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Paul and the Hellenization of Christianity

1968

The background for this essay is given in its first footnote and in more detail in the Preface to this volume. (See also Eccles 1985:123-28, 173.)

I don't recall ever discussing with Goodenough why the bulk of this essay should be devoted to Romans. Beginning with Acts is logical enough, see the essay just previous. But it is not equally self-evident that all of the rest of the study ought to be devoted to just one Pauline letter. After all, Goodenough could have addressed himself to some or all of Paul had he wished, either by proceeding thematically or by taking up selected passages from several letters.

But I suspect that Goodenough selected Romans for several reasons, conscious or unconscious. It has traditionally been seen as the heart of Paul's message and a kind of "dogmatics in outline." It has also been the beginning of movements of renewal within the Church, witness Augustine, Luther, Barth. Finally, going through Romans chapter by chapter allowed Goodenough to experience the Pauline "gospel" in comprehensive form a final time.

Paul was an author Goodenough returned to again and again in his research and writing. Why did Paul the Christian fascinate him, when most of Goodenough's thinking was devoted to Judaism and not to Christianity? Two parallels in their careers may supply part of the answer. Both men —
Goodenough and the Apostle Paul—insisted on viewing Judaism and Christianity simultaneously. Of all the Christian texts available, only Paul’s letters come from the time when the separation between the Jews and the followers of Jesus was not yet final, and perhaps could have been reversed. As a Christian missionary Paul was in the middle of those debates, and his letters inevitably reflect the conflict. By the time of the gospels and the other later New Testament writings the decision has been made, but Paul came from a social location and from a decade or two in which the parting of the ways had just begun. Goodenough too could not accept that retaining Christianity meant letting go of Judaism. In his work he moved constantly from the one to the other, and had there been time he would have interpreted both, the one by the other.

But Paul was also moving in a particular direction. A snapshot would show him linked to both religious traditions and would depict them indeed as perhaps more than one but surely not yet two, separate and distinct. But a videotape of Paul would reveal him in motion, leaving old positions behind, abandoning them just as his opponents had claimed he was doing. With Paul the movement was from the old to the new, no matter how much it seemed to him to be otherwise, no matter how much his writings appeared to retain some of each in tension or in paradox. I suspect that this circumstance of being in motion or “in between” also attracted Goodenough to Paul. After all, that movement was the subject of Goodenough’s research as he originally conceived it. Paul was the figure who exemplified that progression, more than any other. And through his entire teaching career Goodenough was in motion too, out of traditional Christianity to whatever the next stage for him might be. (The young William F. Buckley unwittingly attests to this in the opening chapter of God and Man at Yale [Buckley 1951:8-9]. The Goodenough Buckley knew of in the late 1940’s was clearly in motion religiously, something Buckley was not prepared to appreciate when he wrote in 1951.)

What direction would Goodenough’s work have taken if he had had another two decades to write?

His use of Jewish literary sources over those years would have benefitted significantly from the aid and influence of Jacob Neusner and his students. The two men had come to know each other well in a relatively short time. Goodenough’s
estimate of Neusner's contributions, actual and potential, is reflected in a sentence from the Preface to volume 12 of the Symbols, dated October, 1963: "A new obligation has arisen from the critical aid that a recent acquaintance, a brilliant young scholar, has given during the last two years, Jacob Neusner."

Goodenough would have been delighted with recent archaeological discoveries. When he and I first met, it was to discuss my working with him on what would become the essay below. But almost before I knew it he had plans, photographs and reconstructions of the Sardis synagogue spread out before me and was commenting on them with obvious pleasure and excitement. He knew enough about Sardis and its marvelous synagogue to believe it would corroborate his views of Diaspora Judaism and of the development of Christianity. He was able to add a bit about Sardis to Symbols 22 just before publication, see pages 191-95.

He surely would have been all over a number of important Greek inscriptions unknown or at least unappreciated in his lifetime. The 80 new texts from Sardis would have been first on his list; here are some others:

Louis Robert's study of Greek funerary curses (Robert 1978) calls attention again to such inscriptions as IG III² 13209, 13210 = SIG 1239 (from Athens) and SIG 1240 (from Chalcis in Euboea), in which curses resembling those in Deut 28:22, 28 are used to protect the graves of well-to-do sophists of the second century. (See also Horsley 1983, No. 96 and Kraabel 1981:121 note 26.)

New inscriptions from the Greek island of Delos show that the Samaritan Diaspora had reached the Greek world and adopted many of its conventions far earlier than had been directly attested previously (Bruneau 1982, Kraabel 1984 and White 1987). If this tiny sister-tradition of Judaism was so well represented on Delos as early as the third century BCE, as one of these inscriptions suggests, how much more extensive and "Hellenized" might the Jewish Diaspora have been at that time!

The century's single most important Greek inscription, as far as the history of Judaism is concerned, is the theosebeis text discovered at Aphrodisias in Caria in 1976 and recently published

Goodenough’s major concern, however, would have been for New Testament studies and the "hellenization of Christianity." Recent comments by Dieter Georgi suggest that Goodenough would have had an increasing influence upon New Testament scholars like himself. Goodenough was just coming to know and appreciate Georgi’s writings during our work on his last paper. In the second edition of his book on 2 Corinthians, Georgi confesses himself "strongly influenced" by Goodenough’s "monumental work" on Diaspora Judaism, criticizes the neglect of that work by other scholars, and asserts that "the basic theses of Goodenough appear to be vindicated more and more" by recent discoveries. He cites the Nag Hammadi Gnostic texts and especially the excavations of ancient synagogues in this connection (Georgi 1986:368-71).

Goodenough also would have been pleased with the approaches to Paul and to Acts represented in three recent monographs. I single them out here for two reasons: they are or soon will be typical of most writing being done on these topics, and in them the issues are particularly accessible. They are well organized and clearly written, and their extensive documentation offers ready access to the work of other scholars. (See also Kraabel 1989.)

In The Jews in Luke-Acts, Jack Sanders (1987) demonstrates two things: 1) how completely Luke-Acts is "theology in historical guise" (to use a term of Jacob Neusner’s) and not straightforward narrative at all. While this will come as no surprise for the gospel, since that conclusion is one of the sure results of Redactionsgeschichte, it will cause great difficulty for many readers of Luke’s second volume. Acts has no "parallels," as the gospel has, to reveal its Tendenz. And Acts is also the only account we possess of the careers of the first generation of Christian leaders. For nearly two millennia it has been the story of how the earliest church developed and grew, and in particular how it related to outsiders, both Jew and Gentile. In later centuries the Church often used the pattern of examples set by "the Apostles" in Acts as it worked out its own relationships to non-Christians, and particularly to Jews. Sanders then draws on the work of many other researchers.
to show 2) how fundamentally anti-Jewish Luke was in his theology, and how that view of Jews is carried particularly in the many stories about them in Acts.

Goodenough many times cited Kirsopp Lake’s statement about the historical value of Acts, and his own demurrer. He repeats it in the first paragraph both of the previous essay and that reprinted below. He would have accepted readily Sanders’ first point, and quickly drawn the conclusions of the second for his own work.

Räisänen (1983) and Watson (1987) also represent directions in the study of Paul which Goodenough would have welcomed, even though they would have required his reconsideration of a number of the points he makes in the essay below. They argue that Paul must not be removed from his first century context and made into timeless dogmatics as in particular the heirs of Luther were wont to do. First of all, they say, Acts must be set to one side; particularly with regard to Paul’s understanding of the Law and his relations to non-Christian Jews, the Lukan image cannot be credited. Here they echo some of the concerns of Sanders already noted.

According to Räisänen in Paul and the Law, because Paul’s letters are occasional pieces, the product of passion and intuition rather than of detached and logical thought, they can be inconsistent and self-contradictory, secondary rationalizations of positions Paul found himself driven to adopt. And they must be interpreted as such.

In Watson’s view in Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles, Paul’s own experience with the Gentile mission brings him to see Christianity as a sect, of itself, rather than as a movement of renewal remaining within Judaism. This puts Paul on a collision-course not only with non-Christian Jews, but especially with those Jewish-Christians (and their converts) who did not wish to become detached from the ancestral community. It also requires Paul to depict the Law in a negative, polemical fashion, an image which has hampered the establishment of proper relationships between Christians and Jews to this day. Watson believes that the social setting of Paul’s work was missed during the many centuries when the Church saw him as its premier and earliest theologian, and that Paul’s original intent has been lost and his position (particularly with regard to non-Christian Jews) distorted as a result.
Goodenough never had the chance to grapple with issues of Christian origins as fully as he had always desired and intended to do. In a longer active career he would have had a great deal forcefully to say about "the hellenization of Christianity" and about "the relations between Christians and Jews." His broad familiarity with the thought and the imagery of Greek-speaking Judaism would have made him a formidable contestant in these debates. The republishing of much of his work, initiated by Jacob Neusner, will allow our greatest native-born historian of religions to influence a new generation of readers, perhaps in ways he and his editors could never have predicted.
I. The "Paul" of the Book of Acts

Understanding of Paul and his message has from the beginning been thrown into confusion by many factors. The Book of Acts gives a beautifully written, straight account of Paul and his preaching, the various journeys, the first trial with its autobiographical speeches –

[Dr. Goodenough had long intended that his last major work would be a multi-volumed study of "the hellenization of Christianity"; in the winter of 1964-65, when he learned that he had only a short time to live, he determined to carry the project through, as far as he could. As his research assistant, I was responsible for investigating and summarizing the work done by New Testament scholars on the texts and issues with which he was concerned.

When it became clear that there was not time to complete a book, Dr. Goodenough deliberately began to rework his notes and preliminary material into a long article on Paul; he reasoned that in an essay on this seminal and very early Christian writer he could clarify the methodology and indicate many of the conclusions of the larger work.

At the time of his death, March 20, 1965, Dr. Goodenough had written or dictated the material which is contained in the body of this article; as he requested, I have rewritten and edited it, and supplied such footnotes or parts of footnotes as are enclosed in brackets. I have attempted to carry out his wishes and instructions to the best of my ability, but it should be made clear that he had read little of the rewriting and none of my footnotes at the time of his death.

Three of my teachers have assisted me in this work: Krister Stendahl first brought me into contact with Dr. Goodenough and, at the latter's request, assumed final responsibility for this article and its publication; Helmut Köster and Dieter Georgi advised me in the preparation of the manuscript. A grant from the Bollingen Foundation provided financial support both while I worked with Dr. Goodenough and while I completed the article after his death. With gratitude I acknowledge all this assistance. – A.T.K.

Dr. Goodenough's books which are often cited in the notes are abbreviated as follows:


In the footnotes, "G." is the abbreviation for Erwin R. Goodenough.]
and these seem completely plausible.\(^1\) His message as Acts presents it—about Christ and salvation and about the coming Great Event—is quite identical with the ideas attributed to Peter and James in the same book.\(^2\) In practically all the older lives of Paul, and in many present-day popular accounts, the authors approached Paul primarily through Acts. The youth of the Church are commonly trained to outline the missionary journeys on maps. Kirsopp Lake said to a graduate class years ago that if Acts is not an historically reliable account of the beginnings of Christianity, we know nothing of that beginning, and so he and Foakes Jackson compiled their great work called *The Beginnings of Christianity*, which was almost exclusively a study of Acts.\(^3\)

At the same time it is widely recognized that Paul's own letters reveal a man presenting a scheme of salvation which calls not just for belief that Christ was the son of God who rose from the dead and was soon to return, but a belief in Christ, a death of the self and a union with the savior which Acts never suggests.\(^4\) To take a specific example:

\(^1\)[In his article "The Perspective of Acts" reprinted above, G. argues 1) that Acts presents a "largely fictional Paul," 119 above, with an over-simplified and thoroughly Jewish-Christian theology; and 2) that, for the most part, it is deceptively and deliberately silent about the true nature of the Church's developing theology and organization. On the basis of the way Acts ends, G. concludes that "it was written while Paul was still preaching in Rome," 121 above.]

\(^2\)[M. Dibelius delineates some of these similarities in *From Tradition to Gospel*, 1935, 16ff. In his *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, 1956 (hereafter abbreviated *Studies*), 165ff, 184, he points out that the repetition of the same themes in the speeches of different men is due in part to Luke's didactic purpose, cf. H. Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HNT), 1963, 8: "wollen die Reden nicht die individuelle Art des Redners verführen, sondern die substantielle Einheit der urchristlichen, dh normativen Predigt."]

\(^3\)[*The Beginnings of Christianity*, I (five volumes, 1920-33, hereafter abbreviated *Beginnings*) turned out to be just what G. calls it here. However, in a letter dated April 5, 1965, H.J. Cadbury, who collaborated with Lake on the final two volumes, says that the work on Acts was originally planned as the beginning of a much larger study; this is indicated in the prefaces to volume 1, page vii, and volume 2, page v-vi, and by the method of numbering the volumes i.e., the five books on Acts together form only part I of *Beginnings*.

\(^4\)[G.'s understanding of Paul in the epistles is elaborated below, 140 ff. in the major section of this article—but not only there. He often found occasion to refer to Paul at length in his studies of Judaism in the Roman Imperial period, e.g. in *Light* and in *Symbols*; so also, when he turned his attention to the modern world and its religions, e.g. in *Toward a Mature Faith*, 1955, and in *Psychology* (see the indices to these volumes). Thus, long before he began this article, G. had approached Paul from a number of sides and published some preliminary conclusions; for this reason many of G.'s earlier writings have been brought in to amplify and illuminate the present article.]
there has recently been much dispute about the validity of Paul's speech at Athens⁵ as Acts reports it, with the final judgment that there is nothing in it that Paul could not have said. But this does not establish the validity of the speech, since Paul writes in his letters much that would indeed have instructed the Athenian pundits, but which does not appear in the sermon.⁶

The point is that it is sheer perversity to go from Acts to Paul's letters, from a second-hand account to a man's own exposition of his thought. We must work the other way: first look for Paul in his own writings, and then go to the narrative in Acts; be fully prepared (if necessary) to find discrepancies, and to let the first-hand sources have complete right of way in case of disagreements. We can thus judge the value of the secondary work as a historical source, and read with greater or less credulousness the incidents and speeches for which there is no comparable report from Paul himself.

In a study of the hellenization of Christianity as effected in Paul's work, we are under no obligation to make so complete an analysis of Acts as the preceding paragraphs would suggest. But it is so common to read the letters with Acts in mind that we must at the outset raise a few points to show why Acts seems to be a tendentious document written to exaggerate Paul's Jewish conservatism and the unity of the early Christian preaching.⁷

---

⁵[Cf. B. Gärtner, The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation, 1955, 249. G. had read Gärtner carefully and critically; many parts of the book he considered excellent, but he also felt that it defined "Greek philosophy" much too narrowly along Stoic lines, cf. his comment in footnote 39 below and in Symbols 12: 187 note 1. Gärtner would also minimize the distinctions G. makes between the "Paul" of Acts and the Paul of the Pauline letters; see Gärtner's concluding chapter, "The Areopagus Speech and Paul," 248-52.]

⁶[Conzelmann, op. cit. 103, lists the Pauline theologoumena missing in this speech: the "wrath of God" (cf. Rom. 1), the contrast between faith and law, the theologia crucis, the dialectical relationship between "present" and "future," and the idea of an imminent Parousia. In Studies, 58, Dibelius calls it "a hellenistic speech with a Christian ending" (17.31); for the non-Pauline elements, see 57-64.]

⁷[Most scholars would agree that Acts has a Tendenz which becomes clear in what the author chooses to stress or play down, to include or omit. In "Le plan des Actes des Apôtres," NTS 1 (1954-55), 44-51, Ph. Menoud finds the pattern of Acts in the missionary command of the risen Lord, Acts 1:8. This command is fulfilled "theologically speaking" by the time of the Jerusalem Council, Acts 15, when both Jews and non-Jews have heard the gospel, and the council's action assures that the Church will include both groups. "Geographically speaking" the command is fulfilled when Paul reaches the center of the Roman Empire, Rome, from which the gospel will penetrate "to the ends of the earth." According to Menoud, Paul is emphasized in the latter part of Acts because of
Begin with Paul's early life, before his conversion; the most famous passages are Gal. 1:13-5 and Phil. 3:4-6. The first passage says that he "advanced in Judaism beyond many of my own age among my people, so extremely zealous was I for the traditions of my fathers (or, my father, \( \alpha l \, \pi \alpha \tau \rho \kappa i \, \mu o \nu \, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta \sigma \sigma e i s \))." This continued as he persecuted the Church, but he was suddenly changed when God, who had elected him, "was pleased to reveal his Son within me (\( \epsilon \nu \, \epsilon \, \mu o i \))," vs. 16. The RSV makes this conform to Acts by rendering "reveal to me," precisely the sort of reading Paul through Acts which I am deploring. The RSV
translation presupposes the vision on the road to Damascus (Acts, chs. 9, 22 and 26), a story I think Paul himself had never heard;\textsuperscript{11} I prefer to follow Paul,\textsuperscript{12} both on historical principles and because this inward mystical experience, implied by his "revealed (with)in me," will prove to be the heart of Paul's message.\textsuperscript{13} The zealous early years can

\textsuperscript{11}Lake suggests, Beginnings 5:190, that Paul knew of this story in a version or versions told by his detractors and is deliberately opposing them in, e.g., Gal. 1:1, where the phrase "an apostle not from men or through a man" cannot be reconciled with the figure of Ananias in the Acts account, 9:10ff. See also Conzelmann's summary, \textit{op. cit.} 59; and, for a defense of the historicity of the Damascus vision, J. Munck, \textit{Paul and the Salvation of Mankind}, 1959, 11-35, where an attempt is made to reconcile the accounts in Acts with those of Paul.

\textsuperscript{12}Wetter, art. cit., draws the following conclusions regarding the Damascus vision: 1) Paul's letters reveal that he was conscious of having received direct commands from the Lord, who often spoke directly to him and sometimes appeared to him. In this way Paul's life and mission were guided; this is the source of his sense of election and of apostolic authority, and the reason for his stubborn attacks on opponents -- in matters about which the will of the Lord has been clearly revealed, there can be no compromise. 2) But Paul does not mention a "Damascus vision" in the texts where it would greatly strengthen his argument e.g., where he feels compelled to refer to, or "boast of," his own ecstatic experiences, as in 2 Cor. 12. Had it been possible, surely he would have brought in this vision in such cases. The event thus did not happen to Paul as Luke tells it, but Paul was known to be the kind of man who could and did experience such things, i.e., the kind of man about whom such a story could easily have been told.

G.'s own understanding is similar to Wetter's. In "John a Primitive Gospel," page 54 above, he argues strongly that Paul's "tremendous revelation of the institution at the Last Supper" must have come in a vision. In Symbols 5:53 note 106, he quotes A.D. Nock's assertion that "certainly Paul's account of the Last Supper was what he had been taught by early disciples," G.'s reply: "Since Paul denied that he had received anything from them, and says directly that he received this 'from the lord,' the certainty of Nock is strange to say the least." Nock's statement is now available in \textit{Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background}, 1964, 125.

\textsuperscript{13}G. constantly used the terms "mystery" and "mystic," e.g., in \textit{Light}, which is subtitled "The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism"; he realized, however, that they were often misunderstood, see his comments below, page 59. One attempt at clarification was his article "Literal Mystery in Hellenistic Judaism" in \textit{Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake}, 1937, 227-41. There he indicates that "mystery" may refer to the Greek mysteries or to the mystery religions, which offer \textit{lusis} in their initiation rites. However, for Plato and later Greeks, philosophy also offers \textit{lusis}, and on a higher level; "this \textit{λυσις} consists in philosophy's teaching that reality lies not in things perceived by the senses, but in the invisible things perceived by the soul," 230. Further, Plato commonly used terms from the vocabulary of the mysteries and "the question of whether these terms in Plato were intended literally or figuratively turns on the
be taken as no more than they say, namely that Paul was a completely
observant Jew until convicted by a great revelation of Christ within
himself.¹⁴

The passage in Philippians builds up a ponderous pleonasm for
Paul's Jewishness: circumcised on the eighth day, of the people of
Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew born of Hebrews,¹⁵ in his
attitude to the law a Pharisee, a persecutor of the Church and
blameless before the Law (Phil.: 4-6). This passage adds nothing to the
other except the allusion to the Pharisees. Much as it would have
added to his argument to say that he was himself a Pharisee, he does
not say it — only that he followed the Pharisees (as did most of the
Jews, apparently), rather than e.g., the Sadducees or Essenes, in his
understanding of the Law.

In contrast, the Paul of Acts states, "According to the strictest party
of our religion I lived as a Pharisee" (Acts 26:5); "Brethren, I am a
Pharisee, a son of Pharisees" (23:6); and even "I am a Jew born at Tarsus
existence not of an initiation rite, but of a belief that the process of learning the
higher truths was a real purgation and means of salvation," 229. Thus G. could
call philosophy a "mystery" without requiring it to have mystery rites, rites of
initiation. He then called hellenistic Judaism a "mystery" in the same sense,
but argued at the same time that there may have been rites of some sort in the
Jewish cult (for his evidence, chiefly from Philo, see Light, 259-64). When a
heavy, altar-like table was found to be a focus of worship in the huge ancient
synagogue at Sardis in Asia Minor, G. considered it strong evidence for his
position, see Symbols 12:195. — For a description of the mystic who influenced
¹⁴[On the basis of Paul's involvement in the death of Stephen, Acts 7:58f, Enslin
suggests that Paul may have been much more conservative and orthodox than
the average Palestinian Jew. As an equally plausible alternative to the view "so
easily noisyed about today, that all Jews of the Diaspora must of necessity have
been far less Jewish than their fellows in Judea," he suggests that these
Hellenists (Acts 6:9), may be "diaspora Jews" who had settled in Zion for the
precise purpose of getting free from the contaminating danger of the larger
world. In a word...we are free to wonder if these synagogues of 'hellenistic Jews'
were not of the most ultraorthodoxy, composed of those who had at last been
enabled to return to Zion, and that their reason for disputing with Stephen was
due to a feeling of outrage that some of their own members had become
infected with a sorry heresy," art. cit. 157. G.'s reaction to this hypothesis (and
Enslin insists that it is only an hypothesis) might well have been that, were it
ture to the evidence in Acts, it would be but another example of how the author
has "Judaized" Paul.]
¹⁵The NEB suggests that this could mean "a Hebrew-speaking Jew of a
Hebrew-speaking family." I can see this only as another attempt at "Judaizing'
Paul.
in Cilicia, but brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel,\textsuperscript{16} educated according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers" (22:3). These passages state that, while his opponents might be Jews, Paul was all of that, and in addition had received the highest rabbinic training, that under the great Gamaliel himself, and had even been a member of the closely guarded ranks of the Pharisaiic party, where his ancestors had preceded him. Such references to his background could have been used to great advantage in the letters, as Paul defends himself and answers his Jewish detractors; but he says nothing which corresponds to these texts from Acts. An argument from silence may be weak when used to support an unwelcome judgment, but the natural inference is that Paul would have said the more if he could have done so, and that Acts is expanding Paul's remarks for him. In that case, we should suppose that Acts was interested to pull Paul closer to Judaism than he actually was. Thus far we have grounds only for suspicion that such may be the general purpose of Acts, but unless these grounds of suspicion are removed, we have no right to assume that Paul had been a member of the Pharisaiic party and a pupil of Gamaliel merely on the basis of the statements of Acts.\textsuperscript{17}

There is much other evidence in Acts for questioning the Lukian version of Paul. Paul himself says that he did not return to Jerusalem after his conversion until he had spent three years in Arabia, and even then he stayed privately with Peter and consulted no other Jerusalem Christians except James. Then he went to Syria and Cilicia where he began a preaching campaign on his own (Gal. 1:18-24). But Acts 9:26-30 says on the contrary that when he left Damascus he came to Jerusalem,\textsuperscript{18} where Barnabas brought him to the apostles, and told

\textsuperscript{16}[In "Paul and Gamaliel," \textit{Jour. of Rel.} 7 (1927), 360-75, Enslin has summarized what can be determined about this account of Paul's training in Jerusalem by Gamaliel, if the Pauline letters are used as sources and Acts discounted. His verdict is that Paul's "rabbinic exegesis" is what anyone who attended synagogue services regularly might acquire, but that "there is not the slightest trace...of any technical halakic training," 370, such as might be expected from a student of Gamaliel. Further, "there is no trace of any connection with Jerusalem prior to his conversion," 372. Enslin is not arguing here for a "hellenized" view of Paul (see notes 10 and 15 above; rather he is questioning the reliability of the Lukian picture of Paul, much as G. himself is doing.]

\textsuperscript{17}[Lake considers it highly unlikely that a "pupil of Gamaliel" could have produced "so gross a caricature" of the Jewish law as does Paul, \textit{Beginnings} 4: 278f.]

\textsuperscript{18}["Nach dem Plan der Act kann sich Paulus noch nicht an die Heiden wenden, denn die Heidennmission ist noch nicht sanktioniert; andererseits soll er nicht untätig bleiben: die Wirkung seiner Bekehrung muss demonstriert werden." Luke's solution is to have Paul preach in the synagogue of Damascus (Acts}
them of his conversion. According to Acts, Paul did considerable preaching in Jerusalem until the Hellenists wanted to kill him; then he was taken away to Tarsus (which is in Cilicia). 19 The interesting main points here are that he was for an unspecified time preaching along with the apostles in Jerusalem, and that it was the Hellenists who wanted to kill him. He was apparently fully acceptable to the "Hebrews" in the Jerusalem congregation, but the Hellenists rejected him. 20 The author is indeed laying it on thick, that Paul's gospel, far from being hellenistic, especially turned the "Hellenists" to murderous fury.

The accounts of the great conference in Jerusalem, which Paul says occurred fourteen years later (Gal. 2:1), show discrepancies in exactly the same direction. Possibly the two accounts refer to different incidents, but I agree with the overwhelming majority of scholars who hold that they report the same Jerusalem meeting. Acts 15:1ff. says that some Judean brethren (who had come to Antioch when Paul and Barnabas were preaching) had insisted that without circumcision a Christian could not be saved. Paul and Barnabas opposed this, until the group sent them with some others to Jerusalem to have the point out with the "apostles and elders" there. A group of believers from the Pharisaic party upheld the requirement of circumcision (15:5ff.), but Peter, Barnabas and Paul successfully opposed them, and required only that the converts accept the "Noachite law," i.e., that they "abstain from idolatry, from unchastity, from things strangled, and from blood"

9:19ff.) and then go to Jerusalem, Conzelmann, op. cit. 59. The differences between these accounts in Galatians and Acts are discussed by Lake in Beginnings 5:192-94.

19 [Acts 9:30 and Gal. 1:21 may be in agreement at this point, one giving the name of the city, the other the name of the larger district in which the city is located.]

20 [Acts 6:1ff. describes an argument in which the Jerusalem congregation is divided into "Hebrews" and "Hellenist." G. assumes that the "Hellenists" are the hellenized Christians of Jerusalem, i.e., the group whose position is close to that of Paul, and that 9:29ff. is an attempt to conceal Paul's "Hellenism" by having this group attack him. Cadbury argues that the "Hellenists" are gentiles, Beginnings 5:59-74, but most scholars consider them Jews whose native language is Greek rather than Aramaic. Conzelmann states: "Sie müssen mit der Gesetzeshaltung des Judentums in Konflikt gekommen sein, dh sie dürften die Linie Jesu klarer als die Zwölf fortgeführt haben," they were driven out of Jerusalem (8:1) after the martyrdom of the "Hellenist" Stephen, op. cit., 43, cf. 52. Nock agrees (St. Paul, 1937, 61ff.), but Munck holds that while the "Hellenists" and the "Hebrews" differed in language and perhaps in place of birth, "we know nothing of any dogmatic or ethical differences between the two groups," op. cit., 221, cf. 219. Enslin suggests that the "Hellenists" may in fact be ultra-orthodox, see note 15 above.]
(15:28f.). To this Paul and Barnabas agreed, and they separated to go on different missions. But Paul had no sooner come to Derbe and Lystra when he at once circumcised Timothy so as not to offend the Jews of that region (16:1-3). Paul opposes circumcision at Antioch, then his view prevails in Jerusalem, then he circumcises a gentile as soon as he reaches Asia Minor—a story of incredible contradictions.

Paul's own account of the Jerusalem council (Gal. 2:1-10) is that he had a revelation that he should go to Jerusalem; accordingly he went to talk his gospel over privately with the leaders there, taking along Titus and Barnabas. Titus, a Greek, was uncircumcised and, in spite of protest, remained so; the only thing asked, as the leaders gave Paul and his party the right hand of fellowship, was that they remember

21 [Problems connected with this "apostolic decree" have been widely discussed. Conzelmann, op. cit., 84f., concludes that 1) originally the decree embodied a "concession by the gentile Christians" to facilitate social intercourse with Jewish Christians. But 2) Luke's understanding is "heilsgeschichtlich": "das Dekret stellt die Kontinuität zwischen Israel und der gesetzesfreien Kirche dar." Finally 3) the Western text shortens the decree and turns it into timeless moral commands adding the Golden Rule. See also Lake, Beginnings 5:204ff.]

22 [Lake's solution of the discrepancies between Acts and Galatians posits a certain amount of confusion or differences of emphasis among the participants and in the later written accounts: 1) Galatians 2 brings out the theological questions: Is circumcision necessary for Christians? How does the Law apply to gentile Christians? 2) The actual decree was intended to "facilitate the social intercourse of Jewish and gentile Christians by establishing rules of conduct for gentiles which would remove the possibility of offense in Jewish circles," Beginnings 5:209f., (emphasis supplied). But since Christians were soon rejected by Jewish society, "social intercourse" was soon no longer a problem; by the time Luke wrote, although he knew the content of the decree itself, "he did not quite know what the exact controversy was," loc. cit.

In Studies 94-7, Dibelius shows that the council speeches in Acts 15 presuppose things known not to the men of the council, but only to the reader of Acts. Peter's speech, vs. 7-9, refers to the story of the conversion of Cornelius not as it occurred in more common tradition but as it had been reworked and amplified by Luke in Acts 10:1ff., cf. Studies 108ff. The important speeches of Paul and Barnabas are barely mentioned, vs. 12, "because God's acts in the mission to the Gentiles have already been related, not in this gathering of the apostles, but in the Book of Acts." James' speech, vs. 13ff, is surprisingly out of character and also refers to the Lucan version of the Cornelius story. Dibelius' conclusion, 99-101, is that Luke has composed the story of the Jerusalem Council to fit the plan of his book. "We thus have only one account of the meeting...that of Paul in Gal. 2. We are not justified in correcting it according to the account in Acts."

Conzelmann, op. cit. 89, suggests that Paul's co-workers (including Titus? Gal. 2:3) must be circumcised so that they may enter the synagogues where (according to Luke's presuppositions) Paul's work always begins. See also the preceding note.]
the poor (presumably the poor in Jerusalem). That is, not a single trace of legalism intruded into the settlement.

The differences are indeed considerable. The Acts account, even without the Timothy incident, contradicts Paul's repeated insistence that the legal approach in any form cancelled the approach through grace and faith. James in Acts does not explicitly say that it was necessary to be circumcised to be a Christian, but such is the clear implication.23 The incident of Timothy's circumcision comes in after the narrative about the council is closed, as though the author of Acts is saying, "...but Paul was not really so rabid about circumcision as he is reported to be."24

Since Paul himself says that even a commandment like "Thou shalt not covet" destroys one when it is presented as law (Rom. 7:7ff.), I cannot believe that he would have meekly accepted the law of kosher meat as Acts 15:28ff. implies; indeed this rule was one he openly flouted in his missions (e.g., Gal. 2:11-21). Paul, as we shall see, just did not like what Philo called "specific laws."

On less secure grounds, Paul's Roman citizenship (Acts 22:25ff.) also seems dubious.25 At one time, under Ptolemy and Caesar, citizenship was given rather freely in the East to those who would help in the army, either in service or by contribution. It is conceivable that Paul's great-grandfather had had such an honor, and that is why I consider it a possibility. But it is by no means a probability, for in that case Paul would have come from a great and probably rich family, and of this there is no indication whatever. The only argument for the truth of the tradition is the name Paul; this is the sort of gentilicum26 one would have taken over on being made citizen (usually by adoption). The story

\[23\text{[On the basis of investigations by, e.g., Dibelius, Menoud and Conzelmann, many scholars would hold that the pictures of James and Paul have both been softened to suit the purposes of the writer of Acts.]}\]

\[24\text{[Nock, op. cit., suggests an explanation for the contradiction: "Timothy was the son of a Jewish mother, and on Rabbinic theory obliged to be circumcised, and Paul emphatically held that except in matters of tablefellowship...a convert should abide by the status which was his by birth...So he might fairly hold that Timothy was by birth in the category of circumcision," 108. Nock also points out that a strong emphasis on circumcision might well have resulted in a lower status for uncircumcised Christians; for Paul, however, "you were 'in Christ' or you were not 'in Christ': there was no half-way house, and there were no second-best Christians," 103, cf. 109, 149.]}\]


\[26\text{[See Cadbury, The Book of Acts in History, 76.]}\]
of Paul's various travels and his trip to Rome are so brilliantly told that it seems utterly perverse to doubt their veracity, but if Paul was not a Roman citizen, there could have been no "appeal to Caesar" (Acts 25:9-12) and we must regard that part of Acts as romance or propaganda, wonderfully disguised as history.27

My chief objection to using Acts alongside Paul's letters as a source for his ideas is that the essential preaching of Paul in Acts is a Jewish-Christian message practically identical with that of Peter and James, one which asked of converts only that they believe in the resurrection of Jesus and the coming resurrection of men. Paul could use such language himself, as when he said, "If you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord, and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved" (Rom 10:9) – and this after the long explanation in that letter than much more indeed was involved. While much can be found in Paul's letters that resembles his speeches in Acts (e.g., 1 Thessalonians as a whole is very similar in tone), what appears in most of the letters to be the essential Paul is not there.28

I am not concerned with Acts as such, but only to recover that essential Paul, and to see what his manner of thinking was. For this I consider it extremely dangerous to use Acts as a primary source, implicitly or explicitly.29 When we have the Paul of the letters more clearly in mind (we shall never have him clearly so, since his writings are often far from clear), then perhaps we may evaluate the historical reliability of Acts. In this article, however, our problem is to ascertain what Paul contributed to the hellenizing of Christianity, once we have seen what Paul was trying to teach.

27[Conzelmann, op. cit., points out that, when the specific references to Paul are omitted, the account of the sea journey in Acts 27 becomes a unified narrative and is "in höherem Grade literarisch als irgend ein anderer Teil des Buches," 146; he quotes similar texts from Lucian and Achilles Tatius, 151-54. His conclusion is that the chapter is neither an eyewitness account nor an elaboration thereof, but a literary composition with clear parallels in the pagan literature of the time. E. Haenschen has recently tested Conzelmann’s arguments and evidence in his article "Acta 27" in Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an R. Bultmann, 1964, 235-54.]
28[In "The Perspective of Acts," G.’s criticism of the "Lucan" Paul is more severe, witness the final paragraph, page 122 above.]  
29[G.’s doubts about the objectivity of the writer of Acts have the support of many New Testament scholars, cf. the summary opinion of Conzelmann, op. cit., 9f.]
II. The Letter to the Romans

Method or plan is the first problem in trying to reconstruct the "essential Paul." None of Paul's letters conveys exactly the impression of any other, especially in details, and some seem quite different in kind. Perhaps this diversity stems from Paul's wish to speak to each church on its own terms (cf. 1 Cor. 9:19-22). In 1 Thessalonians, for example, he says that the Thessalonians "became imitators of the churches of God in Christ Jesus which are in Judea" (2:14); I strongly suspect that the Thessalonian church was made up largely of Jews and their church "imitated" the churches in Judea. Accordingly, when Paul writes to this particular church, he uses the word "faith" as the Judean church might define it, i.e., much more along the lines of Acts than of Galatians or Romans. In 1 Thess. 3:5-10 he is anxious to know about their faith, and that they "stand fast in the Lord," which seems to be what he means here by "faith:" he even hopes to supply what is lacking in their faith if he can come to them. He appears to mean: "Hold the faith" in Christ until those events occur which are related soon after in what we might call Paul's "little apocalypse," (3:13, 4:13-5:11, 23). As he uses it in this letter, faith is acknowledging that a body of statements of external facts is true -- facts such as that Christ is Lord, that he rose from the dead, and that he will return for the final judgment. When Paul defines faith differently in other letters, it is due in part to his concern to "speak the language" of the particular congregation to which he writes.

In view of these apparent fluctuations, is it legitimate to attempt to extract from a single letter what we take to be the essential message of Paul? I believe it is, since in this letter, Romans, he is provoked by no outside vagaries or problems; he is expounding the message of Christ, the theme of which is salvation. He does this quietly and as systematically as I think his mind ever could work. He becomes deeply emotional in places, but the gospel was a very deeply emotional message and he a deeply emotional person. Nevertheless, his intent in this letter is clear; he is simply telling to the Romans the gospel of Christ as he understands it.

Our approach in this essay is thus akin to that of the text critic, who strives to establish a single critical text, the text which seems to him the most accurate, then he considers the variants as variants from this. We must have a ποι ὅστις and Romans seems quite the safest one.30

30[G.'s view of Romans as a general summary of Pauline thought is supported by T.W. Manson's article, "St. Paul's Letter to the Romans -- and Others," now reprinted in Studies in the Gospels and Epistles, 1962, 225-41. Manson
Paul and the Hellenization of Christianity

Romans, Ch. 1

The letter opens with Paul's greeting to "God's beloved in Rome" (cf. vs. 7). He states his qualifications as an apostle, one set apart for the gospel of God (vs. 1). In verses 3 and 4 he makes the puzzling statement that the Son was "descended from David according to the flesh, and designated son of God in power according to the spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead." Many have felt that this text manifests an adoptionist conception of the divinity of Christ, one that would contradict other passages in Paul's letters. I think the passage too brief to allow taking a stand, thus I pass it by completely. 31

Paul's commission was to bring about "the obedience of faith for the sake of his name among all the gentiles" (vs. 5). It should be noted that the word "obedience" implies a legalistic conception of faith or, at least, includes in "faith" some kind of acquiescence; 32 this is echoed in chapter eight, where Paul speaks of the law of the spirit in Christ Jesus. One thing we may say surely: this is not an obedience to the law of Moses; of that there is no hint whatever.

concludes: "We should think of our document primarily as the summing up of the positions reached by Paul and his friends at the end of the long controversy whose beginnings appear in I Corinthians and...in Philippians iii. Having got this statement worked out to his own satisfaction, Paul then decided to send a copy of it to his friends in Ephesus...At the same time he conceived the idea of sending a copy to Rome with a statement of his future plans...Looked at in this way Romans...becomes a manifesto setting forth his deepest convictions on central issues, a manifesto calling for the widest publicity, which the Apostle did his best – not without success – to give it," 241. Munck summarizes the Manson article and agrees with its conclusions, op. cit., 197-200.

31[Many scholars explain this "contradiction" by identifying vs. 3f. as Christological tradition of the pre-Pauline community; see G. Bornkamm, Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum, 1959, 199, note 25. G. points out that Philo ascribes a "similar double birth" to Moses, see Symbols 9:118f, where the passage (QE ii, 46) is printed.]

32[The relation between obedience and faith in 1:5 is explained by A. Schlatter as follows: "Der Glaubende untergibt sich dem gnädigen Willen Gottes und stellt sich unter Christus. Weil er bewusst und vollend in die Stellung eintritt, die Gott ihm bereitet hat, erhält das Glauben den Charakter der Gehorsamsbewältigung. Darum sah Paulus für das, was das Gesetz über die Stätte des göttlichen Gebots und seine Einwohnung im Menschen sagte, im Glauben die Erfüllung," Der Glaube im Neuen Testament, 5 1963, 363. (G. commended an earlier edition of Schlatter's book for its definition of the idea of pistis in Philo, Light, 400 note 212.) Cf. R. Bultman: "Paul understands faith primarily as obedience; he understands the act of faith as an act of obedience...Thus, he can combine the two in the expression ὑπακοὴ πιστεος (the obedience which faith is,' Rom. 1:5)," Theology of the New Testament, 1:314 (1951).]
Paul begins his great exposition of the gospel in verse 16. He first speaks of the gospel as the power, δύναμις, of God for salvation to everyone who has faith; the sentence states that the gospel brings salvation, but words are otherwise unclear. We are not in a position to bring Philo\footnote{G. will often refer to Philo because this older contemporary of Paul is the major figure in the hellenistic Judaism which G. sees behind the hellenization of Christianity. He once states his argument as follows ("New Light on Hellenistic Judaism," *Journal of Bible and Religion* 5 [1937] 21f.): "First, there is the fact that Christianity grew out of Judaism, and never lost the sense of its Jewish roots...Second, it is equally well recognized that Christianity was steadily hellenized, even though we disagree on the extent of this hellenization...Third, it is equally evident that at every stage in the development of their religion Christians felt themselves bitterly opposed to paganism, especially to the Mystery Religions toward which in many ideas they seemed steadily tending...There is a fourth fact...which is the most perplexing of all, the crux of the problem of the origin of hellenistic Christianity...namely, that Christianity, in the process of hellenization, never disintegrated into a thousand sects...Only after this process of the hellenization of Christianity was completed did the great controversies arise which ended in a number of separate Christian Churches...Why, if Christians were in any sense borrowing pagan notions, taking them directly from the pagans about them, were there not as many hellenistic Christianities as there were Christians under pagan influence?...Why hellenization, but at the same time a solid front against acute hellenization?"} at once into the picture as a criterion of interpretation, but

\footnote{G. finds the answer in the Judaism behind early Christianity, a Judaism exemplified by Philo and manifesting three important characteristics: 1) It is already heavily hellenized, has already drawn much from mystery religions and the religious philosophies of the time. 2) It is Jewish, and so escapes Christian attacks on "paganism". 3) It is a unity in the sense that it possesses a normative text, the Old Testament, and a standard method of interpretation (see below); drawing on this common tradition, not on "paganism" directly, early Christianity resists fragmentation while it becomes steadily more hellenized.

This hellenistic Judaism has two important similarities to early Christianity: "First (in both)...the Old Testament is made into a mystic document, in which literal adventures of Abraham and Sarah, for example, have much less significance than their typological meaning...Second (in both)...salvation is made available to men by the great struggles of the Patriarchs whose lives are our patterns as they fought down the cloying power of matter and received the crown of victory, union with supra-material reality."

Philo furnishes the clearest evidence for this kind of hellenistic Judaism, but he is himself no innovator; he stands within a well-developed tradition. G. explicates this most thoroughly in his book *Light*, the thesis of which he once defined as follows: "Philo is directly in line with this tradition (i.e. the combination of religious philosophy and mystery religion which presents the "true philosophy" as the "true mystery"), and the Old Testament was for him a guide to the true philosophy by which man was though saved by association with the immaterial," art. cit. (note 14 above), 235 with footnote 31.
we do recall that he regarded the extension of God's power as a series of powers, which collectively was the Logos; thus, to say that the gospel is "the Logos of God which works salvation" is by no means a poor guess at what this passage means, for in this gospel "the righteousness of God is revealed" (vs. 17). Here we first meet the term δικαιοσύνη, righteousness, a word whose importance greatly increases as we go on. We shall see that righteousness is a fixed and absolutely stabilized organization of all one's parts, and that the righteousness of God means his absolutely stable reliability, his unchanging character. Here it is hard to see how a mere conception of this righteousness, a mere revelation of it, would bring salvation.

It is revealed "out of faith into faith" (vs. 17) and commentators have long failed to agree as to what this might mean. I would suggest

If G. was to prove his hypothesis, he had to show that hellenistic Judaism as he defined it was wide-spread in the ancient world. Some of his strongest evidence here is in the Jewish art remains assembled and published in the monumental Symbols; in this series (especially volumes 7-8, "Pagan Symbols in Judaism"), many of the references to early Christian writings and art are intended to show how the Greco-Roman world influenced Christianity not directly, but via hellenistic Judaism. At the beginning of Symbols 12, G. states explicitly that this hellenistic Jewish background to the New Testament has been his major scholarly preoccupation, beginning with his doctoral dissertation, (The Theology of Justin Martyr, 1923); his "approach to hellenized Judaism has been from two directions, as dictated by the data," i.e., from Philo and from Jewish art, 3. He also lists here six kinds of sources for determining "what impact Greek religion and thought had upon Jews of the ancient world," 184. The first three are covered in Symbols: 1) the literary evidence, chiefly from Philo; 2) the archaeological remains; 3) "the biblical paintings of Dura". The others are 4) the rabbinical writings and 5) the Septuagint as these manifest Greek influences, and 6) "the new mystic-gnostic material...from the early rabbis" as studied e.g., by Gershom Scholem.

34[On the "Logos-Stream" and its powers, see Light, chapter one, "The God of the Mystery," and, more briefly, Introduction, 100-10.]
35[On dikaiosune in Paul, see the recent discussion carried on between E. Käsemann, "Gottesgerechtigkeit bei Paulus," (reprinted in his Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen II, 1964, 181-93) and R. Bultmann, ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΘΕΟΥ, JBL 83 (1964), 12-6. The second article is a critique of the first; when the first was reprinted, Käsemann included new footnotes in reply to Bultmann's criticisms. For the distinctive stamp put on dikaiosune by the translators of the Septuagint, and its relation to the use of the word by Paul, see C.H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, 1935,42-59.]
36[W. Bauer says that this phrase "merely expresses in a rhetorical way the thought that πιστεύω, is the beginning and the end," op. cit. s.v. πιστεύω 2.d.a. However, his explanation neither suits the verb apokaluptai (as it is used in vs. 17f.), nor explains the repetition of ek pisteos, i.e., of only half the "rhetorical" phrase in the Old Testament text which ends vs. 17. G.'s interpretation suggests
that it harmonizes with what follows if we recognize that "righteousness" and "faith" have meanings very similar; faith is really "fidelity, stability", so that Paul is saying that out of the faithfulness, fidelity, righteousness of God we ourselves come into faith. This explanation gives an active meaning to the sentence, something very much needed if it is to be regarded as the theme of the letter to follow.

"For the wrath of God has been revealed..." (vs. 18). Here Paul continues to speak along exactly the same lines. There should have been no need for this revelation of wrath, since God had fully revealed himself in nature. He has not been shifting and changing through the varieties of revelation; he is the same faithful, reliable, identical God in whom we may come to the reliability and steadfastness of *pistis* (faith) and *dikaiosune* ourselves. Paul parallels Philo when he says that the nature of God has been revealed in the created world, that his eternal power and deity could have clearly been perceived in the things have been made. We are thus "without excuse" (vs. 20); we

---

37 This interrelation of *dikaiosune*, *normos* (law) and *pistis* is brought out clearly in G.'s essay "Law in the Subjective Realm," printed as an appendix to *Light*, 370-413. The relation of *dikaiosune* and *nomos* becomes clear in this sentence: "That blessed state which a man achieves when he turns from sin to a life in harmony with God's Spirit or Law is the state of *dikaiosune*, specifically explained as the voluntary following of the Laws of Nature. To say that a man has acted unjustly, has broken the higher Law, or has committed impiety, these are but three ways of saying the same thing, according to Philo and Paul alike," 398. *Pistis* is "in brief that ultimate trust and dependence upon God that marked the achievement of the life completely oriented in God," 400. God is not simply the God of the Old Testament here, but the God whose law is in a sense co-terminous with the laws of nature, as indicated by the first quotation. G. goes on to point out the differences between *pistis* defined by Philo and that defined by Paul, but then concludes: "In any case it is clear that to Philo as to Paul the association of *dikaiosune* and *pistis* was very close," 401.

38 The Old Testament would say, "The heavens declare the glory of God," etc., but to say that the invisible nature of God has been made known in its *dunamis* and *theiotes* (1:20) is to use the hellenistic approach. [For Philo see the discussion of Moses' vision of the "back" of God, Ex. 33:17-23, in *Light*, 213f. and the references to Philo given there. For Plutarch, see *de Iside* 71-75. B. Gärtner concludes that 1:20-23 has little in common with hellenistic philosophical thought; he understands these verses on the basis of Old Testament - Jewish tradition, although he acknowledges that "what really makes Rom. 1:20 ...so difficult to interpret is the number of terms familiar to us from Greek philosophy"! *(op. cit.* 82, cf. 133-44). G. wrote the following note in his copy of Gärtner's book: 'In the paragraphs on Greek philosophy and hellenistic Judaism, Gärtner considers only Stoicism. His argument is that Paul's thinking
have not come into the faith of God, because we have blinded ourselves to the revelation already given. Men wanted something more immediate, could not take anything so abstract; they exchanged the great God for "images that resembled mortal men or birds or animals or reptiles" (vs. 23).\(^3\)

*Romans, Ch. 2*

The result of men's failure to recognize God as revealed in nature is that God has abandoned them to the lusts of the flesh, given them up entirely and will condemn them in the last day of judgment; he will render to every man according to his works (vs. 6), to the Jew first and also to the Greek, whether of reward or of punishment (vs. 9f.). Men were to be obedient to the power and glory of God as revealed in nature, but Paul does not say that this revelation in nature is a revelation of God's *law*; he calls it the revelation of God *himself* and his grace, and it amounts (as we shall see) to a law that is higher.

If verses 14ff. *nomos* (law) clearly has two meanings, so that I would paraphrase: When the gentiles do by nature what the *Jewish* law requires, they are a law to themselves, even though they do not have the Jewish law. For what the *universal* law requires is written on their hearts, "while their conscience also bears witness and their conflicting thoughts accuse or perhaps excuse them..." (vs. 15).\(^4\)

---

\(^3\)This could easily have come from a hellenistic Jewish treatise in Egypt; certainly God in the form of birds, animals and reptiles is a way of speaking which would be unusual elsewhere. [In *Symbols* 9:6 G. suggests that "Paul might have drawn from either Philo or Gamaliel" for l:22f.; he refers to Philo, Decal. 66-81, and to *Introduction*, 83ff.]

\(^4\)[Gartner again stresses the "Old Testament-Jewish" evidence, citing Test. Judah 20 and the *Qumran Manual of Discipline*, IQS 3: 18-4: 26 as parallels to Rom. 2:14-16; see his excursus, *op. cit.*, 83-5. However, in "Gesetz und Natur: Röm. 2:14-16" in *Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum*, 1959, 93-118, G. Bornkamm points out four elements of 2:14f. which are clearly hellenistic: 1. das durchaus unbiblische, spezifisch griechische Begriffs paar *'υσις/*νόμος, 2. die ebenfalls dezidiert unjüdische, aber umsgehrr griechische Wendung]
Clearly a gentile never had the Jewish law, the Mosaic code, "written in his heart", but a few righteous gentiles have known the natural law, the real law, the law of the spirit, and have obeyed it. Such people become a "law to themselves", because they are guided by the true law; even though they have never heard of the Jewish law, they can be fully acceptable to God.

In addition to this natural law available to all men, the Jews have had the Jewish law, which is a wonderful revelation but which they have not kept (vs. 12f., 17ff.).

The summary in verse 29 makes the contrast clear: the real law is in the spirit, not in the written code, έν πνεύματι, οὗ γράμματι. The gentile who has neither the gramma nor fleshly circumcision (vs. 25ff.) but still fulfills the law will condemn the Jew who for all his gramma and circumcision still breaks the law. Clearly there are two laws, the law of the spirit and the law of the letter, i.e. the law written down, the law in nouns and verbs. Of these the law of the spirit is the only true law.\(^{41}\)

Philo also makes a great point of this contrast between the written law and the universal law (what Paul here and later calls the spirit-law or the law of the spirit); I explicated his understanding of it at great length in my book By Light, Light (1935). Philo was a loyal Jew; he kept the law, he did not abandon it as Paul did.\(^{42}\) But he was...
presented with a great difficulty in that he was looking for a law higher than anything which could be put in writing. The approach to this higher law, he says, is a matter of allegorizing, of really coming to understand what is implied by the text of the Torah; only those who are in a special, spiritual frame of mind can come through to this understanding.

The spirit-law, according to Philo, is revealed also in the great patriarchs, from Enos to Moses, who lived righteous, i.e. law-abiding lives before the existence of any written code. They offered the Jews access to the higher law, since the spirit-law was also revealed in the Torah, in the stories about these patriarchs. Their victory was so great, their power of salvation for other men so mighty, because they had revealed the higher law directly and before there was any written code. This is the very heart of Philo’s message. He describes these men as νόμοι ἐμψυχοι, incarnations of the law.

I discussed the nomoi empsuchoi at considerable length, with parallels from contemporary hellenistic writers, and showed that the phrase does not mean an incarnation of a written code; both for the Greeks and for the hellenized Jews it rather means the incarnation of the higher general law, what the Stoics call the law of nature, a law which by its very nature could not have been a code. In theistic circles this law became the way, the will, the nature of God himself; the word "nature" came to mean "God" and the law of nature, the law of God. This is the law which was revealed to everyone and which could

Introduction 79f. In Symbols 12:9ff. he discusses the agreements and disagreements between [Philonic and rabbinic views of the law.]  

43 [In Symbols 12:13f. G. briefly describes the four levels of "law" in Philo: 1) "At the top is the nomos-logos, the metaphysical law (with the true Being above it, of course). God used this as the formal principle in creating the universe, as Plato described the Creator doing in the Timaeus." 2) Next come the "incarnations of the nomos-logos, the metaphysical law become vocal (logikos). Such a person was the philosopher-king in Plato's and Aristotle's terminology...the nomos empsuchos, the lex animata, the law become alive (in a person)." Then, for "the great majority of people" God gave verbal laws, the 3) Decalog and 4) "the positive and negative commands, the "Specific Laws"."

44 [In a section entitled, "Teilhaber Gottes (θείοι ἄνδρες) in der jüdischen Tradition," D. Georgi describes this "divinizing" of Old Testament heroes, Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief, 1964, 145ff. The evidence he gives from other hellenistic Jewish writers shows that their approach is much the same as that of Philo. G. was impressed with what he knew of this book, but had to break off writing before he could make use of it in this article.]

45 [The summary in Introduction, 68-71, is perhaps the most succinct; for further bibliography see notes 44 above and 48 below. See also the forthcoming article of H. Köster in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament s.v. 'ύσις, and his "Natural Law in Greek Thought" in Neusner (1968).]
become *incarnate*, could become written into the hearts of the few great men of old. The idea was carried on at least through Justin Martyr, who was convinced that Socrates and Plato likewise were incarnations of the Logos;\(^46\) it was so popular in early Christianity that they came near to being canonized as Christian saints.

The background and atmosphere here are platonic: the law, the true law, was a source of platonic reality which could never adequately represent itself in matter. The written law was *ipso facto* inferior to the law of the spirit (to use Paul's word for it). The *nomos empsuchos*, he who was the incarnation of law, had it as his function to formulate law, or rather, to formulate laws in writing. It was essential to have a king who was an incarnation of law, of the spirit-law, so that he could make it vocal, make it λογικός, verbalize it; he himself stands above all the codes, which periodically turn out in new circumstances to be fallible and unjust.\(^47\) The only true justice was in the law of the spirit. According to Philo the great advantage of the Jew with his Jewish tradition and scripture was not that the letter of the law was revealed to him, but that Moses, the supreme incarnation of law, had made verbal the true law and that the Jew had access to it in the persons of these great patriarchs.

This understanding of the true law as a kind of platonic Real, a basic thesis of Philo's whole writing, is carried over directly in Paul's contrast between the law of the letter and the higher law of the spirit. It is this latter law which, in the sphere of ethics, issues in the higher principles of morality which Paul is everywhere and throughout his

---

\(^{46}\) [See G.'s *The Theology of Justin Martyr*, 1923, especially chapter 5, "The Logos".]

\(^{47}\) [In his lengthy essay, "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship," *Yale Classical Studies* I (1928), 55-102, G. argues that this is "the official political philosophy of the Hellenistic age," 102, and "the philosophy of state which thrust itself irresistibly upon the Roman imperator," 100; "νομος ἐμψυχος was...a by-word for royalty of great antiquity in the second century of our era," 94 ("second century..." is a correction written into G.'s copy of the essay). G. found much of his evidence in neo-Pythagorian texts contained in the Stobaean fragments; his summary of the view of kingship stated there clarifies the present article at this point: "The supreme function of the king is by virtue of his own relationship with deity...to infuse into a man a new power, which is a new recognition by man of his own potential nature...until the logos of the king...like leaven, has transformed man's lumpishness into the divine existence God meant him to be. Thus transformed in his spiritual nature, man will be an imitation of the king as the king imitates God, each in turn self-rulled and subject to no external compulsion. So man will at last have achieved the dream...of all Greek ethical thinking, he will be able to live spontaneously by divine law and dispense with the seriatiim compulsion and injustice of the written codes," 90f.]
letters exhorting the Christians to follow. It is not at all an antinomianism which allows one to do whatever one pleases; one follows the higher principles of morality, but as *principles* and not as specific commands.

It is this approach to morality which appears behind much of what is said in chapter two of Romans. For example, verse 10: "Glory and honor and peace for everyone who does the good, the Jew first and also the Greek." The good, τὸ ἀγαθὸν which Jew and Greek may do, is a Greek philosophical term, not a Jewish expression; it reflects the universal good and, with it, the universal law discussed above. Whoever practices this higher law, whoever reflects it in his character, brings into effect what Plato or a later Platonist might have called *to agathon*, just as Philo did. Some gentiles have put *to agathon* before themselves as their model; they have "done" *to agathon*, says Paul. Such gentiles, who have no Jewish law, have the true law written in their hearts (vs. 15). Paul here shows that he is using "law" in two senses, that revealed by Moses in the Torah and that which can become *empsuchos*.

Again in verse 13 Paul contrasts those who are hearers of law with those Jews and gentiles (cf. vs. 9f.) who are doers of law, οἱ ποιηται νόμου: "Law" in both cases is singular; "doers of law" does not mean that these wonderful people are doers of *Jewish* law. If they are a "law to themselves", clearly they do have a law; just as clearly, it need not be a written law.

*Romans, Ch. 3*

Paul has shown that the keeping of the higher law is a matter of the heart, not something external which can be measured by precepts of the written law. The higher moral good which people should practice

---

48 For example, in *de Posteritate Caini* 85: "(Moses) in a thoroughly philosophical way makes a three-fold division; he says, 'it is in your mouth and heart and hands' (Deut. 30:14 LXX), that is, in words, in plans, in actions. For these are the parts of *to agathon*, and of those it is compacted, and the lack of but one not only renders it imperfect but absolutely destroys it." Philo omits the references to the Old Testament covenant and to the commandments which abound in Deut. 30. He talks instead, para. 86f., of the sophists who do not keep the three parts of *to agathon* united. Then, in para. 88f., he mentions "the boundaries of the good and the beautiful...(which) were fixed not by the creation to which we belong, but on principles which are divine and are older than we and all that belongs to earth." We have left the Old Testament thought-world; *to agathon* here is an object of philosophical speculation. [In his article in Kittel's *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* I, 1964, s.v. *dyabōs*, W. Grundmann discusses both Philo and Paul but makes no particular reference to the use of *agathon* with the definite article, the point which concerns G. here.]
has of course been reflected in the written law: avoidance of adultery, of stealing, of blasphemy against God – these are all mentioned in the Mosaic code. If however the gentile avoids these, the question is: What advantage has the Jew in having the Mosaic code? What is the value of circumcision? (vs. 1). Because of the way the previous chapter ends, these questions must arise. Though the written law cannot bring the Jew dikaiosune, it does at least bring him knowledge of sin – thus verse 20 finally answers verse 1. But verse 2, always mistranslated because literally untranslatable, answers in a deeper way. The Jews were given a share in that great pistis (of God) by being given the formulated laws of God, ta logia. Most Jews were false to this pistis, but this by no means impugns the pistis of God (vs. 3ff.). The few who did not betray this pistis will in the next chapter be presented in the person of Abraham who, because he had pistis was also dikaios like God.

Thus the Jewish law is itself a great revelation of the righteousness of God, and of his faithfulness, his pistis, his stability, which stands out all the more clearly revealed in contrast to the people who break the law and so becloud everything. While the primary revelation, the higher law, is available to all men, the Mosaic code, a second gift of

49 According to vs. 4, God is "true" and "just", words apparently synonymous with pistos. [See following note.]

50 The word pistis is one of the most difficult in the New Testament, because it appears in a great variety of meanings. I suggest 1) that the noun, like so many abstractions, is secondary to the adjective pistos, which means trustworthy, reliable or trusting; 2) that "to have pistis" and "to be pistos" are absolutely identical in meaning. [In his Kittel article on pistis, Bultmann agrees that the noun pistis and the verb pisteuo are secondary to the adjective pistos, although both noun and verb are quite early, the verb being in use from the seventh century BC, (English translation in Bible Key Words III, s.v. pistis 34ff.). As pistos is sometimes more active in meaning ("trusting"), sometimes passive ("trustworthy"), so the noun "can mean the trust that a man feels as well as the trust that he inspires, that is to say, trustworthiness," 36. Bultmann also indicates that neither the adjective nor the noun are religious terms in classical Greek; it is not until the hellenistic period that they become part of the religious vocabulary. At that time pistis "became the key word in the propaganda of the proselytising religions, not only Christianity", 41. There is perhaps an indication of the distance between Paul and Qumran in the understanding of Hab. 2:4 in Rom. 1:17 and in 1 QpHab viii, 1; in the latter "the saying is made to refer to the 'doers of the Law'...the exact opposite to what Paul finds in the same prophecy," H. Ringgren, The Faith of Qumran, 1963, 247 – but see his discussion there.]

51[Here G. finds the same parallels between the adjective dikaios and pistos which he drew earlier (pages 143-44 above) between the nouns dikaiosune and pistis.]
Paul and the Hellenization of Christianity

God, was specifically given to the Jews; this is their great advantage (vs. 2).

But now (nuni de, vs. 21) still a third revelation of the righteousness, the resolute "law-abidingness" of God has been granted; in Christ it has been made freshly available quite beyond anything that men have had before. From this point on indeed no one has any excuse. Now we leave the law of the Jews entirely behind, since through this law comes only knowledge of sin (vs. 20).

Actually all men have been and still are sinners (vs. 23); only as they come into the dikaiosune of God can they hope to become righteous themselves (vs. 24). God's dikaiosune is available only as a gift, only through Jesus Christ; in his sacrifice he manifested God's dikaiosune (vs. 25) by his own faith (vs. 22 & 26). We are made righteous because this faith of Christ is given us.

It is crucial to note that "faith" in this passage (vs. 22 & 26) is not faith in Jesus Christ but the faith of Jesus Christ, πιστίς Ίησοῦ Χριστοῦ. There have been many attempts to make this phrase conform to the traditional idea of Christian faith; I see no possible way to do so. Rather, as the parallels between the faith of Abraham and the faith of Christ in the next chapter will make clear, this faith of Christ is simply his trusting that the cross would not be the end, and that God would save him from death because God is pistos, God is the righteous one who is absolutely supreme in that he is beyond life and death. As we identify with Christ, become one with him, we ourselves are given the faith of Christ. It is not our faith, it is no goodness of ours; it is a free gift. By this faith of Christ, transferred to us, we have hope of immortality ourselves.

52[See now the arguments of G.M. Taylor for the translation "faith of Christ," 75f. in the article treated in the following note.]

53[Here G. states most clearly his understanding of "faith" in Paul as the faith which Christ himself possessed and demonstrated and gives to Christians; while G.'s may be a unique understanding of faith, it is quite in line with the rest of his interpretation of Romans and with his thesis that the key to Paul is to see him against the background of the hellenistic Judaism best known from Philo. G. interprets three major Pauline terms in similar ways: dikaiosune (see pages 143-44 above), nomos (see page 145ff. above) and pistis. (In an article discussed just below, G.M. Taylor gives useful details regarding the interrelation of these three words in the Pauline letters, 59ff.). Just as dikaiosune is primarily the stability and trustworthiness of God, and just as nomos is embodied in Christ, the nomos empsuchos, so pistis is first of all Christ's pistis, his own trust in God, a trust which has a preliminary manifestation in the larger-than-life patriarchs of the Old Testament (cf. the discussion of nomoi empsuchoi, page 41ff. above). Once G. has said this about the source of faith, he can go on to describe the faith of Christians in a number of ways, e.g. as gift (page 155ff. below) and as
obediency (page 141 above). In the traditional Pauline corpus similar or identical expressions occur in Gal. 2:16 bis, 20 ("the faith of the Son of God"); 3:22; Eph. 3:12; Phil. 3:9.

G.'s "philonic" understanding of pistis in Paul might appear so much his own that no other scholar's work bears directly on it; nevertheless, certain references can be given:

1) In the standard reference works: W. Bauer, op. cit. s.v. πιστις, 2,b, b on "the pistis Christou in Paul"; F. Blass and A. Debrunner, op. cit. para. 163 entitled, "objective genitive".

2) A detailed study of ,,die mit pistis verbundenen Christus-Genetiv" is given in O. Schmitz, Die Christusgemeinschaft des Paulus im Lichte seines Genetivgebrauchs, 1924, 91-134. Reviewing the debate on the subject, Schmitz points out certain dangers: 1) that of forcing this genitive into any one grammatical category, e.g. the "objective" or the "subjective" genitives; 2) that of defining pistis too narrowly, i.e. equating it either with acceptance of historical data, or with the believer's (mystical) union with Christ, cf. 131. He concludes: ,,Alle diese Schwierigkeiten fallen mit einem Schlage weg, wenn man sich entschliesst, die mit pistis verbundenen Christus-Genetiv im Sinne einer ganz allgemeinen Näherbestimmung dieses 'Glaubens' als 'Christus-Glauben', 'Christus-Jesus-Glauben', 'Jesus Glauben' zu verstehen, ohne irgend ein konkretes verbales Verhältnis zwischen den beiden Nomina, sei es nach Art des Gen. obj., sei es nach Art des Gen. subj. durch den Genetiv als solchen ausgedrückt zu finden... So versteht es sich von selber, dass Christus 'Gegenstand' des 'Christus-Glaubens' ist (vgl. Gal. 2:16); aber das ist nicht die einzige Beziehung, die zwischen diesen beiden Grössen obwaltet, vielmehr wird Christus (wie Gott) für Paulus nie in der Weise Objekt, dass er nicht zugleich ihn selber (Paulus) zum Objekt machte und zwar so, dass er (Paulus) mit seiner Subjektivität dadurch an der Objektivität dieses Subjekts (Christus) beteiligt würde...Daher bestehen bei Paulus die objektiv-historischen Aussagen und die subjektiv-mystische Aussagen immer zusammen wie die Wasserbestände in zwei kommunizierenden Röhren. Dieser gesamte, in vollem Gleichgewicht befindliche historisch-mystische, objektiv-subjektive Sachverhalt liegt den mit pistis verbundenen Christus-Genetiven zugrunde," 132f. Schmitz's work is evaluated by A. Deissmann (who argues for his own brand of "mystical genitive") in Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History², 1927, 162ff. with footnotes; and by R. Bultmann in "Zur Geschichte der Paulus-Forschung," now reprinted in Das Paulusbild in der Neueren Deutschen Forschung, ed. K.H. Rengstorff, 1964, 331ff.

3) In an important article "The Function of πιστις Χριστοῦ in Galatians," JBL 85 (1966), 58-76, G.M. Taylor argues that in this letter this phrase is "the fidei commissum of Roman law; and that Paul uses this concept to explain, in juristic terms, how the inheritance of Abraham is transmitted, through Jesus Christ, both to Jews and gentiles," 58. According to Taylor, diatheke in Galatians is not the equivalent of the Hebrew berith, but of testamentum, the Latin term for "will", 63 note 8. Fidei commissum (which is translated pistis in Roman legal documents written in Greek) is the only variety of testamentum by which a testator could name two successive heirs (the first-named heir being obliged, if he accepts the benefits of the legacy, also to accept the second-named as, in effect, his own heir), or by which a national alien could be named the heir of a Roman citizen, 66. Applied to Galatians, this means that "Abraham and Christ
Before Paul can go on to illuminate this understanding of faith and righteousness from the Old Testament story of Abraham, he must make clear its implications for "law"; the philonic distinction between the higher law and the written law is again essential for the argument. On the basis of "law" our boasting is "excluded" (vs. 27), but "excluded" is the equivalent of the German "verboten"; it implies a law that forbids. By what law is humility enjoined and personal boasting, self-righteousness, excluded? The Mosaic law by no means does so, for there is great satisfaction in obedience, in the law of legal acts, ἐργα. God commands, I obey, and the righteousness is my own. The supreme sin of pride, spiritual pride, is here "boasting" (vs. 27), the inevitable result are successive testamentary heirs, who receive the inheritance in πίστις – fidei commissum – because that device is necessary to constitute Christ as successive heir, and because the testament is intended to benefit gentiles as well as Jews (i.e. people of another nation) and to adopt them all as equal heirs through Christ's heirship. The testament can not take effect until Christ, as successive testamentary heir, accepts the inheritance, including its obligations, with the consent of his father, God (4:4ff.). Until then the intended beneficiaries are subject to tutelage," 67. While Taylor applies his explanation to the Galatian letter generally, it should be restricted to one section, 3:15-4:7, where Paul is making use of this Roman legal terminology in an explanatory analogy, beginning with κατὰ ἀνθρωπον λέγω (cf. RSV's paraphrase: "to give a human example..."). In 3:26ff. there appear the different and more familiar phrases "baptized into Christ", "put on Christ", and "one in Christ"; these are here paralleled with and "geared into" the legal metaphor, which comes to the fore again at 3:29. Taylor's explanation fits well with the use of pistis lesou Christou (3:22) and diatheke (3:15 & 17) within the verses of this metaphor, but not otherwise. Thus, pistis in 2:16, 20 would not be taken to mean fidei commissum without the "help" of 3:15ff., and diatheke is used later in another analogy (4:22-31) in a very different, non-legal way (this in spite of Taylor's denial, 63 note 8). Also, the "entirely new and different juristic personality" effected among the Romans by adoption is quite a distance from the ideas "death to self" and "new life in Christ" in 2:20 and "putting on Christ" and being "baptized into Christ" in 3:27 (compare these verses with the legal text referred to in note 20; see also 66ff.). Nevertheless, Taylor's explanation of fidei commissum, 65-74, is a valuable commentary on the use of pistis Christou in 3:15-4:7; in this "human example" Paul again (cf. page 34 above) appears to be fitting his words carefully to his readers, here the Galatians, since, as Taylor points out, "the Galatian was the only non-Roman legal system" to make use of just this kind of testamentary law, 70. (For an attempt to explain the Galatians passage on the basis of rabbinic law, see E. Bammel, "Gottes ΑΙΑΘΗΚΗ (Gal. iii, 15-17) und das jüdische Rechtsdenken," NTS 6 (1959/60) 313-19.).

4) The genitive might be explained as a Semitism whose closest parallel is the "construct state" of the Hebrew of Aramaic substantive. This explanation would find some support in K.G. Kuhn's article, "Der Epheserbrief im Lichte der Qumrantexte"; here Kuhn shows that "die Vorliebe...für Ketten von Genetivverbindungen" in Ephesians is a characteristic of its "semitizing" Greek and has close parallels in the Dead Sea Scrolls, NTS 7 (1960/61), 335f.]
of an approach to righteousness by deed, acts, obedience. Psychologically Paul is entirely right. Legalism does bring satisfaction the satisfaction of self-approval; we are sure that God likes an obedient child.

But now, for the Christian, boasting is "excluded". By what law, by what nomos? The Jewish law, the law of works? No, but by the law of faith (vs. 27). No more clear statement could be made of the difference between the two laws: one is the higher law, which manifests itself and is achieved through faith; the other is the law of precepts, observed only by human effort and thus never really, thoroughly fulfilled.

The contrast continues: according to verse 27b we are justified "through the law of faith", according to verse 28 we are justified "apart from the works of law". Again two laws, two entirely different laws, the law of the Jews and the law of faith. In verse 29f. this contrast between two laws is linked to the theme of the inclusion of the gentiles, just as it was in 2:10ff., 2:25ff. and 3:21ff (πάντες).

"On the contrary, we uphold the law..." (vs. 31). By going beyond the law of Moses to the law of faith, we are not overturning the idea of God's law, God's way, but we are coming into a higher version of it; through faith we are able to vindicate the law of God, to live it, to be it,\(^{54}\) once we have realized the incompleteness of the law of precepts and individual commands. When we go on to the law of faith revealed in Jesus Christ, do we then vitiate the old law? Not at all! We are simply going beyond it to a law that is more potent and real, but in essence the same.

**Romans, Ch. 4**

Paul goes to the Old Testament to prove that justification by (the law of) faith was the only principle of justification from the time of Abraham; his interpretation is philonic as he uses Abraham as the great example of the man who is saved by faith.\(^{55}\) His text is Gen. 15:6. The faith was very simple: God made Abraham a promise and Abraham believed it. This was all that Abraham had to do (vs. 4f.);

---

\(^{54}\)According to 2 Cor. 5:21, we "become the dikaiosune of God" by the fact that God put our sin upon him who knew no sin.

God did the rest, God reckoned it (ελογίσθη) to him as righteousness, dikaiosune, i.e. God pronounced him just, gave him righteousness, quite apart from any knowledge of written law, simply because he had believed God.

Paul very much wanted further Old Testament support for this, so Ps. 32:1ff. is made to fit (vs. 6ff.). This text has nothing to do with God's "reckoning" dikaiosune; it manifests a traditionally Jewish idea of forgiveness, i.e. God's forgiving a failure to keep the law. But the verb used in the Abraham story also appears here (λογισηται, vs. 8); following Jewish proof-text methods, this connection was enough.56

Afterward came the law and the enjoinment of circumcision (vs. 9f). The faith that made God ascribe righteousness to Abraham was a relation between him and God on a level any pagan could experience (though few ever did) – no laws, no circumcision, and yet God declared him dikaios, just.

God’s purpose in this was to make Abraham the father of all the faithful, of all who believed (vs. 11f.). Descent from Abraham and inheritance of the blessing have nothing to do with the flesh; the descendants of Abraham are those who have such a faith that dikaiosune is reckoned to them, imputed to them, whether they have been circumcised or not. The promise was made to Abraham not through law, διὰ νόμον but διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως (vs. 13); this last phrase is puzzling, but I think it should be translated "through the faith that brings dikaiosune" since, throughout, Paul has been contrasting nomos and pistis as means toward dikaiosune.57

Paul begins to define this faith. It is a gift – this we must not forget – a gift of trust in God, who can make the dead alive and treat what does not exist (because dead) as though it existed (vs. 17). Abraham believed in the steady rule of God, in his reliability, in his existing

56[J. Jeremias has shown that Paul's repeated use of the verb logizesthai in this chapter is an argument by analogy along the lines of the gezera 'shawa, the second of the seven interpretative rules ascribed to Hillel (cf. H. Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, 1959, 94, and G.F. Moore, Judaism, 3:73 note 14). Jeremias gives the rule thus: "dass identische (oder gleichbedeutende) Wörter, die an zwei verschiedenen Schriftstellen vorkommen, sich gegenseitig erläutern," "Zur Gedankenführung in den paulinischen Briefen" in Studia Paulina, in honorem Johannis de Zwaan septuagenarii, 1953, 149.]

57[In his article "Philo Judaicus," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 3:798, (1962), G. says: "The heart of Philo's message is exactly expressed in Rom. 4:13: 'The promise to Abraham and his descendants, that they should inherit the world, did not come through the (written) law but through the righteousness of faith.'"]
beyond life and death. He trusted in God's promise of descendants even though he knew that both his and Sarah's bodies were dead in so far as their power of reproduction was concerned. He was as good as dead, being a centenarian, and there had long been νεκρωσις in Sarah's womb (vs. 19), so that the miracle worked by God would have to be no less than a "resurrection of the body". Nevertheless, Abraham was fully convinced that God was able to do what he had promised (vs. 21); that is why his faith was reckoned to him as dikaiosune (vs. 22).

Paul has drawn his parallels clearly. Abraham believed that God was to be trusted even to effect a resurrection; this was the faith of Abraham, and it "was reckoned to him for righteousness" (vs. 22). Christ believed in his own resurrection – the passage takes that for granted; this is the πίστις Ἰησοῦ, the faith of Jesus, which brings righteousness. "But (the words) 'it was reckoned to him' were written not for his sake only, but for our sakes too" – righteousness "was reckoned" to Abraham and "would be reckoned" to us, for "we" are described as "those who trust in the one who raised Jesus our lord from the dead" (vs. 24). And God raised him for 'our righteousness,' ἡ δικαιωσις ἡμῶν (vs. 25). To make his point clear, Paul brings our faith, the faith of Christ and the faith of Abraham together (cf. vs. 17 & 23ff.): each is a faith in the God who raises the dead, and the result of each is righteousness.

Clearly Paul has had a great experience and discovery; he has found a new life in the crucified Christ – and all this is strangely identified with a gift of pistis-dikaiosune, first given to Abraham, then made available to all men through Christ, the Seed of Promise, as we identify ourselves with Christ.

It is inconceivable that the raw experience of Christ should have suggested to Paul this extraordinary rationalization through Abraham, unless he had had considerable association of religious experience with Abraham already. It could not have come simply from the Genesis story of Abraham. How could he have come to think of a faith of Abraham which became the faith of Christ and so the faith of Paul? It would be too much to say that Paul has simply taken over that tradition of hellenistic Judaism, known from Philo, which saw the patriarchs as nomoi empsuchoi, possessing great power of salvation for other men. Indeed Paul seldom deals with patriarchs other than Abraham, but (so far as I can see) this is just because Christ, as revealed in the resurrection, was so supremely the nomos empsuchos, the incarnation of the higher law, that he had no need of the others and so passed them by. The presence of Christ has made a great change in Paul's theology, but clear traces of the hellenistic Judaism we know from Philo are everywhere to be seen.
Romans, Ch. 5

This chapter adds that dikaiosune ek pisteos, righteousness out of faith, brings us peace with God. It is through Christ that we have had access to this gift and hope to share in the glory of God (this last is my overtranslation of verse 2, "we have hope of the glory of God"). This is all a free gift; Christ died for us while we were sinners. We contribute nothing, our good deeds purchase us nothing (vs. 8). We atoned for our sins by his blood, indeed we are made righteous by it (vs. 9). This seems at first a contradiction of "righteousness ἐκ πίστεως," righteousness that comes out of faith, Paul's more usual expression; the fact is that the wrath of God had to be appeased before he could begin to give righteousness to us (vs. 9f.). We must be crucified with him before we can have the resurrection in which righteousness is bestowed (6:1-11, see below).

In verse 12ff. a whole new problem opens up. How could the righteousness of one be the salvation of the human race? This Paul argues quite after an old Jewish way. The world had always been united in Adam; all men are descended from Adam and all men have to die, because of Adam's sin. Paul leaves the Jewish tradition when he insists that "sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, so death spread to all men because all men sinned" (vs. 12).

The fact of the universality of sin was by no means Paul's invention, but the suggestion that the sin of Adam vitiated Adam's character in such a way that "original sin" came to all men as guilt, and that all men shared in Adam's sin — so far as I know, this is a contribution of Paul himself. I can find no parallels in Philo, or in any other writings; the

---

58 This basic framework is typically Jewish and will be found worked out in G.F. Moore, Judaism 1:460-96. [For a summary of the Pauline understanding of sin and the Jewish background of his thought here, see K. Stendahl, "Sünde und Schuld IV. Im NT," in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 3:6:485f. (1962).]

59 See Psychology 152ff. on the connection Paul makes between human guilt and the death of Christ.

60 The manner in which Paul goes beyond his "sources" to a "unique" idea of original has been approached in various ways. A. Dubarle, The Biblical Doctrine of Original Sin, 1964, concentrates on Rom. 5:12-21 in discussing "original sin in St. Paul," 142-200. He concludes: "Paul does not form any systematic theory on the origin of sin. According to the object that he has in mind at the time, he draws attention to this or that aspect of the reality. He is not unaware that there remains in every man a personal responsibility (e.g.)...Rom. 1-2...But there is also a collective downfall in mankind...(cf.) Rom. 5:12-19...There is an element of artificiality in these descriptions, which in each case show only one side of the reality," 166. "In conclusion, Paul teaches a handing on of sin from Adam to all men without explaining how it operates. He
Jewish rabbinical teachings definitely steer away from such a conclusion. The rabbis believed that man had indeed become a mortal creature through the fall of Adam, but they make no suggestion of a doctrine of original sin.\(^6\)

is content to take up the thought of Genesis, making explicit the idea that the heritage of the first man contains not only death but also sin," 195, cf. 172, where it is suggested that "perhaps Paul simply brought out and gave abstract formulation to what Genesis described in a concrete way." G. Bornkamm finds in Rom. 5:12-21 a mythological understanding of history containing both Jewish and gnostic elements; its "jüdische Elemente in der Lehre von Erbflich und Erbtod und im Schema der beiden Aonen erkennbar sind, während die Lehre vom ersten und zweiten Menschen offensichtlich der Gnosis entstammt," "Paulinische Anakoluthen im Römerbrief," in Das Ende des Gesetzesa, 1958, 89, cf. 80-90. However, Paul adds two elements of his own: 1) the fact that sin is an action for which the sinner is responsible, the function of the law being to make that responsibility clear and explicit (vs. 13f.); 2) the superiority of grace, whose relation to sin is expressed not by \(\omega\) but by \(\pi\lambda\lambda\iota\mu\alpha\lambda\omega\nu\) (vs. 15-7). The effect of these two "Pauline" additions is to break down the mythological view of history and to go beyond it to an understanding of sin and grace which can be traced neither to Jewish nor to gnostic sources. The anacoluthon in vs. 12-21 reflects the intrusion of this new Pauline element: the comparison between Adam and Christ which begins in vs.12 is broken off by vs. 13-7 and then continued in vs. 18ff.

\[61\] [Paul's Adam-allegory "was in all probability a pure tour de force whose consistency with his general thinking had little importance. Philo has scores of such allegories of the moment. But, to the Christian fathers, all that Paul wrote was literally and ponderously true, and so out of this allegory of the fall grew the momentous doctrine of original sin," Psychology, 61. Rom. 5:12-21 is a text often investigated, because of what it suggests about the origin of sin (see above note), or because of its use of the figure of Adam; for a recent, detailed examination of the latter, see E. Brandenburger, Adam und Christus, 1962. G. will remark that only a Jew could have used Adam at this point, but the question remains: What kind of Judaism is the source here, i.e. how heavily penetrated by other influences? Rabbinic elaboration of the Adam-story is summarized by J. Jervell, Imago Dei, 1960, 96ff., and by W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabinic Judaism\(^2\), 1955, 44ff.; according to Davies, Paul is familiar both with this speculation (which Davies holds is devoid of hellenistic influence and which results in a glorification of Adam) and with hellenistic Judaism's "distinction between a Celestial and an earthly Adam", 49, a conception which owes much to Greek thought and which occurs, e.g. in the hermetic literature and especially in Philo. But C.K. Barrett holds that Jewish tradition is more unified at this point; he uses Philonic passages to illustrate the tradition "simply because Philo is both more quotable and more intelligible than the Rabbis, and yet proceeds from the same convictions," From First Adam to Last, 1962, 7. On O. Cullmann's interpretation, this text contains the two major Christological conceptions of the early Church, Son of Man and Servant of God, which Paul unites "exactly as Jesus united them," The Christology of the New Testament, 1959, 171, cf. 170-74. This union solves 'the Adam-Son of Man problem which Judaism was actually unable to solve either by tracing man's sin to the fall of
The purpose of bringing Adam in at this point is stated in verse 14: Adam was a type of the "one who was to come," i.e. in Adam all men were united into a single unit, in Adam all men were represented; his deed accounted for the deeds of all subsequent men. So Christ, the "one who was to come," can gather to himself a new "body", a new community or group whose members are "one in him". Thus the sin of Adam brought condemnation and death for all, so the atoning death and resurrection of Christ brought dikaiosune and zoe (life) for all (vs. 17f.). Thus we are now in a new dispensation, a whole new order of existence; now we must live by the grace of Jesus Christ.

Romans, Ch. 6

"Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound? By no means!" (vs. 1). We have died to sin, we cannot live in it still (vs. 2). In baptism we partook of the death of Jesus Christ; "we were buried...with him by

the angels rather than to the fall of Adam (the Book of Enoch), or by denying the fall of Adam altogether (the Jewish Christians) or by seeking a middle way in presupposing two first men, (Philo)," 170. According to Bultmann, "Rom. 5:12ff. interprets Adam's fall quite in keeping with Gnosticism, as bringing (sin and) death upon mankind," Theology of the New Testament 1:174 (1951), cf. 164ff., 251ff.; for a brief summary of gnostic and other speculation about the Anthropos or (heavenly) Man, see S.E. Johnson, Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 4:416ff. (1962). It appears that, for this topic at least, it is quite difficult to be precise about what is Jewish, what gnostic, and what from "Greek thought" in general; and it is nearly impossible to separate the "Jewish" themes according to whether they come from "orthodox" or "Palestinian" or "Old Testament-Rabbinic" Judaism on the one hand, or from "hellenistic" or "Philonic" Judaism on the other.]

62 This new group appears in 1 Corinthians very importantly and in various other parts of Paul's writings. [Cf. the Pauline uses of soma Christou to mean the ekklesia, e.g. 1 Cor. 12, and the development of this idea in Colossians, where Christ the head (kephale) and the Church, the Body, are joined in mutual dependence, Col. 1:18a. For recent summary articles, with bibliography, see H. Schlier, "Corpus Christi" in Reallexikon für Antike and Christentum 3: 437-53 (1957) and E. Schweizer in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament 7: 1064ff. (1964). Explanations of the Body-image and of Paul's use of Adam (see note above) are usually closely related e.g. Bultmann refers both to gnosticism, op. cit. 177ff., 298ff., while Davies links both to rabbinic speculation about Adam, op. cit. 57. For a brief categorization of sources for the Body-image, see J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, 1952 (Studies in Biblical Theology 5), 55.]

63 [In an allegory of Noah's ark, Philo says, "because of one righteous and worthy man (Noah), many men were saved" (QG ii, 11, p. 83 of the Marcus translation in supplement volume 2 of the Loeb edition of Philo). C. discusses this allegory in Symbols 8:162ff. and notes that "reminiscences, or premonitions, of Pauline phraseology in Romans are striking" throughout it, note 323.]
baptism into death" (vs. 4), and the result is that we may therefore hope to live with him in the life of glory.

No one can deny that only a Jew could have written such an allegory of Adam (5:12ff.); no gentile would have thought in terms of Adam to explain the power and glory of Jesus Christ. But with 6:5 we begin to swing into the problem in its Greek sense: "For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we shall certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his. We know that our old anthropos was crucified with him, so that the sinful body might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin" (vs. 5f.). This passage opens the whole problem of the identification of sin with the body, something as recognizably hellenistic as it is foreign to essential Jewish thought. We are still in our "mortal bodies" even after baptism, and there is always the great danger that sin will run rampant as a result of the body's influence. Paul appears to be introducing a whole new criterion here, a criterion of the corruptability of the flesh, of the subversiveness of the flesh over against the spirit. We are indeed free from the Mosaic law of statutes, no longer does the hoped-for dikaiosune come from that law, but we can still yield our members to sin as instruments of wickedness (vs. 13f.) – and this is fatal. It is the old problem brought out in Plato's Allegory of the Cave (Rep. vii: 514ff.): those who have gone outside the cave and seen the glory, seen the truth, seen reality, must still return to the cave and sit on its inner bench again, seeing only the shadows and living the life of the shadows.

Romans, Ch. 7

We have gone through a real death, a death to the Mosaic law and that whole network of theology and ethics which goes with it. The many references to "death" and "mortal" in chapter six are summed up

---

64 [Behind this connection of death with the water of baptism, G. finds a widespread ancient (and modern) equation of water with death; thus the ark or ship becomes a symbol of salvation e.g. in Philo and in the ancient Church. See Symbols 8:157-65 for texts and bibliography; this Romans passage is mentioned in note 301.]

65 [This chapter has been the subject of countless studies for the light it throws on e.g. Paul's anthropology or on his view of the law. It has been seen by some as autobiography describing Paul's Christian (or pre-Christian) life, and by others as a typical description of a Christian (or non-Christian) under the law. Major studies of the chapter include W. Kümmer, Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus, 1929; R. Bultmann, "Romans 7 and the Anthropology of Paul," Existence and Faith, 1960, 147-57; and G. Bornkamm, "Sünde, Gesetz und Tod," Das Ende des Gesetzes², 1958, 51-69. For a recent treatment with which G. strongly disagreed, see K. Stendahl, "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West," HTR 56 (1963), 199-215.]
in 7:1-3 in an argument which turns the Mosaic code back upon itself: once a death has occurred, the obligations of a marriage contract are annulled. We owe nothing to the law any longer, we are free of it and must stop thinking about it: "My brothers, you have died to the law through the body of Christ, so that you may belong to another, to him who has been raised from the dead in order that we may bear fruit for God" (vs. 4). Paul speaks again in terms of the new community, the common existence of all the faithful in Christ.

What has the Mosaic law been doing to us? "What shall we say? That the law is sin? By no means! But had it not been for the law I should not have known sin; I should not have known what it is to covet, had the law not said 'You shall not covet'. Sin, finding opportunity in the commandment, wrought in me all kinds of covetousness" (vs. 7f.). Paul hinted earlier that the law came in to increase the trespass (5:20), but here he makes one of the most extraordinary analyses of the effects of commands upon the human psyche. Every wise parent knows that if children are to be obedient and comply with the wishes and criteria of their parents, they must be given as few actual laws as possible. To give a homely illustration: in the back farms of early New England, toys were almost non-existent, and a handful of dried beans could be a welcome plaything; but wise mothers knew that to give a two-year-old child some beans to play with, while telling him not to put them up his nose, was to invite him to do precisely that. The parent made the suggestion by making the law and prohibition. This is just Paul's point (vs. 7f.): the law, in setting up prohibitions, sets up desires. It is a common saying that the id knows no negatives, that every negative command is for the id a suggestion; we are coming pretty close to Freud's id in this matter of the members and their special life.66

"The very commandment which promised life proved to be death to me; for sin, finding opportunity in the commandment, deceived me and by it killed me" (vs. 10f.). The commandment is perfectly all right (the child should not put beans in his nose); it is simply that the giving of the command stimulated the desire to rebellion. There is no difficulty about the law itself; it is "holy, just and good" (vs. 12), but it brings death to me because (while the law is spiritual) I am carnal, fleshly, sold under sin.

66I have no intention of reducing Paul to Freud's categories, but both of them said the truth many times, and one who says the truth is apt to say what others have already said. [In Toward a Mature Faith, 1955, G. called this discussion of the ego in Romans 7 "one of the most amazing premonitions of later Freudianism," 119, cf. the pages following. For a further discussion of Romans 7-8 in this context, see Psychology, 58-63.]
Is the self the person Paul knows he ought to be, the person he feels he should be? Or is the self the person he actually is, the one who sins with or without the law's promptings? "The law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin. I do not understand my own actions. I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate. Now if I do what I do not want, I agree that the law is good, so then it is no longer I that do it, but sin that dwells in me, for I know that nothing good dwells within me, that is, in my flesh. I can will what is right, but I cannot do it, for I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do. Now if I do what I do not want, it is no longer I that do it but sin that dwells in me" (vs. 14-20). Paul is lost in the problem of finding his own ego, split as it is between idealism on the one hand and the flesh with its desires on the other. What is he, Paul? What am I, Erwin Goodenough? This is the great question we all have been asking ourselves all the centuries since, and we still have no answer.\(^6^7\)

The array of nomoi mentioned in the following verses (vs. 21ff.) will always be the despair of anyone who tries to understand "law" in Paul solely on the basis of the Old Testament and later Judaism. There is an overall law, i.e. that he has a divided ego: "I find it to be a nomos that when I want to do right, evil lies close at hand" (vs. 21). While Paul calls this a law, it is certainly no part of the code of Moses; it is a law of nature, and we are talking from a Greek point of view which has nothing to do with "codes". "I delight in the law of God in my inmost self" (vs. 22); this could be the law of Moses, but it is more probably the law of the spirit as in verse 25 below. Then "I see in my members another nomos at war with the nomos of my mind and making me captive to the nomos of sin which dwells in my members" (vs. 23);\(^6^8\) at least one law is introduced here which has not been mentioned in vs. 21f., an evil law which is in the members or in the flesh. Finally Paul closes this extraordinary passage by saying, "I myself serve the nomos of God with my mind, but with my flesh I serve the nomos of sin" (vs. 25), a condition of conflict which seems to be according to the first law mentioned, the "law that when I want to do right, evil lies close at hand" (vs. 21).

\(^{67}\) It is true that the Freudians can tell you what the ego is, but they do so in their own terms and do not satisfy the rest of us; ego is a very mixed-up affair. Philo encountered the same difficulty Paul expresses here, see Spec. iii, 1-6, a passage I have often quoted (e.g. in Introduction, 5f.).

\(^{68}\) [In Rom. 7:21-3 "Paul assumes a knowledge of the sort of treatment of law in the inner man preserved to us only by Philo, a knowledge which his readers most probably had, but whose absence has obscured his remarks ever since for later readers," Light, 394.]
I read with incredulity the arguments of modern commentators which identify this division of the law of the flesh and the law of the spirit with the yetzer ha ra and the yetzer tob in rabbinic thought. The sense of inner conflict between an impulse to do right and an impulse to do wrong is universal, and the Jews did express it in this latter form. They did not, in rabbinic circles, express it as the war between flesh and spirit; they did not urge us to get away from the flesh, to die to the flesh in order to escape this conflict. The Jew lived with the conflict, he lived with it nobly, and fought his battle out as best he could. But for Paul, this was not enough. He wanted to be free of the conflict altogether and so turned to the Greek identification of sin with the fleshly element in one's constitution.

In his great work Judaism, George Foote Moore has a masterful section on the yetzer ha ra and the yetzer tob, the evil impulse and the good impulse in man,\textsuperscript{69} he makes it clear that this conception is quite different from the hellenistic idea widely held in the time of Paul, i.e. that these two impulses were centered, one in a superior part of man like the soul, and the other in the body. Later, after the publication of Moore's work, I wrote an appendix to my By Light, Light in which I elaborately spelled out this Greek idea of the body as the corrupting agent.\textsuperscript{70} The theory originally goes back to the Orphics who saw the soul as a fallen particle from God imprisoned in the body (σώμα-σήμα,

\textsuperscript{69}[In pages 479-96 of volume 1 and the notes thereto in 3:146-51, especially note 209. The major study of yetzer cited by Moore is F.C. Porter, "The Yeqer Hara: a Study in the Jewish Doctrine of Sin," Biblical and Semitic Studies, 1902, 93-156. Porter concludes: "The result of our review is that in rabbinical usage the yeqer is hardly other than a name for man's evil tendencies or inclinations, the evil disposition which as a matter of experience exists in man, and which it is his moral task to subdue or control. It does not contain a metaphysical explanation of the fact, a theory as to its source or nature...All this, it is evident, has nothing to do with a dualistic contrast of body and soul...It must, moreover, be evident, apart from any positive explanation of Paul's doctrine, that the parallelism between his contrast of spirit and flesh and the rabbinical contrast between the good and evil impulses is remote and insignificant. Of course Paul in Rom. 7 is describing the same experience of struggle between two opposing forces in man upon which the Jewish doctrine rests, but his way of expressing the struggle as a war between the law (of sin) in his members, and the law of his mind (νοῦς), or between that which he possesses and does in his flesh and in his mind, is widely different from the Jewish conception, and seems to rest on a different view of the world and of man," 132-34. The rabbinic evidence is categorized and summarized in the excursus, "Der gute u. der böse Trieb" in H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch IV, 1, 466-83 (1928).]

\textsuperscript{70}["Law in the Subjective Realm," 370-443; much of the material in Light which is most relevant to the present article will be found in this appendix.]
the body is a tomb). The particle struggled to free itself from the body and those struggles were aided by the Orphic mysteries, the mystic exercises themselves. The idea continues in Plato's *Phaedrus* (246ff.) in the well-known myth of the Charioteer: here the evil horse is the desire for physical pleasure; it pulls the chariot downward, i.e. forces the rest of the soul into an incarnation in the body, where all is lost until man begins to discover the truth again and so orients himself that reason can become master. I will not here review all this material from my book, but I can state positively that the doctrine that sin is a product of the body, that the law of sin is a part of the body, is quite hellenistic. Perhaps its most striking ancient image is the story of the death of Socrates: Socrates' death means that finally he is to escape the body and come at last into the true realm of being; mortal things will trouble him no longer.

Plato and the other Greeks stop short of the iron-clad dualism of the Persians and later Manichees. These are not eternal principles so much as factual descriptions of man's problem. The various members *do* have their own law. It is the law of the sexual organ that it should seek gratification. It is the law of the stomach that it should want food, the law of the body in its weariness that it wants repose. All the parts of our bodies have a law that they should perform their functions, but they are utterly incorrelated, unorganized, and can (any of them) become obsessions, as when the craving for drink takes over a man's reason and he becomes a dipsomaniac. The law of the mind knows

71[In Light 395, note 160, G. suggests the following passages as examples of Philo's view of the sinfulness of the flesh: Gig., 12-15; *Immut.*, 142ff.; *Agr.*, 89; *Heres*, 239ff. In "Philo on Immortality," HTR 39 (1946), 96ff., he writes: 'Often as Philo refers to the 'soul' as the prisoner in the body in the Orphic-Platonic sense, it is strictly (the) higher mind which he means...It is which this correction that we should read all the passages of Philo where he more loosely speaks of the 'soul' as being confined to the prison, the tomb, of the body (L.A. i, 107ff.; cf. Q.G. iv, 152), or where, in terms which alone make Paul's seventh chapter of Romans intelligible, he speaks of the body as a corpse to which we are bound, and of ourselves as 'corpse-bearers': 'The body is wicked and a plotter against the soul, and is always a corpse and a dead thing. For you must understand that each of us does nothing but carry a corpse about, since the soul lifts up and bears without effort the body which is in itself a corpse' (L.A. iii, 68, cf. 72, 74). Philo has in this connection the same confusion of figures as Paul, for with both of them the body is simultaneously a corpse tied to the soul, and an active schemer for the soul's destruction." For a brief summary of this point from the New Testament point of view, with relevant texts, see H. Lietzmann's excursus, "Das Fleisch und die Sünde," An die Romer, (HNT) 1933, 75-77. Lietzmann finds Philo to be the ancient writer whose ideas on "flesh and sin" most closely resemble Paul's, and says that this connection of sin with flesh is, for Philo, "das Fundament der Ethik", 75.]
better, but the law of the mind is not strong enough to control our impulses, and we have all sinned, as we all know. The law of the mind is not a matter of precepts, but of the perception of the true religious values; somehow we must have access to a greater realization and acceptance of this higher law.

With their deep hellenistic coloring, Philo’s writings run along these same lines: here incarnation in the body is the great tragedy, one is trying always to free oneself from the body, e.g. by ascetic practices or by study. The Greek mysteries were presenting a savior in a Hercules or an Isis; savior-gods were springing up all over. This appealed to Philo and he turned the great patriarchs into incarnations of the higher law, they become his nomoi empsuchoi, through whom we could come into the higher law and live lives of value and virtue. He was convinced that the Mosaic law was but a shadow of the higher law; the business of man was indeed to live by the law, but we are not to stop with the precepts and the written law, but go on to the higher law. This higher law was made accessible to man in the patriarchs who had been law-abiding and pleasing to God before, and thus without, the Mosaic code.

In lengthy discussion in By Light, Light I called this the "mystery" of hellenistic Judaism. The term received more attention than the idea behind it, an idea which was very familiar to Paul himself, for he has left us a most masterful summary of the real meaning of this mystery: "I want you to know, brothers, that our fathers were all under the cloud and all passed through the sea and all were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and all ate the same 'pneumatic' food and all drank the same 'pneumatic' drink, for they drank from the 'pneumatic' rock which followed them, and the rock was Christ" (1 Cor. 10:1-4). I could not have put the essence of the mystery into more compact form myself. Those who had passed through the sea and the cloud were baptized into Moses; he was a personal revelation of this higher entity. Baptism into Moses exactly parallels Paul’s idea of baptism into Christ. "They all ate the same 'pneumatic' food and all drank the same 'pneumatic' drink" – Philo says this very often about the manna in the wilderness and the water which issued from the

---

72[For a description of human nature in these same terms, but in a discussion of Philonic ethics, see Introduction, 116f. For an earlier discussion of Paul’s "law of the members," see Light, 391ff.]

73[This is the theme of the first nine chapters of Light; it is summarized also in Introduction, 138-58.]

74["I do not see why recent translators make of the 'pneumatic' rock and food something 'supernatural'. That conception is quite foreign to the ancient mind," Symbols 12.171 note 44. Both RSV and NEB have "supernatural".]
great rock (Ex. ch. 16-7): the great rock with its stream of water was the Logos which came to relieve them. Paul's change is a simple one: "the rock was Christ."

Behind these verses in 1 Corinthians lies a hellenistic Jewish tradition which Paul has Christianized only by making the rock and its flow not Sophia or the Logos, but Christ. Paul certainly did not invent the idea that the passage of the Red Sea was a baptism into Moses. Here is indeed a survival from his earlier thoughtways. The cloud, the rock and the superhuman Moses are all depicted in the Dura Europos synagogue, in a fresco which might well be used among Christians to illustrate and explain Paul's text. Baptism "into" Christ and existence "in" him would be instantly understandable to these familiar with this hellenistic Jewish "Moses" tradition.

Romans, Ch. 8

The same theme continues: "There is now no condemnation for these who are in Christ Jesus, for the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set you free from the law of sin and death" (vs. 1f.). As they were baptized into Moses, we are now in Christ Jesus; the effect is very similar: we can rise from the lower law to the higher law which Christ embodies as Moses did. Christ has done away with the law of the flesh (vs. 3); the result is that we can fulfill the just requirement of the law by walking not according to the flesh but according to the spirit (vs. 4f.). This "just requirement" is surely not the Mosaic law; Paul has not gone through all of his experiences (his death with Christ in baptism, his emerging as a new creature in Christ) just so that he can more faithfully keep the Jewish law. Such an understanding he would have

---

75[For a further discussion of "spiritual food and drink" see Symbols 6:198-216, where G. summarizes the Philonic material.]
76[This paragraph is based on Symbols 10:135. Chapter 16 of Symbols 10 (105-39) is G.'s thorough discussion of the Moses-Exodus-Red Sea typology as it applies to the Dura fresco mentioned here; he entitles it "Moses Leads the Migration from Egypt" and prints it as color-plate XIV in Symbols 11. For the relevant New Testament and early Christian material, with bibliography, see Symbols 10:134ff.]
77[Cf. 2 Cor. 3:6-18, which describes the giving of the spirit-law which is the Lord. For an ingenious analysis of the source of this text, see Georgi's excursus, op. cit. 274-82.]
78[In Psychology, 152ff., G. discusses some uses of "in Christ" imagery in the later Church.]
79[G. points out that Paul's language here (e.g. living "according to the spirit" and "the mind of the spirit," 8:6) comes close to Philonic terminology, since "Philo often prefers to use the word Spirit when he speaks of the Logos in relation to man, how it comes in at inspiration, and abides in him as the higher mind," Introduction, 117 with note 5.]
repudiated altogether. The Jewish law is something past and gone; instead there is a higher law which we obtain through Christ as did those Jews who were baptized into Moses before Sinai had issued a single commandment.

We are no longer in the flesh, but in the spirit, if the spirit of God really dwells in us – so says verse 9 in the peculiar, allusive speech of the mystic; we are in the spirit if the spirit is in us. One cannot press these mystic figures too closely; their purpose is to express union, without a concern for firm, logical terminology. The spirit is the spirit of Christ; if we lack this in us, we do not belong to him.°

The major part of this chapter is a peculiarly Pauline mixture of mysticism, eschatology and the doctrine of election, themes which appear again in chapters 9-11; Paul is working at the difficult task of describing Christian existence until the Parousia. Law-observance in the sense of pre-Christian legalism is an impossible solution, yet we are not to live according to the flesh (vs. 12); we must set our minds upon the spirit. The spirit dwells within us (vs. 11, 13ff.) but our bodies are still mortal bodies (vs. 11); the final glorification (vs. 17) and the final gift of life (vs. 11) are still ahead of us, the whole creation sharing our "in-between" state (vs. 19-22).

We have the gift now only partially, only the first-fruits° of the spring (vs. 23); in our present struggle for obedience to the higher law, the law of the spirit, we will frequently fail, but the spirit helps us in our weakness, interceding for the saints according to the will of God (vs. 26).°

80[For an exhaustive study of the conception of "indwelling deity" in the ancient word, see J. Haussleiter, "Deus internus," Realexikon für Antike und Christentum 3:794-842 (1957), especially the sections on Philo and Paul, 815-20.]
81[In Symbols 5:86 G. suggests that this term "seems in itself to indicate Christ" at work within us. He further points out that Paul sometimes uses ἀπαρχὴ of Christ, and at other times, of certain Christians, e.g. the first converts in Asia (Rom. 16:5) and Achaia (1 Cor. 16:15). This "double implication" of the term occurs already in Philo, and, presumably, in the tradition upon which he draws. According to Philo "the Jews...had been set aside as the first fruits of the human race to the Creator and Father, a prerogative they attained...through the righteousness and virtues of the Patriarchs, 'which endure like immortal plants bearing an everblooming fruit that for their descendants is saving and profitable in every way' (Spec. iv, 180f.)....Just as the Christians become first fruits through the merits of Christ, the Jews had become first fruits through the merits of the Patriarchs. Christ as the saving first fruits has his prototype in Philo's Jewish saviors, the Patriarchs who are also first fruits," Symbols 5:89. For G.'s discussion of the other instances of ἀπαρχὴ in the New Testament, see Symbols 5:84-91 and 12:104f.]
82[The distinctly hellenistic character of vs. 29 is usually obscured by translating it: "Those whom he fore-knew, he also predestined to be conformed to the
We have entered a new legal regime, a new order, a new way of life. It is not yet perfect; *dikaiosune* in its fullest form is an attribute of God himself, and we shall not come into it in full perfection until we are rid of our bodies, or until our bodies have been transformed into spiritual entities. But through Christ we come into an entirely different order: in their blundering the gentiles have missed this and gone over to idols; the Jews thought they could win it by trying to obey with ever-increasing nicety the commandments of the Mosaic code. Neither of these will work. We have to die to our whole selves, die to our material nature, die to the flesh and come to live in the law of the spirit which is in Christ Jesus (vs. 2); only in this way do we approach the final *dikaiosune*.

*Romans, Ch. 9-11*

In these chapters Paul turns to the heart-breaking problem of Israel's rejection of Christ. He finds his consolation in the whole history of Israel, for all the people who are fleshly descendants of Abraham by no means belong to Israel (9:6-8). Over and over again the people have rejected God, while whoring after other gods; God has had to reject them, but he has always kept a remnant. He is keeping a remnant now. There seems to be no way to distinguish between those who obey and follow, and so become a part of the remnant, and those who do not. Even in a family so exalted as that of Isaac, Jacob is accepted and Esau rejected (9:9-13). Why? That is a question we must not ask. Salvation is to come as an act of God, an act of mercy, and not by men's efforts. But why should some have this grace and others lack it? Again, this question we must not ask. Who are we to talk back to God.
God does as he pleases with his own; he is a potter who may make vessels of honor and vessels of dishonor at his will. It is not for the clay to question the potter (9:20-23). The gift of grace and with it the gift of faith and with that the gift of righteousness – all these God has finally bestowed upon Jews and gentiles alike (9:24ff.).

Philo's idea of Israel is quite similar. The true Israelites are those who live not by the laws of the commands, but by the Logos and the powers in the higher law. But unlike Paul he does not say that those who are doing the best they can (the ordinary Jews with the Mosaic code) are rejected people. He would have been utterly impatient with Paul's taking this position. For Philo there was the true Israel, and there was the mass of Israelites – what could you expect? The mass of people is not spiritually minded, not capable of the higher experiences, the higher ideas; consequently, they are mercifully given the law of Moses by which they live. Philo saw no cleavage or warfare between these two kinds of Jews. He himself wanted to live the life of the higher, unwritten law of the Logos and the powers, but he was a close fellow-worker with the Jews and would have nothing to do with those who rejected observing the law of Moses. But Christ had made the higher law so vivid, so accessible, so real for Paul that he took the step which Philo would never have taken; he rejected those who tried by their own efforts to be saved. For Paul, salvation must be a matter of abandoning our effort and being given the grace, the gift of faith and of dikaiosune (10:3). The Jews who were ignorant of the righteousness that comes from God as his gift sought to establish their own righteousness; they attempted to make themselves righteous by their own effort, and this was their fatal mistake. They could not and did not submit to God's true righteousness, the righteousness by gift.

It is not difficult to receive this gift; "the word is near us, on our lips and our hearts, that is, the word of faith which we preach" (10:8). We must cease our own efforts and pray to God for the gift, "for everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved" (10:13). For this reason we spread the gospel as rapidly as possible by preaching, because no one can confess and believe what he has not heard (10:14ff.).

We will not attempt to reconcile chapter 9 with chapter 10. Paul believes in preaching, in telling people, and yet everything is the work of God, foreordained and predestined. Fortunately, for our purpose,
the analysis of Paul's thought for hellenistic elements, the settlement of this controversy is not required. I suspect that Paul was a predestinarian very like most predestinarians; in some moods he submitted to God and felt that God did everything, in other moods human effort (even if only the effort of giving up and praying for God's help) seemed of some avail and God did listen. If predestinarians were not of this sort, the Calvinist churches would not have gone on with their preaching. They were carrying the gospel to the people but (by strict logic) if God did this directly for the elect, preaching and churches were quite supernumerary. The problem seems to me not specifically Jewish or specifically Greek; it is rather a problem which has arisen out of Paul's own experience of Christ. He received the great gift as a gift, with a sense that his effort was absolutely nil, that only when his efforts ceased was the gift bestowed. But did his own election mean that God turned a deaf ear when others piously asked for salvation and pistis? Paul could not say that, and the resulting contradiction is one within his Christian thinking. I see nothing comparable in Philo or in rabbinic texts.

Chapter 11 continues this theme: God has by no means rejected the whole of his people (11:1). Paul himself is proof of that, he himself is a Jew; all Jews have not been rejected. God has hardened the hearts of most Israelites however, so that the gospel will be spread among the gentiles, a thing which would have been most difficult had the Jews all eagerly accepted it and made it a part of their Judaism. Jews have been broken off, branch by branch, from the great olive tree, and gentiles grafted in their places (11:17ff.) But someday the broken-off branches will be taken back and put into the great, true olive tree. If you who have been grafted in begin to feel superior for that fact, you too will be torn off (11:21). The only superiority is in God himself; it is fatal for you to have any pride or sense of accomplishment in yourself.

Romans: the Final Section

Paul's great exposition of the essentials of the Christian faith has come to an end. Chapter twelve brings us into the letter's final section, a

contradiction, or in any case did not try to express its belief in a form which was free of contradiction," op. cit. (note 51 above) 111.]
[The doctrine of predestination "was a natural and logical conclusion from the experience that Paul himself had... but logical conclusions are as dangerous in religion as they are in most of life," Toward a Mature Faith, 1955, 147.]
combination of instruction and exhortation directed to specific issues and problems within a Christian's everyday life.88

Particular ethical statements in the Pauline letters are often quite like those of Jesus, e.g. in the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus too wanted men to live with neighborly love, as did the rabbis; he too was ready to disregard Mosaic proscriptions for the principles that lay behind them, thus, e.g. he goes beyond "Thou shalt not kill" to forbid even anger and words of derision (Mt. 5:21f.). There is to be no adultery, even in a look (Mt. 5:27f.); no resistance, even under attack (5:38ff.).89 But Jesus was a Palestinian in that he came to the higher meaning by generalizing the laws of the code themselves; Paul, on the other hand, worked to establish a morality that rises above specific precepts altogether, one that is based instead on the higher perception of right and wrong, on the higher immaterial law.

This difference between the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount and that of Paul is the result of the fact that Paul thinks in hellenistic terms; this becomes clear when we compare him with Philo.90 In his de Specialibus Legibus Philo approaches the specific laws of the Mosaic code much as Jesus does, but his de Virtute has interesting similarities to these last chapters of Romans. The de Virtute is a summary of the second major section of Philo's writings, the very long "Exposition of the Law,"91 which details God's giving of the law in the Old Testament, beginning with Creation. Philo's object here is to clarify God's law, the law which could be called the law of nature, since for theists nature is God. In the creation the law of nature92 is manifest; that is nothing less than the first great revelation of God's law. The second comes in the

---

88 I include in this section chapters 12-15, since chapter 16 is generally recognized as a piece from another letter altogether. [In the article summarized above, note 31, T.W. Manson rather calls chapter 16 a "covering note" sent to Rome with the summary of Pauline theology now called Romans 1-15. G. probably would not have quarreled with Manson on this point.]
89 [For a detailed comparison of Jesus' view of the commands of the Torah with the views of later Judaism, primarily Qumran, see H. Braun, Spätjüdisch-Häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus, 1-2, 1957.]
90 [There are several useful comparisons between Pauline and Philonic ethics in Introduction, 112-33. On Philo's ethics, see also E. Bréhier, Les Idées philosophiques et religieuses des Philon d'Alexandrie, 1950, 250-310; G. once mentioned that it was the first edition of this book which caused him to begin his study of Philo.]
91 [G. characterizes the different groups of Philonic writings and lists those treatises which make up this "Exposition" in his article "Philo Judeus" in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible 3:796f. (1962). His book Jewish Courts in Egypt, 1929, is an exhaustive treatment of de specialibus Legibus.]
92 [See note 46 above.]
giving of the law to the nomoi empsuchoi,\textsuperscript{93} and then (since these were not enough) the giving of the law in the Ten Commandments, and finally the elaborate regulations of the Torah which Philo explicates in the four books of the de Specialibus Legibus.\textsuperscript{94} Paul has done nothing comparably elaborate; the whole of Romans is smaller than the little de Virtute. Philo, however, never lost his reverence for the Mosaic code in its literal form, as commandments; consequently he is driven to a long exposition of these regulations.

But once the specifics of the law have been explained, Philo leaves detailed laws behind altogether; he is writing for gentiles, for Romans who ave their own ideas of morality and so, in the de Virtute, he summarizes the special laws under the general topics Courage, Humanity, Repentance and Nobility.

Here the commands are elevated into reminders of the universal laws. In his discussion of the commands to kindness, he transforms specific laws into a general principle. Many laws are quoted to show how kindness and consideration are required within the tribe; kindness is due also to proselytes and even to animals and plants. But then Philo summarizes: "With such instructions he tamed and softened the minds of the citizens of this commonwealth, and set them out of the reach of pride and arrogance, evil qualities grievous and noxious in the highest degree" (Virt. 161) — that is, all these many laws of Moses were actually established to teach the dangers of the great Greek sin hubris; they are to keep us humble and make us realize our own limits.\textsuperscript{95} We must never lose the remembrance of God; that is the one thing which will help us keep from falling into sin and pride, "for as when the sun has risen, the darkness disappears and all things are filled with light, so when God the spiritual sun rises and shines upon the soul the gloomy night of passions and vices is scattered and virtue reveals the peerless brightness of her form, and all is purity and loveliness" (Virt. 164). As Philo reminds us frequently in this book, this higher estate of the soul is called dikaiosune, righteousness. It alone will keep us as we should be, and it comes to us as we turn to God and let the brilliant sun of his person rise and shine upon the soul. When this happens, "the gloomy night of passions and vices scatters."

\textsuperscript{93}[See page 41ff. above.]
\textsuperscript{94}[See note 44 above on the four levels of "law" in Philo.]
\textsuperscript{95}[For a detailed examination of the hellenistic conceptions present in Philo’s approach to the Torah, see I. Heinemann, Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung: kulturvergleichende Untersuchungen zu Philons Darstellung der jüdischen Gesetze, 1932. G. evaluates this book in Introduction, 11-13.]
Paul's view is recognizably similar; for him the only way to avoid the sins of the flesh is to let the light of God so shine into us that the body with its desires and passions fades out of existence. This is our only hope. This is the way we will come into virtue, virtue pure, virtue unified, the virtue of God.  

When Romans 12-15 is compared to the Philonic writing in this way, it becomes clear that Paul's approach to the problems of ethics is as much like the de Virtute as his teaching (at its best in Romans) is unlike that of Jesus. Indeed the evidence from Philo and Paul strongly suggests that there was a general tendency (among gentiles as well as among hellenized Jews) to admire the Jewish law for its reflection of general principles of morality, both men often appear to me to be capitalizing on such a situation.

While Paul and Philo thus approach the problems of ethics in the same way, Paul's great difference is that he has been so engrossed,

96 [Paul and Philo might well describe this result in the same terms; compare the "catalog of virtues and vices" in Virt. 182 with those in Paul [e.g. in Rom. 1:29-31, 13:13. See O.J.F. Seitz, "Lists, Ethical" in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible 3:137-39 (1962) and add to the bibliography there, S. Wibbing, Die Tungend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament, 1959).]

97 [On the use of non-Christian elements in early Christian pameesis and the place of Romans 12 in early Christian ethics, see E. Käsemann, "Gottesdienst im Alltag der Welt," Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen II: 198-204 (1964) and the literature cited there.]

98 [Jewish apologists in the Diaspora were compelled to (and often eager to) relate and recommend their law to the gentiles around them. G. here discusses Philo's approach; other frequently mentioned examples are Ep. Aristeas 128-71 and Josephus, c. Apionem 2:151-235, cf. E. Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ2, 2:311-27 (1891). D. Georgi argues "dass das Medium der jüdischen Propaganda vor allem der Synagogengottesdienst und die hier dargebotene Gesetzesauslegung war," op. cit. 87, cf. 83ff. and his discussion of Juvenal and Horace, 105ff. The evidence indicates two things: 1) Many Jews realized that their law had to be taken with them into the gentile world; it was important to make Judaism attractive and available to gentiles, but if this were done by rejecting the Torah, the result could no longer be called Judaism. 2) As G. here suggests, the law-ordered life of an observant Jew was often highly attractive to his gentile neighbors. For both of these reasons, the law was a major element (perhaps the chief one) in the contacts between gentile and "apologetic" Jew, with both parties interested in stressing its general principles and universal scope rather than its Jewish particularity.]

99 [The similarity which G. stresses here extends to the literary forms used by Philo and Paul; both employ a common form of hellenistic moral exhortation, the diatribe, which has been characterized as follows: "Eine philosophische Unterweisung volkstümlichen Charakters mit vorwiegend ethischem Inhalt...In ihrer Anlage ist die D(diatribe) ein fingierter Dialog mit einem anonymen Gesprächspartner...(Sie) bedient sich der einfachsten u(nd) ausdrucksvollsten
encompassed, engulfed by the vision of Christ that he no longer needs to
defend the specific commands; indeed he rises above them altogether
and looks toward a state where the higher mind, the higher vision,
the higher self illuminated by God, is governing us, so that the body
has become dead.

Paul's vision of Christ leads to many differences between his
statements and those of Philo, but it is clear that both of them are
trying to lead man into a life in which the higher part, the part
engulfed by God, takes over and the fleshly impulses are no longer in
control.100

Kunstmittel der klassischen Rhetorik...Die Verfasser von D. lieben es, ein
bestimmtes Repertorium von Themen aus der philosophischen
Elementarethik abzuhandeln," H.I. Marrou, "Diatrise" in Realelexikon für
Antike und Christentum 3:998 (1957). Marrou, 999f., finds the following
eamples of particular elements of the diatribe style in Romans: ethical
exhortation, chaps. 12-15; imaginary dialogue or apostrophe, 2:1, 9:19;
interjected protests, 9:19, 11:19; question and answer, 6:1-19; personification
of abstractions, 10:6-8; parataxis, 2:21f., 13:7; parallelism, 12:4-15; catalogue of vices,
1:29(-31); imperatives, 12:14f. On the diatribe in Philo, see P. Wendland, "Philo
und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe," in Béträge zur Geschichte der
griechischen Philosophie und Religion, 1895, 1-75; Wendland indicates (cf. 66)
that Philo's attacks on gluttony, sexual license and other contemporary evils
owe much to the Diatribe, his de Vita Contemplativa being one of the clearest
eamples of this influence. H. Thyen relies heavily on Philonic examples to
demonstrate the similarities between hellenistic-jewish preaching and the
Diatribe, Der Stil der jüdisch-hellenistischen Homilie, 1955. On Paul, see R.
Bultmann, Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe,
1910; Bultmann argues that the Diatribe has a limited but definite
fluence on Paul, cf. his conclusions, 107-09.]

100[Both for Philo and for Paul "the only possible solution is that the higher
mind conquer the lower members...The permanent adjustment is not, during
this life at least, disembodied existence, but complete regeneration, the goal
which Paul called 'the redemption of the body' but which he more commonly,
like Philo, called by the legal-ethical terms, dikaiosune or justice. This term
with both men still has the meaning which Plato gave it in the Republic:
ämely, a perfect regimentation of the state, civic or subjective, by which the
higher faculties are in command, and the lower members perform their
functions fully and fully, but keep each to its own business according to the
laws fixed by the proper governor...Nothing distinguishes both thinkers more
sharply from Stoic ethics than the refusal to build up the inner ethical harmony
from within...Philo like Paul despaired of achieving the end without a new union
with the Universal Spirit: the fragment or extension (of that Spirit) within him
was helpless against the forces of his lower nature unless it was freshly united
and augmented in the divine Spirit or Logos as a whole," Introduction, 118. "On
no point is the thinking of the two so similar as on the ideal adjustment of the
soul and body for one who found the higher reality," 116.]