspaper: "One does not discover a single Paulinism but rather many Paulinisms, and more importantly, more than one deeply religious Paulinist in these letters. Indeed, 1 Corinthians 13 might be the word of an entirely un-Pauline yet thoroughly Christian prophet. While I respect the other authors (particularly the one of Romans 1-8), I must tell you which of all my favorite Paulinists is. It is the one who reveals to us so intimately and gently his Christological Christianity at the beginning of each of the two Corinthian letters, which is still entirely religion and entirely Christianity. How often has his word, his pure personality, moved me! He shapes our life when he shows that the Crucified, religion in its personal reality, is more than wisdom and wonders. He brings us to complete clarity when he shows that the religion of Jesus, the light that shines from the face of Christ, has removed the veil of Moses from our face. He elevates us to the highest and purest freedom of the spirit when he tells us that it matters to know Christ not according to the flesh (as an earthly Messiah) but according to the spirit (as Christianity in person). If someone can prove to me that this Paulinist is the same as the one of the Epistle to the Galatians, or even just the one of Romans 1-8, I will believe that the same poet composed 'Befiehl du deine Wege,' 'Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott,' and 'Wach auf du Geist der ersten Zeugen.' I would believe that Schleiermacher's, Dorner's, and Ritschl's dogmatics all come from the same author."

366

It will be the future task of scholarship to pursue these traces more closely and see whether they lead to a satisfactory solution. Observations that emerged from entirely different viewpoints have already shown that the thought world of the Pauline major letters, despite its apparent coherence, is not as unified as commonly assumed. We should briefly recall the excellent studies conducted by Lüdemann in his "Anthropology of Paul" (1872). His conclusion was that two parallel lines of thought run alongside each other in these letters: the Hellenistic-Platonic and the Jewish-Old Testament, and that these two are only partially and insufficiently reconciled.

From our perspective, this result is not surprising. If the letters emerged from Christian Hellenism and the Old Testament elements were only incorporated through engagement with the Alexandrian Bible, it follows naturally that this connection is inherently loose and the disparate elements tend to separate. However, it is also possible that this observation leads to another solution: the assumption of two or more authors, suggesting a similar history of the development of our current letters as proposed in the "Verisimilia" by Pierson and Naber with their theory of Christian reworking of Jewish fragments.

Reaching a conclusive judgment on these questions is far from possible at this time. It will require the application of all the critical acumen available to Protestant scholarship to discern what may be true about these ideas. Our focus in this investigation has been on the overall view of the letters. The finer chisels may later try their luck, after the axe has done its work. And indeed, our results create justification and space for such work. For now, we are content with demonstrating that our letters, when viewed as a whole, represent not the beginning but the pinnacle of Pauline development. However, to shape this into a preliminary overall view, at least an attempt must be made to outline the main features of this progression.

—----------

In the counter-argument presented by the highly esteemed Scholten, as his final testament against the Loman hypothesis, the main argument is that Paulinism is presupposed by numerous New Testament writings. It existed before the Acts of the Apostles, as well as before the Gospel of Luke; it is also considered polemically in the Gospel of Matthew, as well as in the Apocalypse and the Epistle of James. On the other hand, it is developed further in the First Epistle of Peter and the Epistle to the Hebrews. To the extent that this argument asserts the existence of Paulinism before the composition of most of our New Testament writings, there is little to contest. However, insofar as it seeks to prove the existence of our major letters at the same time, it must be countered that this does not follow from the premise. It belongs to the schema that critical scholarship has used to reconstruct the history of early Christianity, placing the most developed forms of opposition—the Apocalypse on one hand and the Pauline major letters on the other—at the beginning of the development. The Pauline formulation must counter the Jewish-Christian formulation of the Christian principle, and then the rest of the New Testament literature builds as mediating and reconciling links on these foundational pillars, culminating in the higher reconciliation of opposites in the Johannine doctrine.

However, this construction is not very solid. Concerning the Apocalypse, there is increasing doubt about its previously assigned position, with some suggesting it belongs to a later period, in whole or in part. Our findings suggest that the Pauline major letters are not as old and authentic documents of Paulinism as previously thought. Specifically, we believe we have demonstrated that the Epistle to the Galatians does not precede Acts but follows it. Whether the other letters also presuppose our Gospels remains an open question. We consider it probable but also find it possible that while they indeed recognize written collections of Jesus' words, these collections were not yet in the form of our current Gospels, which would have been edited into their present form later. Thus, the process of the development of the Gospels and the letters may not have unfolded sequentially but rather interwoven, with some words in the final form of the Gospel text potentially referring back to our letters, while elements in these letters, as we believe we have shown, point back to the older predecessors of our Gospels. However, this is not the place to delve into such details.

Regarding what Scholten and others attribute to Paul in the Gospels, much of it is very uncertain and unprovable. For example, the suggestion that the hostile man in the parable of the weeds among the wheat (Matthew 13:30) represents Paul, or that the wolves in sheep's clothing (Matthew 7:15) refer to Paulines, seems far-fetched. A less drastic interpretation is just as plausible. Even if some elements in the Gospels refer to Paul and Paulinism, this does not necessarily mean that it must be the Paul and the Paulinism of the major epistles. Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles, is indeed a significant historical figure, independent of the question of the authenticity of his letters. We do not doubt his existence; on the contrary, this vibrant personality is the starting point of the entire movement within which the Pauline epistles are situated. The principled stance and activities of the apostle were likely quite similar to the usual descriptions, albeit somewhat more human, historical, and less unequivocal than suggested by the major epistles. The life of the apostle is primarily to be drawn from the Acts of the Apostles—as has essentially been done so far. The system followed by its author, with its moderating and mitigating influences, must be considered. It is also possible that the letters contain some genuine information derived from the tradition of the Pauline communities. However, the so-called "We" passages in the second part of Acts provide a vivid and realistic picture. The Paul on the ship in Acts 27 is so lifelike and realistic, and at the same time so humanly simple and straightforward, that here, as Loman also noted, we get the most immediate impression of an apostolic personality that the New Testament offers. Moreover, the general portrayal of Pauline thought and activity, as previously presented, can be largely maintained in its main outlines. Without doubt, it was Paul who first took the step of opening the door to Christian salvation wide and free for the Gentiles. Individual prior instances of Gentile conversions by other apostles do not diminish this significant fact, as they were incidental and not of a principled nature. It was undoubtedly Paul who first fundamentally freed himself from the Jewish law, which remained a burdensome hindrance for the older apostles. His origin from the Diaspora, not from Palestinian Israel, likely facilitated this freer stance once he was convinced of the fulfillment of the Messianic hope in Jesus. The doctrine of justification by faith would have belonged, in essence, to the preaching of the historical Paul. However, the strict systematic development that this doctrine received in the major epistles is unlikely to have been the work of the apostle himself. It is questionable whether this much-discussed doctrine could have fully emerged from a purely Jewish context. Despite its Old Testament basis, it seems to us that it essentially overturns Judaism and the Old Testament. We might ask whether its father is indeed the Old Testament, but its mother—the Roman law, whose expressions seem particularly familiar in the Epistle to the Galatians. Paul's own stance towards the law might have been more practically liberal than as sharply principled as depicted in the major epistles. From this perspective, certain aspects of Acts, such as the account of Timothy's circumcision and the Nazarite vow offering in Jerusalem, might be more understandable than from the perspective of the Epistle to the Galatians. This also offers a simpler historical interpretation for the much-debated phrase "if I still preach circumcision" (Galatians 5:11).

370

This further explains the otherwise contradictory depiction of Paul's final journey to Jerusalem and his reception there, as represented both in Acts and in the Epistle to the Romans. On the one hand, Paul is received in Jerusalem by the Jews with extreme hostility, which quickly

escalates to death threats. On the other hand, the Jewish Christians greet him as a brother, and even James, the strictest of the early apostles, welcomes him warmly, only advising him to do something to appease Jewish prejudices (Acts 21 and 22). Therefore, the relationship between Paul and the Jewish Christians cannot have been as strained as the critical school has portrayed it. Paul must have been able to maintain the hope, despite prevailing differences, that his personal appearance in Jerusalem would be welcomed by the Christian brothers there. One must ask, however, whether this would be conceivable if the relationship were as depicted in the Epistle to the Galatians and the Corinthian letters. In that case, even the delivery of a love offering could hardly have been sufficient to alleviate the differences, and the transition from the second Corinthian letter to the understanding of the situation indicated in Romans 15:25–33 would be inexplicable. Thus, although Paul's thinking differed significantly from that of the original apostles, there could not have been a complete break between them, and the opposing statements in the major epistles merely reflect the mood of a much later time. A certain appreciation of Paul and his work must have existed even within Jewish Christian circles, as evidenced by Acts, and this appreciation is also attested to in later times. This is proven by a patristic reference that must have been completely incomprehensible according to the previous understanding of the critical school but has now been utilized by Loman in support of his view and was also emphasized by Ritschl in his time. Specifically, this is a passage from Jerome's commentary on Isaiah 9:1, in which he cites an opinion of the Nazarenes regarding the Apostle Paul that is not hostile but rather approving, particularly concerning his activity as a missionary to the Gentiles. He says: "The Nazarenes try to explain this passage (the people who walk in darkness see a great light, etc.) as follows: with the coming of Christ and his shining preaching, the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, which are of the scribes and Pharisees, was freed from their errors and threw off the grievous yoke of Jewish traditions from their necks. But later, through the Gospel of the Apostle Paul, who was the last of all the apostles, preaching was intensified, that is, multiplied: and the Gospel of Christ shone forth to the boundaries of the Gentiles and into the way of the whole sea. Finally, the entire world, which had previously walked or sat in darkness and was held in the bonds of idolatry and death, saw the bright light of the Gospel." If the Nazarenes indeed thought of Paul in this way—and we have no reason to question Jerome's report, as he extensively studied their writings—then the common view of how this apostle was judged by Jewish Christianity cannot be upheld. It is entirely unthinkable that this judgment, as Hilgenfeld suggests, should refer to the Nazarenes of a later time who had learned to reconcile with Paul. In that later time, the position of these extreme Jewish Christians towards advanced Paulinism had indeed become much more hostile. Rather, this judgment must pertain to the historical Paul and presupposes a respectful evaluation of him by Jewish Christians, as Acts also indicates. Only after the major epistles had emerged, and the advanced Gentile Christians elevated this heightened anti-Jewish image of Paul, did the hatred against the Apostle to the Gentiles arise among Jewish Christians, as evidenced by the Clementine Homilies.

372

From this perspective, we can gain insight into the development of this relationship, which indeed presents a picture significantly different from the views of the critical school. The contrast between the Pauline and the original apostolic direction in Christianity was not at its greatest at

the beginning; rather, it gradually intensified and only reached its peak after the death of the apostles. Initially, the two directions were not so divergent. Paul was likely a bit freer than Peter, and there was a difference between him and the original apostles, but not a sharp contrast. Paul's journey to Jerusalem at the end of his missionary work in the Orient suggests a more moderate understanding of this relationship than the Tübingen school perceived. It was only after the apostle's death that the contrast became more pronounced, and the Pauline epistles, in their sequence, illustrate the development of one side of this contrast. First, the Epistle to the Romans calmly and thoroughly presents the case for Gentile Christian views and deeply grounds it through an examination of the Old Testament foundations of Christ's work of redemption. Then, the Corinthian letters adopt a livelier tone, glorify Paul as the minister of the new covenant, and polemically advocate for the law-free Paulinism. Already before or concurrently, the Acts of the Apostles had revised historical memories and depicted the history of early Christianity in a manner that justified Paul's Gentile mission by drawing parallels between Paul and Peter. Finally, the Epistle to the Galatians, which presupposes the three other main epistles and the Acts of the Apostles, launches a bold attack on the main stronghold of the opponent: the apostolic authority of the Apostle to the Gentiles is presented as divinely ordained, opposed to the human esteem of the original apostles, and the battle against law-based Christianity is brought to a decisive conclusion with the sharpest weapons. At the same time, this epistle reckons with the half-hearted and unprincipled stance of the Acts of the Apostles and presents a much more decisive portrayal of Paul. This entire body of literature adopts the form of letters from the Apostle Paul, utilizing a means of vivid representation that was not uncommon at the time and was adopted by all Christian parties. Following the Epistle to the Galatians, the smaller Pauline epistles appear, with only the Epistle to the Philippians still revealing some echoes of the battle. The Gnostic movement now drives the church circles closer together, the persecutions by the Roman state power work towards the same end, and the formation of the Catholic Church buries the old strife, having reached the Catholic standpoint on the Pauline side with the Pastoral Epistles. The more strictly principled Paulinists, who could not conform to the system of mediation, separated from the church and established their own existence, much like the extreme Jewish Christian elements did in the form of Ebionitism and Nazarene Christianity. The Marcionite movement is the direct continuation of the Epistle to the Galatians, the last offshoot of consistent Paulinism. Just as the Gospel of John stands at the point in the Asian Minor church where the development of the Logos doctrine splits into a church and a heretical line, the four main Pauline epistles stand at the point where Paulinism in the Roman church is on the verge of assuming, on the one hand, the tame ecclesiastical form it later took and, on the other, the wild heretical form of Gnostic anti-Judaism.

What, then, was the impetus that set the entire development in motion and gave rise to this rich literature? We might conceive of it as follows: these letters are products of the process that unfolded through the merging of Gentile Christianity with Jewish Christianity. The key to this mystery lies in the Epistle to the Romans and the circumstances of the Roman Christian community. The Epistle to the Romans remains, as has been demonstrated, an unsolved riddle. Mangold [1)] has precisely and definitively articulated the form of the problem when he states: "The pre-Pauline Gentile Christian community in Rome, as assumed by Weizsäcker, remains an

insoluble riddle for me; it would be an event for which no contemporary historical analogy can be provided." Indeed, this is the case, for how could a Gentile Christian community have formed in Rome at such an early time when there is absolutely no known mission activity there? As long as this community was considered Jewish Christian, its origin was more understandable; the connection between the diaspora Jews and Jerusalem could explain the transfer of the messianic movement from Palestine to Rome. However, a Gentile Christian community in Rome lacks even this weak basis for explanation and is simply incomprehensible. The assumption, favored by the apologists, that proselytes from Rome were present at Pentecost in Jerusalem and then returned to establish the community is untenable. The *epidemountes Romaioi* in Acts 2:10 are not transient visitors in Jerusalem but rather permanent residents who had migrated from Rome to Jerusalem. Therefore, it is inconceivable that Christianity could have come to Rome in this manner.

1) Der Römerbrief und seine geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen 1884, S.287.

375

Nevertheless, the early existence of a Christian community in Rome, one completely separated from Judaism, is a historical fact. We read in the Acts of the Apostles, specifically in the "We" section (Acts 28:14-15), that the imprisoned Paul and his companions landed in Puteoli (in the spring of 62 AD). There, they found "brothers" who allowed them to stay for seven days. Then, the journey continued towards Rome, and the "brothers" from Rome came to meet Paul at Appii Forum and Tres Tabernae. Thus, a Christian community already existed in Rome, with affiliations extending down to Puteoli, indicating that it had been established for some time.

Most remarkably, this community had nothing to do with the Jews in Rome. The Acts of the Apostles further recounts that Paul, three days after his arrival, summoned the leaders of the Roman Jews and narrated to them his experiences in Jerusalem, assuring them that he had done nothing against the Jewish people and the law, but was suffering because of the hope of Israel. They responded that they had received no letters about him nor heard anything bad about him, and expressed their willingness to learn about this new movement, which was only known to them as being widely opposed. Paul explained it to them a few days later, but as was usually the case with the Jews, only a few believed while most remained obstinate. Paul then recited to them the words of Isaiah: "Harden the hearts of this people," and so on.

376

This account is so remarkable that it has been challenged as entirely unhistorical. It seems impossible that the Jews in Rome at that time could have only heard of Christianity through rumors, and it appears tendentious that even in Rome, Israel is depicted as obstinate, while the Gentiles are depicted as faithful, and so on. Granted, in this latter aspect, the author's system, which often reveals itself in Acts, betrays itself again here. Nevertheless, a significant fact remains: Judaism and Christianity existed entirely separately in Rome at that time. This could not be the case if Roman Christianity had emerged from the synagogue. Thus, we are led to assume that Christianity in Rome emerged very early and somewhat autochthonously. The

exclusive use of the Greek language in the Roman community until deep into the second century suggests that the roots of the oldest Roman Christian community lie not in the Jewish, but in the Greek colony of Rome. From this stratum of the population, the Christian doctrine gathered a circle around itself, as indicated in the 16th chapter of Romans, consisting largely of slaves but interspersed with elements reaching into the higher and highest social strata. The "Roman Hellenism," elevated beyond the ordinary thoughts and pursuits of paganism by the advanced Platonic philosophy represented by Seneca in the Roman capital, had become acquainted with the religious teachings of refined Judaism through the Alexandrian Bible and the writings of Philo. With or without the form of proselytism, it sympathized with Jewish monotheism and its purer moral teachings. This environment became the cradle of the first Christian community in the world's capital. Just as the Oriental cults of all kinds found fertile ground in Rome—where, according to Tacitus's bitter expression, "all atrocious and shameful things from everywhere flow together and are celebrated"—so too did Rome become a receptive field for the higher aspirations emanating from philosophy. These aspirations aimed to elevate humanity's moral consciousness and bring the good and the beautiful closer to realization. Among the driving forces of this new outlook was the belief in the personal realization of the ideal in a living bearer of that ideal. This was parallel to the widespread contemporary religious belief in a helping and saving Savior, as propagated by the cults of Serapis and Asclepius. This belief naturally drew new strength and definition from the messianic prophecies during the study of the Old Testament. Everything was thus prepared, only waiting for the trigger to initiate the realization of these tendencies in a specific community. This trigger would have been the news of the Messiah's appearance in the East. Here, disregarding chronology, we can almost fully adopt the depiction given at the beginning of the Clementine Homilies. Clement, who had spent his youth in chastity and moderation, had fallen into deep sorrow over the tormenting questions about the origin and destiny of the world and humanity. He turned to philosophy but found no certainty in the conflicting teachings, especially regarding life after death. In this doubtful state, he became aware of news that reached Rome under Emperor Tiberius one spring and kept growing: as if an angel of God were traveling through the world, and God's plan could no longer remain hidden, the news was that someone had risen in Judea and was preaching the eternal kingdom of God to the Jews, confirming his mission with signs and wonders. This news spread more and more, and already assemblies (συστήματα) were eagerly discussing who the newcomer was and what he wanted. In the autumn of the same year, an unknown man publicly proclaimed: "Men of Rome, hear, the Son of God has appeared in Judea and preaches eternal life to all who are willing to listen, if they act according to the will of the Father who sent him," and so on. This account in the Clementine romance probably contains more truth than is generally attributed to it. This or a similar scenario must have occurred in the formation of the first Roman Christian community. The news of the Messiah's appearance spread from the East, found fertile ground in the circles in Rome who were alienated from the world and pursued philosophical ideals, and formed a small Christian community from the Roman population. To this, individuals from the Jewish colony (like Aquila and Priscilla in Acts 18:2) and proselytes may have joined, without affecting the Gentile Christian character of the community. Thus, it would be somewhat like the Reformation—a dual origin of the new religious principle. On one hand, it arose in Palestine through the messianic movement originating from Jesus and his disciples. On the other hand, it was prepared by the

development of pagan philosophy and religion in Rome to such an extent that the mere news of the Messiah's appearance sufficed to bring it to life in the world capital, where it naturally took on a unique character from the beginning and retained it for a long time.

379

Even if this view can only initially present itself as a hypothesis, it is surely worthy of closer examination. At the very least, it easily explains how the Christian community in Rome, at the time Paul arrived, could already be an established and well-founded one, yet not be connected with the Jewish colony there. It then also explains the distinctly Gentile Christian character of the Roman Christian community from the outset, as assumed by the Epistle to the Romans and particularly evidenced by the findings in the catacombs. Moreover, this view sheds new light on the further development of Christianity. If Christianity emerged simultaneously in a dual form—one Jewish Christian and the other Gentile Christian—then this separate existence of the two centers, Jerusalem and Rome, could persist for a time. Eventually, however, as the Christian church continued to grow and unify, these two halves had to merge into one cohesive entity. The integration of the two halves, the Eastern and the Western, could not occur without a transformation process affecting both. The Jewish Christian communities of the East had to abandon their traditions, insofar as these had not already been disrupted by Paul's activities, for their Christianity to be feasible within the greater church. Conversely, the Gentile Christian communities of the West had to accept certain customs and practices carried over from Judaism if they wished to join the closer fellowship with those communities. Notably, they could not reject a lifestyle aligned with the essential demands of Judaism, as prescribed for proselytes. This process was prefigured by Paul's historical activities, which first established the connection between the two halves of the Christian population. Accordingly, the process could not unfold easily or naturally; resistance was inevitable on both sides, potentially leading to extremes that pushed the opposition to its peak. This painful but beneficial process of integration is testified by the literature of early Christianity, and specifically, the Pauline letters are symptomatic expressions of the resistance from the more liberal faction in the Roman community against attempts to Judaize them. From the Epistle to the Romans to the Epistle to the Galatians, this conflict escalates to its highest point before subsiding as the extreme demands of the Judaizers fail to prevail, while moderate ones gain acceptance. The church then grows, excluding intransigent elements on both sides, into a unified entity that gradually solidifies into Catholicism under the pressure of the new larger struggle against common enemies—heresy and external persecution.

380

Thus, the idea that the Tübingen school had about the development process of Catholicism is essentially correct, but the struggle occurred later, preceded by a period of peaceful coexistence of the opposing views, a neutral form of Christian consciousness as assumed by the Ritschl school. It may seem most surprising that a conflict against Judaism, as passionate as that depicted in the Epistle to the Galatians, could still be possible around 130 AD. It is possible that this fervent letter battles more against an imaginary than a real danger and that the conflict is depicted with colors derived from retroactively dating contemporary struggles to the apostolic

age. However, even if the general body of the community by that time was hardly seriously troubled by the question of circumcision, an extreme faction still upheld this demand, as evident from reliable testimonies. In Justin's "Dialogue with Trypho," the question is raised whether those who believe in the crucified Jesus but still follow the laws of Moses—i.e., observing the Sabbath and circumcision, celebrating months, and practicing purification rites—can be saved. The answer is yes, provided such a person does not insist that other people, specifically those Gentiles who have already been spiritually "circumcised" through Christ, must observe these practices to be saved. This view represents Justin's stance. He also mentions the opinion of others who believe that such Jewish Christians should not be part of the Christian fellowship and have no share in Christian salvation—an opinion similar to that in the Epistle to the Galatians and fully expressed in Marcion's teachings. Justin disagrees with this harsher view. He believes that one can maintain brotherly communion with these weaker Jewish Christians, as long as they do not refuse to live with Christians and believers, and do not insist that others must be circumcised, observe the Sabbath, or follow similar practices as they do .

381

Thus, we find that by the time of Justin, around the middle of the second century, the factions within Christianity stood in opposition to each other much like they do in the Epistle to the Galatians, further indicating that this letter belongs to that time rather than a much earlier period. This same conflict is also present in the Ignatian letters dated after 150 AD. For example, it says: "But if anyone preaches Judaism to you, do not listen to him. For it is better to hear Christianity from a circumcised person than Judaism from an uncircumcised person." Thus, even Gentiles must have upheld this demand. Furthermore: "Do not be misled by false teachings nor by old fables, which are useless. For if we still live in accordance with Judaism, we confess that we have not received grace." Also: "We should not observe the Sabbath anymore but the Lord's Day," and: "It is not right to proclaim Christ Jesus and practice Judaism. For Christianity did not believe in Judaism, but Judaism in Christianity." These may have been extremes, while the broader church had long since found a reconciliation of the differences. Nonetheless, the convergence of these statements with the Epistle to the Galatians clarifies the entire development. We now see that the Pauline formula, which according to the old view seemed to appear miraculously in the apostolic age, is the result of a long development. Moreover, its emergence, which seemed miraculous given that it was propounded by a Jewish-born and educated Apostle to the Gentiles, becomes much more understandable in the intellectual atmosphere of the great Gentile Christian world, as a product of philosophical thought on the one hand and a deep engagement with the Greek Old Testament on the other, where the letter is nowhere explained so poorly, but its deeper meaning is nowhere so well elucidated as in the Pauline letters.

—----------

383

This would be, in broad strokes, an attempt to sketch the history of early Christianity as it presents itself after understanding that our main epistles were written in the second century. Of course, it will still require a lot of work and in-depth investigation before this view can be considered somewhat well-formed and secured. However, it already becomes apparent in this first attempt that ingratitude cannot exactly be attributed to it. Admittedly, the beginning of the preserved Christian literature now shifts from the middle to well towards the end of the first century, with its main bulk belonging to the second century. However, it now develops within a span of about 50 years, whereas previously, a span of 100 years was claimed, which seems less likely by analogy. Indeed, the first 50-60 years, roughly from 30 to 80 or 90 AD, are then devoid of written monuments, at least ones that have been preserved for us, which might seem odd for that literary era. But as long as Christianity existed in quiet small communities in the East and West, there was no occasion for the emergence of a literature. Christians already had a book that they used exclusively in worship—the Old Testament. Alongside, oral tradition and edification through teaching and prophecy were prevalent. Then, they began recording the words of the Lord after the oral tradition became insufficient due to the death of the apostles, and parts of old collections of this kind may reach back to apostolic times. From these words of the Lord and around them, the Gospels gradually formed, but they only received their current form over time and were initially treated with great freedom. Simultaneously, the process of merging the Jewish and Gentile forms of Christianity began, and from this and its upheavals, the actual New Testament literature emerged, reflecting the different phases of this process in the Gospels, Acts, epistles, and the Apocalypse.

384

The most difficult aspect for our modern views remains getting used to the idea that, for conducting such literary battles, people resorted to the method of attributing writings to others and composed letters in the name of Paul, of which he wrote not a single line. The confident manner in which these letters present themselves and the many detailed features of the apostle's life and character they contain give us the impression that they are either genuine or must then be condemned as blatant forgeries. However, our notions about this are not those of the second century. The entire field of religious literature, from the end of the Old Testament to the Christian apocrypha, as I have elaborated elsewhere, is governed by the practice of pseudepigraphical writing. This kind of attribution of writings was not only common in Jewish and Christian circles but also generally in the literature of that time. That period abounds with examples. Many writings are attributed to the philosopher Pythagoras, most or all of which are inauthentic. The Neoplatonist Iamblichus, who lived during the time of Constantine, was well aware of this but praised the disciples of Pythagoras for attributing their writings to the master out of modesty. Especially the letter literature is entirely dominated by this custom. Writing letters in the name of famous people was a popular stylistic exercise at that time. The tyrant Phalaris, who ruled Agrigento in the 6th century BC, is credited with a collection of no fewer than 148 letters. Bentley demonstrated that they were attributed to him during the age of the Antonines. Similarly, the letters attributed to Plato, Euripides, and others are inauthentic. It would be a true miracle if this custom of the time had not influenced the emerging Christian literature, particularly since such attribution is easiest in the religious domain where the goal is not to produce original thoughts but to become an instrument of the prevailing religious spirit.

Upon closer examination, the striking nature of such pseudonymity, from our perspective, largely diminishes, and it becomes quite possible that the New Testament literature, chronologically positioned between the pseudepigraphical Jewish apocrypha and the equally pseudonymous apostolic fathers, adhered to the same practice.

385

Only when this is clearly recognized will criticism justify its last word with its first. As long as it maintains the assumption of inauthenticity for some New Testament writings and authenticity for others, the former category will always bear a negative appearance because they claim apostolic authorship as emphatically as the latter. Consider the Pastoral Epistles, which attribute themselves to the Apostle Paul as definitively as possible, yet the counterarguments are so strong that the entire critical school unanimously asserts their inauthenticity. Once it is acknowledged that the attribution of writings to apostolic names was a common literary form, a principle to be assumed in each individual case, this procedure loses its strangeness and aligns itself with higher perspectives. If everything is inauthentic, then nothing is "inauthentic." The entire question then ceases; there will be no more disputes about the authenticity or inauthenticity of New Testament writings. Instead, each will be understood from its content and placed in the history of early Christianity where it belongs. The moral concern that made the critical positions so unsympathetic to the Christian sentiment dissipates. We can then use and appreciate these writings without illusion but also without prejudice, doing justice to their enduring value.

And even if the Pauline letters, once recognized as products of later Paulinism, are relegated from the first place in New Testament literature to the second, what does it matter? Their content is so deep and rich, they are more a reworking of an already given religious principle than truly creative acts. Their foundational doctrine of the justification of man before God through faith in the grace of God revealed in Christ is already present in the Gospels, though in a less systematic form. In the formulation of the Pauline letters, this doctrine has been the foundation of older Protestantism, while in the form of the evangelical words of Jesus, it is the foundation of the newer. That doctrine of reconciliation has, alongside the Old Testament, a strongly pronounced legal aspect, while the Gospel is rooted in the new religious life that came into the world with Jesus of Nazareth. Here, and not in Pauline systematics, lies the principle to which Protestantism must always return from church doctrine and even from apostolic doctrine, in accordance with the words: "Whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas... all are yours, and you are Christ's, and Christ is God's."