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Abstract

This dissertation describes a historical-biographical method designed to address two problems found in Pauline biographies and interpretations: a missing theory of subjectivity, and a problematic reliance on the critical edition of the New Testament for identification of the ‘Pauline’ Corpus from which to collect historical-biographical evidence of the life and writings of the historical Paul.

Sartre’s Search for a Method provides a methodological framework (using basic historical methods) that challenges sociological and social-scientific portrayals of human actors completely controlled by social structures, and theological interpretations portraying human actors ‘floating above’ their social world. His Marxist-Existentialist historical anthropology instead portrays human actors conditioned by scarcity arising from ‘the given’ social situation (‘the life’), but also acting to ‘go beyond’ that conditioning towards a better ‘envisioned future.’ This dialectical movement of conditioned and free human action is named ‘the project’ that is objectified in ‘the work’
(products of human action). To understand the work, one must understand the project in relationship to the life.

After describing the methodological weaknesses arising from our dependence on the critical edition of the New Testament and the scholar-constructed Pauline Corpus for historical evidence, I constructed two empirical records based solely on ancient manuscript evidence: Remembered Paul: The Work (the set of agreed-upon letters as represented in NT papyri and uncials); and Remembered Paul: Biographical Evidence (the biographical statements also gleaned from primary sources). Using Sartre’s progressive-regressive method, I categorized these statements into three types: Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon, Contemporaries, and Historians. They were then elaborated by means of social-historical research, temporalized in Jewish-Greco-Roman history, and particularized by focusing on Maccabean zeal and Israelite slavery.

The concluding illustrative biographical reading of Galatians relies on the Sartrean project as the interpretive key. Focus on the particular biographical facts named in Gal. 1:13-14 (Ioudaimos, zēlōtēs) and Gal. 6:17 (slavery, stigmata) leads to a provisionary interpretation that brings together the life and the work of Remembered Paul and describes him listing proofs designed to correct a ‘misunderstanding’ concerning his past and present proclamation about circumcision.
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Preface

How the life of the ancient Paulus can or cannot be imagined depends not only on historical evidence but also on the methodological framework we employ to collect and interpret that data. Therefore, to both construct a Pauline biography and biographically interpret Pauline texts, one needs a clearly defined database from which to draw historical evidence, and a theoretical framework in which to interpret that data.

When I first began, I attempted to define and describe the contours of the ‘Pauline Corpus’ within the larger New Testament from which I could glean biographical evidence in order to construct a biography of Paul. I waded through the scholarship concerning the authenticity or inauthenticity of various letters, the use of Acts for writing a biography, the identification of interpolations, the various chronologies of texts, and the partitioning of the Corinthian correspondence. I intended to create a ‘secure base’ from which to ascertain what, indeed, Paul really had said about himself.

When I searched the biographical literature for assistance, I discovered that biographies rarely contained a methodology section, and if they did, they did not provide up front a reasoned explanation for the texts they had included in their ‘database’ or their use of Acts. Even when Acts was acknowledged as a secondary source in contrast to the ‘authentic letters,’ Paul the Roman citizen, citizen of Tarsus, and highly educated student of Gamaliel, still managed to slip into the ‘authentic’ letter-based biography.
As I pored over the arguments concerning the authenticity of Colossians and Ephesians, and the inauthenticity of Hebrews, and the circular reasoning on which the discussion was based, I started to be curious about the extant manuscripts. The first extant collection of Pauline letters (\(p^{46}\)) totals nine letters and includes Hebrews, but not 2 Thessalonians, 1-2 Timothy, Titus or Philemon. The Pauline Corpus of the critical edition contains fourteen letters. In addition, upon examination, I noticed that the critical edition of the New Testament places the letters of the Pauline Corpus in an order unlike any extant New Testament manuscript. Given that manuscripts are edited by scribes, and secretaries were involved in their production, I also noticed that there was little discussion concerning the impact of these composition and editorial activities on our confidence in authentic letters as accounts of ‘what Paul actually said.’ Even if I could resolve all the issues of historical chronology, authenticity, and secondary interpolations in the New Testament Pauline Corpus, how could I argue the superiority of that Pauline Corpus (based primarily on later manuscripts) of the critical edition or the scholar-constructed Pauline Corpus (authentic, deuter-Pauline, pastoral epistles and elimination of Hebrews) over the extant manuscript evidence of the late second, third, and first half of the fourth century. The ‘secure base’ that could provide the ‘objective’ database of biographical facts was not in sight.

The second problem that I discovered was the absence of a theoretical framework through which to theorize Paul’s human subjectivity. Like Murphy-O’Connor, I lamented a Paul
who was “essentially a disembodied mind from which pours theological ideas.”\(^1\) However, as I searched the biographical literature, I realized that scholars appeared to ‘know’ Paul (his intentions, for instance), but they did not outline a theoretical framework from which to explain that knowing. Their interpretations seemed to be based only on an un-theorized ‘common sense’ understanding of human motivation and existence that was named as ‘history’. To avoid simply exchanging their common sense with mine, I needed a theory of subjectivity, a philosophy of human existence.

My inability to find models from within the present body of literature to address each of these methodological questions have given birth to this dissertation. My discovery of Sartre’s *Search for a Method*, and its Marxist-Existentialist philosophy, provided a theoretical framework that would allow me to write the life of the Remembered Paul, both to ground him firmly in his ancient social world, and to give him the ‘breath of life’ that would make him more than just a ‘parchment saint’ or simply the passive product of social forces. Furthermore, it also provided a *progressive-regressive* method which I could use (and adapt), with the help of historical sociological methods, to rely on primary rather than secondary data for the identification of a set of agreed-upon letters (not authentic letters), and to sort biographical evidence into appropriate categories: Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon, Contemporaries and Historians.

---

A methodological study has its limitations. For instance, given that it involves the critique of existing paradigms, the construction of a new methodological framework, and the application of that method to interpretation, it is not possible, within the scope of a dissertation, to complete each task adequately. Furthermore, because of its multi-disciplinary nature (papyrology, text criticism, Sartre’s Marxist-Existentialist philosophy, Pauline Studies, and Historical Sociology), I cannot claim to be an expert in all of these fields. Therefore, though I have provided a strong methodological critique and alternative framework for Pauline biography and interpretation, *Paul-Writing History: In Search of a Sartrean Biographical Method*” presents neither a biography of Paul nor a fully argued biographical interpretation of Galatians.

Chapter One contains a description of two methodological problems that affect the construction of Pauline biographies and the interpretation of Pauline texts. I have named these problems: “Missing Theory of Subjectivity” and “A Composite Text: Problems Collecting Historical Data,” and have argued that our missing, only implicit and mechanistic frameworks for explaining Paul have arisen from our reliance on sociological theories beset with problems inherent in positivism and structuralism. Furthermore, I will argue that the weaknesses of data collection methods are caused primarily by our reliance on the critical edition of the New Testament, a secondary source of historical evidence, and constructed according to the goal of text criticism: to assemble the ‘more original text’ rather than present the range of manuscript evidence. I will demonstrate how use of the
critical edition, or our scholar-constructed edition of the Pauline Corpus negatively impacts on our identification of ‘Pauline letters’ and biographical facts.

Chapter Two outlines the rationale for using Sartre’s *Search for a Method* as a solution to these methodological problems. The impetus for Sartre’s book was his critique of positivism’s influence on French Marxism in the 1960’s, and his concern that it was creating accounts of human lives without human actors. Because his Marxist-Existentialist philosophy is dense and difficult to comprehend, and because his thought has not generally been discussed or considered useful to scholars since the advent of structuralism, or post-structuralism, and postmodernism, I have described his philosophical concepts (those pertaining to this study) in some detail.

Chapter Three is a further discussion of Sartre’s *Search for a Method*. In this chapter, I have described the concepts and methods that Sartre used to ‘operationalize’ his philosophy in order to create biographies of historical personages. Addressing the problems created by use of the critical text and the scholar-constructed text, I have described a new method to identify agreed-upon letters (in place of ‘authentic’ letters) and adapted Sartre’s method for collecting biographical evidence (Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon, Contemporary, Historian) to this study of the ancient Remembered Paul. I then listed the resulting contents (the list of extant texts/manuscripts) of the two databases: *Remembered Paul: The Work* and *Remembered Paul: Biographical Evidence*.

Chapter Four provides a visual presentation of the historical evidence collected from the extant manuscripts included in the databases. Biographical evidence (“I”, ‘we’, ‘us’, ‘he’
or ‘they’ statements) have been presented according to the method outlined in Chapter Three. For each statement of biographical evidence that is eligible for inclusion as a ‘fact’, I have provided a summary fact statement; and for some, I have also added philological information. The information provided is not intended as an exhaustive philological analysis. It is provided to illustrate this step of the methodology. The collected evidence is also summarized in Appendix A.

Chapter Five takes the biographical facts, as derived from the manuscript evidence, and then ‘places’ them within the ancient social context of the first century Mediterranean world. This is accomplished by elaborating on the biographical facts by means of social-historical research concerning the first century Jewish-Greco-Roman social world, for example, capital punishment, Israelite slavery, religious and ethnic groupings, and attitudes toward diseased and injured bodies. Sartre creates a synthetic ensemble of biographical facts, rather than treating one biographical element to the exclusion of others. Similarly, I constructed two biographical ensembles: “Socially Degraded and Vulnerable Man” and “Zealous Israelite”.

Given that I intended to apply the method to a reading of Galatians, I particularized these in line with biographical facts that are unique to that letter: slavery +stigmata (Gal. 6:17) and former Ioudaismos-Israelite zealot (based on Gal. 1:13-14). In line with the practices of Historical Sociology, I then attempted to place “Israelite zealot/Israelite slave” within the flow of Israelite history, beginning with the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 587/86 BCE, and with a particular focus on Maccabean-type zeal and Israelite slavery since
approximately 200 BCE. Again, the primary purpose of this chapter is to illustrate the method. Therefore, the social-historical knowledge provided is incomplete, and the constructed flow of history described is basic.

Chapter Six is a description of the application of this biographical method to a biographical interpretation of the Letter to the Galatians. Although I have not engaged with most of the exegetical issues that are central to interpretation of this text, I have outlined the steps and results of applying the method. The first step is an examination of the apostleship issues that span the entire collection of RP: The Work (material support, competition between messengers, “the collection,” and envisioned future). The second step is to identify the particular themes of Galatians (e.g. slavery, and nomos or ‘works of law’). The third step is to identify the biographical facts that are predominant in Galatians (Ioudaismos/zēlōtēs Gal. 1:13-14, and stigmata Gal. 6:17) and connect these to the overarching themes of apostleship so that Galatians (the work) is read as one particular instance of the project of Remembered Paul moving away, by means of apostleship, from the scarcity of his starting social situation towards his envisioned future. The social-historical-temporal elaboration presented in Chapter Five highlight the constraints and possibilities for action inherent in his social situation which helps interpret the project. In the resulting interpretation, RP the zealous Israelite, in line with advancement in Ioudaismos, proclaimed the need for circumcision and persecuted the assembly. RP believes that the Galatians have heard of this past and mistakenly believe that it is indicative of his present teaching about circumcision. The structure of my interpretation is as follows: The Problem (the Galatians
are turning to another gospel); the Misunderstanding (they think RP is still proclaiming the need for circumcision); and The Proofs (the arguments designed to prove to the Galatians that RP is no longer proclaiming the need for circumcision).
CHAPTER ONE

Naming the Problems

Many biographical portraits of Paul the apostle have been produced over the last 200 years. Although their form and content have meandered through the changing fashions of New Testament scholarship, W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson’s 19th century desire (1866) to construct “a living picture of St. Paul himself and of the circumstances by which he was surrounded”\(^2\) has been a constant pursuit in Pauline studies. James Campbell’s observation in 1907 (referring to the number of biographies produced) that, “their name is Legion”\(^3\) accurately describes the state of Pauline biography even today. Yet, despite continued interest and an abundance of scholarly labour, we are regrettably still mired in a bog of competing biographical ‘facts’ about who Paul was, and conflicting interpretations of what Paul actually did, wrote, and intended.

Various scholars continue to lament this problem, and attempt to identify its causes. Paul Barnett, for instance, states that: “Paul is [still] an enigmatic figure because we have more questions about him than we have answers,”\(^4\) suggesting that the paucity of historical


\(^3\) James M. Campbell, *Paul the Mystic: A Study in Apostolic Experience* (New York: Putnam, 1908).

evidence is the main culprit. Joseph R. Dodson points to the problem of scholar biases in the form of competing ideological and theological investments. He argues:

Despite advances in knowledge since the second century – rather than a consensus on the apostle, his letters, and theology – numerous perspectives on Paul exist and rancorous debates about his theology abound: both in the academy and in the church. The second-century tendencies (such as over-interpreting Paul’s letters and not interpreting them enough, as creatively recasting the apostle to answer questions he himself never asked, and as setting him up as an extreme, either as the hero or villain (to authentic Christianity) remain real and present dangers.5

Robert Paul Seesengood suggests that this proliferation of Pauline ‘identities’:

…the apostle as a homophobe, a closeted gay man, a loyal Jew, a rabbi, a marginal Jew, a self-hating Jew, a cosmopolitan and urbane member of the Greco-Roman world, a radical dissenter opposed to the Roman empire with an unmatched vigor, a man motivated by religious impulses and ideas, or a man motivated by political agendas….These various images survive (and attract attention, if not devoted followers) precisely because they can be defended from our evidence.6

He identifies two causes of this problem: a) challenges presented by the fragmented “nature of the evidence for Paul” including “questions that arise from the nature of the data and the history of its preservation;”7 and b) challenges in “the various methodologies that govern how scholars view that evidence.”8


6 Robert Paul Seesengood, Paul: A Brief History (Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 5-6, 8.

7 Seesengood, 13.

8 Seesengood, 7.
Many scholars lament the limitations of the historical evidence. Calvin Roetzel, for instance, complains that “we are left to reconstruct a portrait of Paul with only scraps of what was once a large and imposing canvas.”\(^9\) Carl B. Smith notes the difficulties that arise when attempting to create a temporal ordering of Paul’s life: “fact[s] of chronology and possibility of connections are often difficult if not impossible to substantiate, and conclusions, thus, are very tenuous.”\(^10\) Ugo Schnelle argues that most of the early life of Paul “lies in the dark”, and the multiplicity of sources “make it difficult to relate his biography and his theology to each other in a way that accounts for the data.”\(^11\) Neil Elliott believes that our reliance on the ‘canonical Paul’ (one that fails to separate authentic words of Paul from pseudipigrapha)\(^12\) is the culprit. Wayne Meeks goes so far as to wonder if our belief that sources can help us find the ‘real Paul’ is itself naïve.\(^13\)


The second challenge that Seesengood raises is that of methodology. Questions about sources are, of course, questions about methodology as well, but they are only one of its many issues. Scholars such as John Dominic Crossan and Marcus Borg,14 Neil Elliott, Michael Grant15 and others have identified different voices in the texts, and argue that the inability of scholars to differentiate between ‘authentic’ and ‘inauthentic’ Pauline texts is a significant methodological problem. Stanley Stowers finds even this solution problematic because: “determining what Pauline is and what is un-Pauline is an extremely difficult task that most of us do without much critical reflection.”16

Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, who earlier created a significantly detailed biographical portrait of the historical Paul in Paul: A Critical Life (1996),17 now repudiates the emphasis on historical certainty that he once relied on: the positivist historical method that focused only on “the points that can be established with a degree of probability.” He laments that positivism has produced a Paul who is “essentially a disembodied mind from which pours theological ideas.”18 He does not wish to abandon history because he still believes that

14 Marcus J. Borg and John Dominic Crossan, The First Paul: Reclaiming the Radical Visionary Behind the Church’s Conservative Icon (Harper Collins, 2009).


Paul's “skull and bones are there,” and they “are strong and weight-bearing,” but he acknowledges that something is missing: “they do not move.”\textsuperscript{19} He admits to lacking a theoretical framework in which to place the biographical-historical evidence he has uncovered.

In Murphy-O'Connor's later book, \textit{Paul: His Story}, he proposes his own solution. He attempts to keep Paul ‘alive’ by using “hypothetical and imaginative” interpretation to “make [Paul's] bones live by clothing them with flesh, and infusing them with a human spirit.”\textsuperscript{20} Roetzel also argues that we are left with no choice but to “use our imagination, experience, or knowledge to fill the yawning gaps.”\textsuperscript{21} Historical fiction, it seems, is the only option imagined to help us theorize human ‘spirit’ – a reading practice that, unfortunately, leaves imagination unproblematicized. Other scholars, also beset by the limitations of positivist historical method, have re-directed their focus to reception history. Dodson, for instance, puts his faith now in “how the second generation of Christians navigated similar turbulent waters in the hopes of supplying fresh insights on Paul to help pilot us toward a better [my emphasis] understanding of early Christianity and of its most

\textsuperscript{19} Murphy-O'Connor, \textit{Paul: His Story}, vii.

\textsuperscript{20} Murphy-O'Connor, \textit{Paul: His Story}, vii.

influential apostle.” The certainty that could not be found in ancient evidence concerning the life of Paul is now allegedly found in the texts of second century Christian writers. Unfortunately, as Benjamin Lee White has argued, these studies contain the same assumptions as the “Historical Paul” studies that they have abandoned. Fortunately, scholars continue to examine, re-examine, combine and apply a variety of interpretive lenses: anthropological, social-scientific, feminist, sociological, Marxist.


ecological,\textsuperscript{29} social identity theory/socio-narrative,\textsuperscript{30} psychological,\textsuperscript{31} and postcolonial/political\textsuperscript{32} approaches in conjunction with social-historical methods to “make Paul move.” Although one can still see the ongoing effects of the previous anti-theory influence of Pauline studies in Meeks’ 2003 recent assertion that “collect[ing] facts without any [sociological] theory too often means to substitute for theory our putative common sense,”\textsuperscript{33} recent discussion focuses more on the need to combine, refine and expand our use of explicit theoretical and methodological frameworks to help us interpret ancient people in their ancient context. Ben Dunham, for instance, has recently re-examined questions about the relationships between individual and community earlier raised by Bultmann and Ernst Käsemann.\textsuperscript{34} Joanna Collicutt has re-opened the question concerning


the use of psychological theories for Pauline interpretation\textsuperscript{35} earlier explored by George Lyons.\textsuperscript{36} All of these developments are in line with Darrell Doughty’s call for a completely new methodological paradigm:

A normative paradigm determines what the "world" is like, how we perceive our world, what we "see" and do not "see," or in our case, how we perceive the Pauline writings. Given the present paradigm, we perceive the significance of what we encounter in these writings in one way; given a different paradigm, we perceive this in an entirely different way, not just a verse or passage here and there, but everything in these writings. Scholars can certainly differ about even important matters, and always will. When such differences, however, derive from different methodological and paradigmatic assumptions, there is no reason to believe that the continued repetition of old arguments, or even new arguments not yet imagined, will resolve such matters….Those scholars who see things differently, and desire to pursue what they see, must begin working with a new paradigm.\textsuperscript{37}

The impetus for this dissertation arose from my desire to challenge the methodological assumptions, often only implicitly at work, that dominate the practices of Pauline biographers, and to offer an alternative methodological paradigm that takes into account: a) problems concerning our use of ancient evidence; and b) Murphy-O’Connor’s concerns about the need for a methodological framework that would “make Paul move”. Although a variety of scholars are grappling with methodological questions that have informed this research, their efforts have not yet translated into an explicit methodology for writing


Pauline biographies that addresses these two concerns. Biographical methods are still based on: a) an unarticulated and/or muddled while implicitly normative set of assumptions and applications of historical method (specifically concerning data collection) and; b) a failure to articulate a theory of subjectivity that adequately links biography, history and social world. The following paragraphs provide evidence for this claim by describing the contours of the discussion since Adolf Deissmann’s ground-breaking study of Paul.38

**The Missing Theory of Subjectivity**

In the 1970s, John A. Coleman spoke out against the primary focus on the “Pauline mind”. He argued that Pauline scholars needed a sociology of religion approach to biblical interpretation that would correct the “overriding individualistic existentialism of Bultmann [that had] eclipsed the sociological task of careful assessment of social setting.”39 Like Deissmann before him, he proposed a corrective to a Paul who seemed to ‘float above’ his ancient world. Robin Scroggs shared his passion and argued that scholars had constructed people as if they had “mind and spirits unconnected with their individual and corporate


bodies."

Bengt Holmberg concurred: “we will not find the soul of early Christianity without finding the body.”

**Social World of the New Testament Group**

A SBL group was formed in 1973 to study the social world of the New Testament, and its sociological flavor was initiated by Gerd Theissen's publications. Jonathon Z. Smith, in his 1975 publication, outlined the elements of this new methodological emphasis: a) a description of social realia in biblical texts, b) a social history of early Christianity, c) an analysis of the social forces and social institutions of the Roman Empire and, d) an understanding of early Christianity as a 'social world in the making'.

Various scholars then attempted to link New Testament texts with the social history of everyday life of ancient human beings with human needs and symbols within sects and groups. To varying degrees, John A. Coleman notes, they utilized the work of prominent sociologists and anthropologists including: Max Weber (charisma and institutionalization),

---


Ernst Troeltsch (sect-theory), Talcott Parsons (action theory), Peter Berger & Thomas Luckmann (social construction of reality), Mary Douglas and Victor Turner (ritual) and Leon Festinger (cognitive dissonance). Robin Scroggs provides a summary of their methodological investments:

Interest in the sociology of early Christianity is no attempt to limit reductionistically the reality of Christianity to social dynamics. Rather it should be seen as an effort to guard against a reductionism from the other extreme, a limitation of the reality of Christianity to an inner spiritual or objective cognitive system. In short, sociology of early Christianity wants to put body and soul together.

A plethora of social-historical and sociological studies ensued. Scholars such as Wayne Meeks, Ronald F. Hock, Brengt Holmberg, Robin Scroggs, Albert Malherbe, David J. Horrell, Margaret MacDonald, John Gager and Dale Martin contributed to this body of knowledge. Anthony Blasi, asserting their significance, stated: “... appreciation and analysis of religious phenomena have been irreversibly transformed by the sociological imagination. These scholars had effectively challenged the biographical characterization of Paul as either motivated by a socially untouched inner and spiritual motivation or by a materially unbound cognitive system.

45 Coleman, 133.
Weaknesses of Sociological Approach

However, because of the limitations of the prevalent positivist/structuralist/functionalist sociological and psychological models, accompanied by a disdain for existentialism and individual psychology, they were unable, using the words of Herbert Marcuse, to grasp:

…the often-overlooked fundamental principle – [that] existence, as being-in-the-world, is simultaneously “material” and “spiritual”, “economic” and “ideological” (these terms merely indicate traditionally differentiated domains of inquiry). Thus in the historical existential movement, ideological domains are produced with non-ideological ones. But there is a basic ontic relationship so that the ideal objective domains that can be found in concrete historical existence have a material basis. In fact, they are ontically based, not according to their validity or their sense (which does not tell us much) – but in their existence, their (historical) presence, i.e. as concrete, historical, and “material” objective domain.⁴⁸

As a result of their failure to articulate this ontic relationship adequately, the Paul that they created did not have the “breath of life” that Murphy-O’Connor was searching for, even though they referred to human needs and placed people in social groups. These sociological studies made a significant impact on Pauline biography, but their peers noted weaknesses in their sociological models. Richard Horsley, for instance, later criticized Theissen for creating an anachronistic and individualist view of sociology.⁴⁹ Holmberg criticized Meeks for an anachronistic view of social class.⁵⁰ Dale Martin was critical of the old opposition

---


⁴⁹ Coleman, 132.

of “Hellenism” and “Judaism”, and claimed that the social world of the historical Paul had been unnecessarily simplified:

What about, for instance, Syrian culture? After all, Paul did not come from Greece or Rome, but from Cilicia and Syria. Was nothing left of older (indigenous?) cultural elements in Tarsus, Antioch, or Damascus? It is possible that Paul understood, if not spoke, Aramaic. Need we be reminded that Aramaic did not completely share the cultural history of Hebrews? And what about Rome?51

Social-Scientific Approach

There were theoretical weaknesses in their uses of sociological theories, but those who were critical of their uses of sociology did not necessarily have a better methodological framework. For instance, the most extensive critique was leveled against them by the Context Group -- a critique motivated by the then prevailing influence of positivism and structuralism on the social sciences. In response to this influence, The Context Group, A Project on the Bible in its Social and Cultural environment opted for a more rigid social-scientific methodology that had its own weaknesses. Organized in 1986 and initially led by John H. Elliot, their work began with:


Criticism of the Bible? (1993) coined a new term for the group's methodology and provided an essential bibliographic survey. Other key figures who published on the subject during this era (all of whom eventually became part of the Context Group) include Dennis Duling, Philip Esler, Douglas E. Oakman, Jerome Neyrey SJ, John J. Pilch, Richard L. Rohrbaugh, and Wolfgang Stegemann.\(^{52}\)

They emphasized categorization of the ancient social world and the need to find models that, they argued, were neither ethnocentric nor anachronistic. Malina defined the social-scientific model as follows:

Social-scientific interpretation of New Testament documents involves reading some New Testament writings by first selecting a suitable model accepted in the social-scientific community, and using the model to form adequate scenarios for reading the document in question.\(^{53}\)

Malina criticized the work of sociologist Anthony Blasi, stating that “his models [were] simply inadequate...at those points where sociology does enter; it is sociology in the service of an anachronistic sociology of religion.”\(^{54}\) Malina even went as far to say that: “‘social history' [is] no more 'sociology' than 'policy' and 'politics' are identical.”\(^{55}\) They focused their critique on problems using sociological theories.


Weaknesses of Social-Scientific Approach

However, other biblical scholars complained that their method was rigid and overly categorized.\textsuperscript{56} Holmberg argued that they harmonized first century society into a monolithic entity.\textsuperscript{57} Coleman stated that their “macro-sociological” analysis was inadequate because it failed to “forge close linkages to microsociology so that relevant comparisons and contrasts [could] be made.”\textsuperscript{58} One could also argue that, in their study of Paul, though they desired not to use modern concepts to discuss ancient personalities, not only did they also use contemporaneous theories (social-scientific has a theoretical framework), but they also failed to take account of history in a meaningful way.

Shared Weaknesses

The sociological and social-scientific models failed to take account, in the words of Fernand Braudel, the “long durée” and:

\begin{quote}
 evade[d] it in two almost contradictory ways: by concentrating overmuch on the ‘current event’ in social studies, thanks to a branch of empirical sociology which, disdainful of all history, confines itself to the facts of the short term and investigations into “real life”; [and] by transcending time
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{57} Holmberg, 25.
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{58} Coleman, 139.
\end{flushright}
altogether and conjuring up mathematical formulation of more or less timeless structures.\textsuperscript{59}

Resistance to existentialism, personal religious experience (psychology), and religious idealism (Pauline theology), combined with the rise of positivism, invited scholars to focus on the historical Paul in his ancient social world. However, because of the state of sociological and social-scientific models, scholars tended to create a historical Paul that, for the most part, was simply a ‘wooden’ product of dominant ancient discourse and ancient social forces.\textsuperscript{60} The individualism and idealism of earlier biographies was replaced with ‘mechanistic’ sociological and then social-scientific accounts of human actors in which, according to Historical Sociologist Margaret S. Archer, “one element became dominant and the other subordinate: human agency became pale and ghostly in mid-century functionalism.”\textsuperscript{61}


\textsuperscript{60} Jerome H. Neyrey, \textit{Paul, in other words: A Cultural reading of his letters}, 1\textsuperscript{st} ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1990). Neyrey applied the social-scientific method to his study of Paul. He stated that his project was to “interpret Paul's letters by describing the symbolic universe of Paul" and by examining how Paul and “others in his world typically viewed their cosmos” (p. 12). The "symbolic universe" was delineated into six categories (based on the work of Mary Douglas). Ancient people, including Paul, are assumed to respond in ways that are "typical" and that fit these categories. For instance, they “find a place for everything and everything in its place” and "order is perceived and prized, but it is under attack” (16). The payoff for this reading is supposedly freedom from "ethnocentrism" and "anachronistic" readings, but the 'typical' "symbolic universe' looks suspiciously like the universe of Mary Douglas ---ordered, with everything in its place. This rigid and abstract framework, when applied to the ancient life erases the singular, the particular, the specific...that is, the person.

Influence of Adolf Deissmann

One can continue to see in the unfolding history of Pauline biography (for good or for bad) the influence of the path-breaking scholarship of Adolf Deissmann. In his footsteps, scholars in both the Social History and Context group[s] have challenged the taken-for-granted use of “doctrinaire” studies which have produced the “paper Paul of our western libraries” in place of the “actual Paul of ancient days.”62 They have attempted to address the idealist focus on Paul's 'theology' that had created, in Deissmann's earlier words: “either a parchment saint, unacquainted with the world” or “suffered the man to disappear behind the [theological] system.”63 Following in Deissmann's steps, they attempted to place Paul in an ancient social context: in the “sunlight of his Anatolian home and in the clear air of the ancient Mediterranean world.”64

Untheorized Psychology

Deissmann had not only described the world in which Paul lived, he also saw, in Paul's letters, “a glimpse not only of the frowns and smiles on his face but also of his very soul.”65 This is an aspect of his work that has not received much positive attention. His Paul had

62 Deissmann, 4.
63 Deissmann, 57.
64 Deissmann, 4.
65 Deissmann, 58.
feelings, needs, and spiritual desires. Given the then rising influence of positivist methodologies, it is not surprising that this characterization of Paul was flatly repudiated by most scholars. Deissmann was speaking about personal religious experience and making a psychological interpretation at a time when psychology had fallen into positivist hands – writing accounts of human beings that depended on what could be observed, counted and measured. One can see the influence of this historical moment, for instance, in Johannes Munck’s critique of Deissmann. Munck argued that his presentation of Paul was unreliable because he strove to explain events “by a series of psychological and other circumstances of which we know nothing certain.”

Although Malina & Jerome H. Neyrey asserted that ancient persons did have a 'self', they quickly provided the following qualifier: “not in any of the introspective, psychological ways” that modern readers would understand.

Positivism brought with it an anti-psychological, anti-existentialist bias that led scholars away from theorizing Paul’s ‘spirit’ or ‘soul’ or ‘personality.’ Instead, a human being with desires and longings and fears and personal needs became the ancient “modal personality” that provided “the mesh between the self and society” – something externally rather than internally created. Meeks, for instance proposed that “status inconsistency” explained why

68 Malina & Neyrey, 10.
people were attracted to Christianity, again a variable that could be observed and measured in the social world. Even Murphy O'Connor, though he dabbles in historical fiction to ‘enliven’ Paul, is influenced by positivist psychology when he assures his readers that “Paul was normal [my emphasis] in his response to external stimuli.” One wonders how much spirit Paul can have if it is external stimuli that will animate him, and only in ‘normal’ ways. All of these interpretive moves are trapped within the positivist reductionism that Clifford Geertz describes as: sociological theories in which the “psychology is too anemic and whose sociology is too muscular.”

**Untheorized Social Class**

Deissmann also claimed that Paul was a ‘simple’ man. Much ink has been spilt in response to this claim as well, and most of it has been used to adamantly refute that Paul was socially situated in the lower socioeconomic class. Edwin A. Judge, for instance, in the words of Ronald Hock, “pictured him as moving typically among the urban elite, whose houses served as salons for his meetings, and whose means provided him with a free flow of

---


70 Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul: A Story*, viii.

hospitality and gifts.”  

Ronald F. Hock, in his ground-breaking study, *The Social Context of Paul’s Ministry*, did place Paul within an artisan’s workshop – a workshop that would have been a source of social humiliation. However, Hock rescued him from the lower classes by arguing that Paul's *attitudes* about this trade were “not those of fellow craftsmen but rather those of aristocrats.”  

Todd D. Still has recently challenged Hock's view that Paul loathed manual labour, and Justin Meggitt, for instance, has confirmed Deissmann's view that Paul lived at the subsistence level of poverty, but their voices are minority ones. Furthermore, whether scholars fall into the aristocratic or ‘simple man’ side of the debate, they generally follow in Deissmann’s footsteps by failing to theorize the relationship between the constraints/freedoms created by a particular ancient material existence and the human being who makes meaning and acts within that historical-social context. If Paul was a lower class man, he was not *every* lower class man. If Paul was an aristocrat, he was not *any* aristocrat.

---


While this discussion has helpfully focused on examining different Pauline texts and providing more nuanced descriptions of poverty and wealth in the ancient Mediterranean, something more is needed. Paul's ‘spirit’ (that which moved him to act) was embedded in his material existence, but that material existence does not completely determine a human response. While his ‘thought’ certainly did not arise simply from his individual ‘genius,’ the possibilities and limitations created by material life were presented to him in his social world, and he acted within them. The problem for biblical scholars is that the sociological theories that have been available have also not adequately theorized this relationship between history, biography, and society – history did not do sociology; and sociology did not do history.

Furthermore, most sociologists did not take up C. Wright Mills' 1959 dictum: “The sociological imagination enables us to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society.”\(^76\) Wright Mills had posited his belief in a sociology that was historical-biographical-sociological:

> For that imagination is the capacity to shift from one perspective to another – from the political to the psychological; from examination of a single family to comparative assessment of the national budgets of the world; from the theological school to the military establishment; from considerations of an oil industry to studies of contemporary poetry. It is the capacity to range from the most impersonal and remote transformations to the most intimate features of the human self – and to see the relations between the two."\(^77\)


\(^{77}\) C. Wright Mills, 7.
His counsels were largely ignored, however, and American sociology continued to follow in the paths set by the Structural Functionalist School. Similar concerns were voiced in European circles. In France, the structuralism of Althusser and others, argued E.P. Thompson, “ha[d] no category (or way of handling) “experience” (or social being's impingement upon social consciousness).” Th8 Althusser, according to Thompson, “abandoned the weary ground of attempting to elucidate a one-to-one correspondence between [a] “real material event or object and that perception/intuition/sense-impression/concept.” Pauline scholars simply inherited these methodological weaknesses.

**Contribution of Historical Sociology**

Historical sociologists and anthropologists began to critique positivist methodological practises. Andrew Abbott, for instance, critiqued sociologists who applied their method in such a way that the social world was presented as composed of “fixed, unitary entities that created only one pattern of effect.” Sociologists, he argued, have created interpretations that rely on untenable “linear assumptions” of a general, static model of positivist social


79 Thompson, 6.

Anthropologist Marshall Sahlins also rightly argued that such a model eliminates the role of human creativity and activity by attributing ‘subjectivity’ to “a kind of Super-subject, Culture, which for its part [is] accorded all powers of movement and determination.”

E.P. Thomson also critiqued Althusser for making “raw material” (the object of knowledge) “[into] an inert, pliant kind of stuff, with neither inertia nor energies of its own, awaiting passively its manufacture into knowledge.” In contrast to an Althusserian method, he argues:

[A] Historian in the Marxist tradition is entitled to remind a Marxist philosopher that historians also are concerned, every day, in their practice, with the formation of, and with the tensions within, social consciousness. Our observation is rarely singular: this object of knowledge, this event, this elaborated concept. Our concern, more commonly, is with multiple evidences, whose interrelationship is, indeed, an object of our enquiry. Or, if we isolate the singular evidence for particular scrutiny, that evidence does not stand complaisantly like a table for interrogation: it stirs, in the medium of time, before our eyes. These stirrings, these events, if they are within “social being”, seem often to impinge upon, thrust into, and break against, existent social consciousness. They propose new problems, and above all, they continually give rise to experience – a category which, however imperfect it may be, is indispensable to the historian, since it comprises the mental and emotional response, whether of an individual or of a social group.”

81 Andrew Abbott, 169-186.
83 Thompson, 7.
84 Thompson, 7.
E.P. Thomson, like Deissmann before him, wants an individual that has thoughts and emotions of her/his own. Yirmiahu Yovel argues that we need methodological frameworks that do not require us to anchor “the individual within his historical context, [but] rather…to situate him [or her] there.”85 He suggests that we need a methodological and conceptual framework that allows us to “discover the particular, irreducible ways in which an individual’s existential freedom projects itself...through...universals,” thus doing “justice to the full concreteness of the category of particularity and at the same time to serve as a warning that the historical universal can neither determine the individual, nor fully capture the sense of life.”86

Gila Hayim, in his book, *Existentialism and Sociology*, argues that the scientific understanding of objective structures as completely deterministic of human behaviour has produced a methodology of society and history that is basically a "methodology of inert exteriority." Atomization in analysis (i.e. parceling out the living social reality into fixed and separate categories and structures) works for positivist reasons because its’ goal, he argues, is “intellection” rather than comprehension.87 Positivistic sociology has emphasized such concepts as: ‘role’, ‘structure' and ‘external variables’, and these have


86 Yovel, 495.

been conceptualized as “conditions relatively independent of the present desires and future goals of acting individuals.” Because human motivation is seen as abstract, it is “considered too elusive and subjective a component of action to be necessary for understanding human behavior.” Utilizing the models of physical engineering, positivist analyses in the social sciences have flattened the attributes of the self to those of matter and have offered us a sociology of "things." This practice, he argued, instills in the human being a feeling of helplessness and gross inferiority vis-a-vis the world because this form of social science practice considers the self as simply the passive product of unintelligible structures. One could, of course, also argue that this very account of human existence serves and props up the power and legitimation of those who desire to control the unruly behaviour of free human actors.

Joseph M. Bryant offers a list of the "common deformations within the social sciences" that have arisen from a positivist philosophy of science:

- the copious profusion of formal theories that fail to make contact with the real-life complexities of historical process; the explanations and models that confuse the ephemeral properties of the present for invariant and essential determinants; the reified isolation of social forces as ‘independent’ variables from their constitutive relational contexts; linear, physicalist models of causation that misrepresent the situational, reflexive logics of human agency; the purported laws which, if not trivial or tautological, override the meaning-imparting specificities of time and place through excessive

88 Hayim, 6.
89 Hayim, 6.
90 Hayim, 29.
abstraction; chronic violations of chronology, in the form of misleading accelerations and decelerations of historical pace, or through dubious periodizations occasioned by forced extensions or foreshortenings of temporal perspective; and perhaps most seriously, the strained transfer of concepts and theories that are laced with the normative evaluations and experiences of particular moments and sites of social praxis, and whose imposition on 'other domains' both violates the ontological integrity of those investigated and cloaks a self-delusional ratification of the framing ideologies that guide the cognitive interests of the investigators.  

It is not difficult to see these same flaws in the work of Pauline scholars. Malina and Neyrey, for instance, describe Paul as a “modal or typical personality” who can be understood simply through the examination of the ancient collectivist culture. They allude to human agency and action when they say that “meanings derive from, and in their own way constitute, the social system of the author and the original audience.” However, they describe social structures (i.e. honor/shame) as capable of completely “ordering subjective interests and actions.” J. Paul Sampley, in the handbook entitled, *Paul in the Greco-Roman World*, argued that it is important to reconstruct “Roman social, economic

---


92 Malina and Neyrey, vii.

93 Malina and Neyrey, 154.

94 Malina and Neyrey, 9.

95 Sahlins, 284.
and political practices, social conventions and values”\textsuperscript{96} and Paul's degree of consonance or dissonance from them. Roetzel characterized Paul as a \textit{marginal} Jew, thus recognizing that human beings can be situated differently in relationship to social structures.\textsuperscript{97} However, while both scholars were attempting to situate Paul within his social world, they fell into the trap that Isaac notes is characteristic of much sociological theory: the ancient human actor is located, at most, in a binary context, rather than in a web of “variegated, contingent, and dynamically reflexive/social relations.”\textsuperscript{98} Yirmiahu Yovel argued that sociological analyses must not only describe the ancient social world in ways that allow this kind of analysis, but must also “explain in concrete detail, \textit{how} an individual life interiorizes the meaning of its historical context, and how it projects itself through this context in an irreducibly particular way of its own, thus participating in the formation of the historical universal itself.”\textsuperscript{99}

Pauline biographers, like social scientists, have “neglected the particular in favour of a variety of historical generalizations, thus working with empty or “abstract” universals.”\textsuperscript{100}


\textsuperscript{99} Yovel, 494.

\textsuperscript{100} Yovel, 495.
As a result, Paul the historical person, constructed by means of these structuralist analyses, ceases to be, in the words of Marshall Sahlins, an “individual social being with a biography not [my emphasis] the same as that of anyone else.”

Murphy-O’Connor has identified the problem, but his turn to historical fiction is not the solution. What is needed is an explicit methodological framework with a robust historical-sociological-biographical approach that does not construct a Paul who either floats above his ancient social context or is completely ordered by that context. It is time to circle back to Deissmann’s characterization of Paul as a human being with desires, needs and experiences, and improve upon his work by theorizing human ‘spirit’ – materially conditioned, but also free to act.

A Composite Text: Problems Collecting Historical Data

The second methodological weakness of Pauline Biography concerns the methods used to collect historical-biographical evidence. Joseph Bryant has noted the obvious: a sound historical methodology must be based upon an existing “objectified ‘record’ of historical facts, as these are variously preserved within the documentary remains… which provides the foundation and organizing basis for historical analysis….”

Any historical study that is, he argues: “insecurely grounded in the empirical and subjectively arbitrary in its

101 Sahlins, Culture in Practice, 284-85.

102 Bryant, 498.
analytical procedures – is an interpretive enterprise incapable of producing either veridical or verifiable accounts about past social phenomenon.”\textsuperscript{103} Bryant accordingly has opposed both positivist and postmodern epistemologies, on the grounds that the former “upheld dogmatically strict, autonomous demarcations between facts, observations, and theories”\textsuperscript{104} whereas the latter declares that ‘the real past’ “is beyond recovery and thus, in Louis Mink’s words: “a product of imaginative reconstruction which cannot defend its claim to trust thy any accepted procedure of argument or authentication.”\textsuperscript{105} Instead he relies on a critical-realist, historical sociological approach which demands that knowledge regarding the historic past:

\begin{quote}
…must remain consistent with the primary communicative task of reporting past actions and developments, which are ‘discovered’ in the surviving records and artifacts rather than artfully ‘invented’ in accordance with the dictates of aesthetic or ideological fashion. While conditions of evidentiary incompleteness and theoretical diversity do create opportunities for speculative interpolations and hypothetical inferences, narrational accounts are ultimately evaluated on the basis of their plausible congruence with the available empirical record.\textsuperscript{106}
\end{quote}


The critical edition of the New Testament (Nestle-Aland 27\textsuperscript{th} or 28\textsuperscript{th} edition or United Bibles Societies UBSGNT\textsuperscript{4}) is the standard ‘database’ or ‘empirical record’ on which

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{103} Bryant, 490.
\textsuperscript{104} Bryant, 509.
\textsuperscript{105} Bryant, 492.
\textsuperscript{106} Bryant, 493.
\end{flushleft}
interpretations of Pauline biography are based. Our uncritical use of this text for Pauline biography is problematic. J. Eugene Botha has observed, for instance, that biblical scholars, relying on the critical edition and “utilizing social science methodologies to read and interpret a text” rarely examine the relevant findings of text criticism “except where it can help an argument”, and thus “generally accept that the text in these editions is the best and most reliable text to use.”\(^\text{107}\) This ‘hands off’ approach, he argues, is understandable given that text criticism “has become so specialized and complex that only those with specialized skills and knowledge dare to venture there.”\(^\text{108}\) However, such inattention to the characteristics of the database on which a historical-biographical study depends ensures that any weaknesses in the construction of the database will, in part, ‘distort’ the Pauline biography produced.

At the centre of the discipline of New Testament text criticism is an ambition to ‘recover’ the ‘original text’ of the New Testament that has been ‘modified’ through manuscript transmission. Bart D. Ehrman states that the goal of text criticism is to “get back to the original text – the text as the author first wrote it – given that our manuscripts are so full of mistakes.”\(^\text{109}\) This commitment guides the shape of the methodology that text critics use to


\(^{108}\) Botha, 561.

construct the ‘standardized’ text, a methodology that contributes to its greater reliance on later rather than earlier manuscripts and its preference for ‘more original’ over a representation of multiple and diverse historical witnesses.

**History of Text Criticism and Marginalization of Papyri**

The *Textus Receptus* (TR), as it came to be known, described as “the text now received by all, in which we give nothing changed or corrupted”\(^{110}\) was produced by Erasmus in 1516, and it was the first edition of his Latin-Greek Bible which was created to annotate and/or confirm the Latin Vulgate on which it was based. He used the manuscripts of seven codices which were dated between the 11\(^{th}\) and 15\(^{th}\) centuries (most were dated to the 12\(^{th}\) century) to create his text. He did not construct the text from the Greek, but noted: “Greek text has been ‘added’ so that the reader can convince himself that the Latin translation does not contain any rash innovations, but is solidly based.”\(^{111}\) Then, because the printer did not accept all of Erasmus’ translations, he edited Erasmus’ Bible before publication.\(^{112}\) In its preface, however, Erasmus claimed:

> I perceived that that teaching which is our salvation was to be had in a much purer and more lively form if sought at the fountain-head and drawn from the actual sources than from pools and runnels. And so I have revised the


\(^{112}\) Combs, 46.
whole New Testament (as they call it) against the standard of the Greek original.…\textsuperscript{113}

Four editions were later produced by Robert Estienne (1546-1551); nine by Theodore Beza (1565-1604); and seven editions by Bonaventura and Abraham Elzevir between 1624 and 1678. The term \textit{Textus Receptus} originates from the preface of their 1663 edition. It was the accepted Bible until Westcott-Hort’s Greek Bible of 1881 was produced, and is the basis of the King James Version (and the NKJV).\textsuperscript{114}

The Westcott-Hort Greek Bible of 1881 was hailed as ushering in a “new era for biblical exegesis in England that fully accepted the new demands of historical criticism” while still acknowledging that it is a ‘faith’ document.\textsuperscript{115} They broke with the tradition of reliance on the \textit{TR}, improved the critical methodology of others, and based their Greek Bible on the earlier manuscripts: fourth century Codex Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.\textsuperscript{116} According to Metzger, their critical edition “was truly epoch-breaking. They presented what is doubtless the oldest and purest form of text that could be attained with the means of information available in their day.”\textsuperscript{117} Most modern versions of the Bible, including the New
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\bibitem{115} Donald H. McKim, \textit{Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters} (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 392), 391.
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International Version, are based on Westcott-Hort. On the basis of this critical edition of the New Testament, Epp argued that text criticism:

...from the early 18th century on... attempted to overcome its long-standing reliance on the textus receptus – the text found in the mass of 8th century and later manuscripts. Slowly but surely textual critics shifted their allegiance, rather, to earlier manuscripts, and particularly to the great uncial manuscripts of the 4th and 5th centuries.118

With the discoveries of different papyri came the opportunity to construct a critical text based on earlier manuscripts. J.N. Birdsall has noted, however, that the common fault that text critics share is their “attempt to discuss and define...early evidence...by standards of later witnesses.” Kenneth Clark, after analyzing the uses of the papyri in the construction of the critical text, came to this conclusion:

Since 1881 [that is, since Westcott-Hort's text] twenty-five editors have issued about seventy-five editions of the Greek New Testament. The collation of these many “critical” texts consistently exposes the fact that each of them is basically a repetition of the Westcott-Hort text...Indeed, we have continued for eighty-five years to live in the era of Westcott-Hort, our textus receptus [the text received by us all].120

This is in opposition to the first rule in the canon of New Testament criticism according to Craig L. Blomberg and Jennifer Foutz Markley: “Prefer the reading attested by the earliest

______________________________


120 Porter, 337-338.
reliable manuscripts.” Even the Nestle-Aland text (identical to the UBS) relies heavily on the uncials of the fourth and fifth centuries, and Epp and Kenneth Clark lament that “the only studies made thus far seem to approach these texts by reversing the centuries. We [text critics speaking to other text critics] require a new mental attitude, wherein we....approach these earliest materials de novo.”

Critical Edition’s Influence on Scholar-Constructed Pauline Corpus

Because Pauline scholars rely heavily on the critical edition of the New Testament, we are dependent on a ‘standardized’ text which is constructed from extant manuscripts (that vary in their content and in their ordering of letters within the Pauline Corpus) but which ‘hides’ their witnesses. The resulting tension between the ‘critical edition’ (canonical New Testament) and the evidence of primary sources has significantly impacted, I would argue, how we view and categorize the contents of the Pauline Corpus. The critical edition presents a ‘complete’ Pauline Corpus of fourteen letters, a collection first attested in Codex Sinaiticus (01), the letters that form the basis of our analysis. Just as the text critic assesses the entire collection of extant manuscripts to re-construct the ‘more original reading,’ we assess this canonical/critical edition collection set of Pauline letters through the lens of


‘authenticity,’ I suspect, because we are aware of the differences between the standardized Pauline Corpus of the critical edition and those of the extant manuscripts. This dual investment to the canonical text and the ancient manuscripts leads to the categorization of a set of authentic/canonical/‘more original’ Pauline letters which stand in contrast to inauthentic ‘variants’ (duetero-Pauline or Pastoral epistles). Our dependence on the critical edition is evident because we base our categorization on this set of Pauline letters rather than the earliest Pauline Corpus of p⁴⁶ or the subsequent collection in Codex Vaticanus.

Because we have accepted the critical text’s dependence on Codex Sinaiticus, we are left to argue for/against the ‘authenticity’ of the “Pastoral Epistles” on the basis of how they are similar or different to ‘authentic’ Pauline letters. Some scholars have argued for the ‘inauthenticity’ of Hebrews on the basis of its location in the critical text¹²³ even though, in each of the three earliest collections (p⁴⁶, Vaticanus¹²⁴, and Sinaiticus) it is placed in a different position. We have left the ordering of letters unquestioned, though the earliest manuscripts vary their order of the letters. We have laboured over the use of Acts in our biographical constructions, in part, I would argue because it immediately precedes the first

---

¹²³ Souter, Alexander. *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1954), 11: He suggested that the canonical placing of Hebrews after 2 Thessalonians was the result of the many doubts concerning its canonicity and authorship.

letter of the Pauline Corpus in our critical text (though this is not the case in either Codex Vaticanus\textsuperscript{125} or Codex Sinaiticus\textsuperscript{126}). Finally, we have simply failed to examine the extant manuscript evidence apart from its presentation in the critical apparatus of the critical edition.

Other scholars have challenged the Pauline Corpus of the critical text, but they have argued that the manuscript evidence will lead us back to the ‘original’ letter collection that lurks behind the New Testament text. G. Zuntz, for instance, believes that p\textsuperscript{46} “derives from exemplars even older, and in a way which it is still possible to determine in some detail.”\textsuperscript{127} David Trobisch attempts to reconstruct the “Canonical Edition” of Paul’s Letters, an archetype which he believes was edited by Paul himself.\textsuperscript{128} Both of these scholars are also influenced by the drive to create the ‘original’ text, both rely on later manuscripts, and both privilege Codex Sinaiticus over the Pauline Corpus of Chester Beatty II or Codex Vaticanus. Again, although this may be congruent with the aims of text criticism, a conceptualized archetype or autograph is hardly an ‘empirical record’ of the historical past.

\textsuperscript{125} The order of the NT is as follows: Gospels, Acts, General Epistles, and Pauline Epistles.

\textsuperscript{126} The order of the NT is as follows: Gospels, Epistles of Paul, Acts, General Epistles, Revelation.

\textsuperscript{127} G. Zuntz, \textit{The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum} (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), 17.

Impact on the Scholar-Constructed Pauline Corpus

Since it is a taken for granted method to use the critical text as the database for Pauline biography and interpretation, it is necessary to describe how our re-arrangement of the critical text, to form what I call the scholar-constructed text, informs the usual issues concerning the Pauline Corpus.

Use of Hebrews

Because scholars depend on the critical text but generally do not consider that Hebrews was written by Paul, they must account for the presence of Hebrews in the Pauline Corpus of the critical edition by means of an examination of ancient manuscripts (and early Christian writers) through the lens of ‘authenticity.’ On the basis of this examination, because Hebrews does not contain an epistolary prescript, and its ‘writing’ and theology is deemed different from authentic letters,129 it is generally not considered part of the Pauline Corpus. Scholars who argue for its authenticity believe that Paul simply left off his name,130 an argument also dependent on the notion of authenticity. However, Hebrews is extant in the first three collections of the Pauline Corpus: p46 (between Romans and 1st Corinthians), Codex Vaticanus (the final text ending at 9:14), and in Codex Sinaiticus (after


2 Thessalonians and before 1 Timothy). In addition, Greg Goswell, in his study of the chapter divisions of Codex Vaticanus, suggests that Vaticanus was copied from a manuscript in which Hebrews was placed between Galatians and Ephesians.\(^{131}\) Hebrews is also extant in \(p^{12}\) (P. Amherst 3b) and \(p^{13}\) (P.Oxy.657 +PSI 1292). Although \(p^{12}\) contains only Heb. 1:1 (250-300 CE) and \(p^{13}\) (250-350 CE) contains only fragments of Chapter 2, 10, and 11-12, these manuscripts also confirm its early existence after its first appearance in the earlier \(p^{46}\).

The extant manuscripts present Hebrews in different locations in the earliest collections. This evidence, its presence after Philemon in the critical edition, and the testimony of scholars such as Calvin,\(^{132}\) makes Hebrews a text in need of explanation. Pamela Michelle Eisenbaum, for instance, states that she is “nearly certain that Paul did not write Hebrews.”\(^{133}\) Despite the strong external evidence for its inclusion in the corpus, she claims that Hebrews is theologically ‘different’ from the ‘authentic’ letters, and should be excluded. Such argumentation assesses texts on the basis of “authenticity” (the basis on which the 14 letter corpus of the critical edition is evaluated) over extant manuscript evidence.


\(^{132}\) Calvin, *Commentaries*, XXII: xxvii.

Pauline Epistles as ‘Missing Pages’

The Pauline Corpus of the critical edition of the New Testament is based on the witness of Codex Sinaiticus. For this reason, the earliest collections of p⁴⁶ and Codex Vaticanus (which do not contain all of the texts of its 14 letter Pauline Corpus) are deemed ‘incomplete,’ and the texts not included in these manuscripts are described as ‘missing.’ The focus of the argument is especially put on the ‘missing pages’ of p⁴⁶: 1-2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and 2 Thessalonians. Because what’s missing is identified on the basis of the later Codex Sinaiticus, it isn’t considered noteworthy that neither p⁴⁶ and Codex Vaticanus, nor any of the papyri evidence of the second, third and early fourth centuries contain the texts 1 and 2 Timothy (or Titus alongside 1 and 2 Timothy). The critical edition (and Codex Sinaiticus) are used to define the shape of earlier manuscripts. Michael W. Holmes summarizes the dominant shape of this argument:

The evidence that is not positive regarding the Pastoral Epistles, such as lack of their inclusion in p⁴⁶, is at best ambiguous, not negative, since there are a variety of possible explanations (in the case of p⁴⁶ one must consider the state of preservation of the manuscript, above all).¹³⁴

Again, the scholar-constructed corpus attempts to deal with the tension between the extant evidence and the critical edition. Jay Twomey reads the PE as “post-Pauline documents, written within a generation of Paul’s death, letters which seem to reflect a sense of church

structure and tradition and politics quite different from what one finds in Paul’s own communities.” Rudolf Bultmann had earlier declared that “the Christianity of the Pastorals is a somewhat faded Paulinism.” The problem with dependence on the critical text, is that it invites us to explain the differences between texts using internal rather than external criteria. Again, scholars identify ‘inauthentic’ texts by comparing them with ‘authentic’ texts identified as such, in part, on their differences from ‘inauthentic’ texts – a method dependent on circular reasoning. If one were to rely instead on external criteria, the evidence would demonstrate that the ‘Pastoral Epistles’ are, in fact, according to the manuscript evidence, a (later) product of the fourth century – thus congruent with the conclusion that they are ‘later’ letters drawn by internal analyses.

The extant manuscripts also assist us to assess the various hypotheses that arise in response to our observation that p
diffs from the critical text. Why aren’t the Pastoral Epistles and Philemon found in the earliest collection? Eldon Jay Epp argues that there was insufficient space for all the ‘expected’ texts:

the calculated space on the missing fourteen leaves following 1 Thessalonians is inadequate to accommodate the remaining writings of the Pauline corpus as we know it, namely, 1-2 Timothy, Titus, and Philemon


(Hebrews, as already mentioned, is present earlier in p⁴⁶ between Romans and 1 Corinthians).¹³⁷

Jeremy Duff counter-argues that 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians and Philemon would indeed fit into this space, and would have needed only five of the fourteen pages, leaving nine pages for the PE.¹³⁸ However, Epp demonstrates that Duff’s calculations required 18,900 letters for the Pastoral Epistles”¹³⁹ and the ‘missing pages’ would not hold that amount of letters. Therefore, though Duff may argues that “p⁴⁶ did not contain the Pastorals but was intended to do so,”¹⁴⁰ this statement is not upheld by the extant manuscript evidence. It is clear that going back to the manuscripts themselves rather than relying on the critical text could solve some of our methodological tangles.

¹³⁷ Eldon Jay Epp, “Issues in the Interrelation of New Testament Textual Criticism and Canon,” in Lee M. McDonald and James A. Sanders, eds., The Canon Debate (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 485-515 at 498, n. 49. His argument was as follows: Given that most of the pages of p⁴⁶ are numbered, “seven leaves or fourteen pages from the beginning of the codex have not survived, and there is no dispute that Romans 1:1-5:17 would fit onto those pages and originally occupied them.” If there are seven leaves missing at the beginning of the papyrus, he argued this means that there are seven leaves (14 pages) missing from the end as well.


¹⁴⁰ Jeremy Duff, 585-89.
Philemon and Titus: Personal Letters

Philemon and Titus are not found in p46 or Vaticanus. To explain their existence in the critical text and thus the Pauline corpus, David Trobisch links 1 & 2 Timothy and Titus with Philemon as a collection of letters written to individuals.141 This supposedly explains their absence from the earliest collection while creating a link between these and the other ‘missing’ letters. However, extant manuscript evidence to support this hypothesis does not exist. Philemon (p87) and Titus (p32) are both extant in the early third century, but they are not attested ‘inside’ the Pauline Corpus until their appearance in Codex Sinaiticus (360 CE). The fourth century extant manuscript supports Trobisch’s theory because 1-2 Timothy, Titus and Philemon are clustered together at the end of the corpus. However, because he is also dependent on the critical text (I am assuming this because he does not try to make sense of Philemon’s absence in Codex Vaticanus), he must resort to the use of a hypothesis based on internal evidence to account for the collection of ‘personal’ letters.

Canonical and Non-Canonical Accounts

The fourth impact that text criticism has on biographical methods is the status given to non-canonical texts. Paula Eisenbaum argued, for instance, that disputed epistles, non-canonical sources, and other ancient Jewish or Christian literature can provide “comparative and contextual data” but they don’t provide “direct unmediated access to the details of Paul’s life and the intricacies of his thought.” Again, based on the notion that there must be an ‘authentic’ source, and the set of authentic letters are found in the critical text, the non-canonical sources are viewed as suspect. This betrays a theological rather than a historical investment. If we were to examine the non-canonical sources on a historical basis, we would discover that the Acts of Paul is extant in Greek and Coptic in the third century\textsuperscript{143} while the ‘complete’ Acts of the critical text is not extant till the fourth century. Yet, while canonical Acts is often considered a repository of biographical facts, Acts of Paul is simply regarded as a ‘story’.

Questions concerning differences between the biographical evidence of Acts and the ‘authentic’ Pauline epistles, a product of the critical text, has garnered the most attention. According to Lüdemann, between the time of Baur and present scholarship, the question

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{143} \url{http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/actspaul.html}
\end{flushleft}
about the historical reliability of Acts has been the primary methodological focus regarding ancient data sources.\textsuperscript{144} Some scholars emphasize its reliability, others its unreliability. Ferdinand Baur, for instance, states that the “comparison of both these sources [Acts and letters of Paul]…must lead to the conclusion that, considering the great difference between the two statements, historical truth can only belong to one of them.”\textsuperscript{145} Sandmel also falls on the side of the historical unreliability of Acts and demands that we identify its literary purpose so as to know how to read it alongside the authentic Pauline data:

It is my judgement that Acts not only errs egregiously in details in matters which are also found in the Epistles, but tendentiousness respecting Paul is so strong in Acts that it adds misleading and unreliable details about him. Among such details are these: it gives him a Jewish name, Saul. It makes him a former student of Gamaliel. It portrays him as speaking Hebrew. It depicts him as turning from Jews to Gentiles only after a series of bitter experiences with Jews; that is, his motivation is not principle, but expediency. The Road to Damascus is a romance; the determination to get extradition papers against the Christians in Damascus is pure fiction; the Roman citizenship is a pipe-dream. Some of these motifs are legendary accretions derived from details mentioned passingly in the Epistles; such, for example, are the details given in Acts of Paul’s persecution of the Church. The purpose of the fictitious items in Acts is to demonstrate that Paul was by residence as much a Palestinian Jew as were the native born Palestinians; it is to deny that Paul was a Jew steeped in the Greek dispersion… it is not Paul the person against whom Acts is contending… it is the Pauline doctrine which Acts is attacking.” \textsuperscript{146}


The problem with solving the reliability question by asserting that Acts 'gets it wrong' is that Sandmell must determine which text ‘gets it right’. That ‘right’ answer, of course, is the ‘authentic’ letters of Paul. The shape of this argument stems from his reliance on the critical text, and its claim to be the ‘original’ text. An ‘original’ text is expected not to contain conflicting evidence about Paul the apostle. If there is a conflict, one of the sources must be wrong. I would hypothesize that it is because the critical text is deemed the ‘original’ text and used as the canonical text, that differences in the composition of the Pauline Corpus and between ‘the facts’ contained in various texts of the New Testament are seen as problematic. Pauline Studies, because it relies on this text, is too heavily influenced by the notion of an ‘original’ text and in which one can find the ‘original’ Paul.

Eisenbaum is one of many scholars who still believes in the notion of an ‘authentic source’. Her “exclusion of Acts” will allow her, she argues, to avoid issues concerning the historical reliability of Acts. Instead, she makes a “deliberate decision to construct a portrait of Paul based exclusively on the apostle’s own writings” which she sees as providing her with “direct access to the words of a figure from biblical history.”147 She declares that “Paul’s letters...contain the apostle’s very own words, his thoughts, feelings, reflections, and theological and ethical teachings.”148 There are two problems with this approach: a) the Pauline corpus is an already edited corpus, so identifying Paul’s “very own words” is

147 Eisenbaum, Paul was not a Christian, 16.

148 Eisenbaum, Paul was not a Christian, 15.
impossible; and b) the exclusion of Acts does not solve questions concerning its role in writing a life of Paul – it simply reproduces the problematic opposition of inauthentic to authentic material.

The methodological tangle can be solved by relying on ancient manuscript data. W. A. Strange has noted that “fourteen papyri contain parts of the Book of Acts, but of these, only p74 [seventh century] contains any continuous substantial portion of text.” Since the version of Acts witnessed in the critical text is first found in Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, it was definitely extant in the mid-fourth century. However, there is no extant evidence, as of yet, that it existed in the form contained in the critical text any earlier. Scholars sometimes argue that Acts must have existed earlier because Irenaeus, Clement or Tertullian quoted it. The problem with this argumentation is that the manuscripts which contain these quotes are also not extant before the fourth century. Scholars re-construct the patristic evidence in the same way text critics construct the ‘original text.’ They re-construct’ early ‘patristic evidence’ on the basis of later manuscripts. Thus, Martin Hengel’s cautionary words are apropos:

In the realm of ancient history the fortuitousness and fragmentariness of surviving sources and the distance between the ancient consciousness and our own can very easily lead to a simplified representation of past reality.\footnote{\textsuperscript{150} Martin Hengel, \textit{Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity}, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1979), 130.}

\textsuperscript{149} W.A. Strange. \textit{The Problem of the Text of Acts} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 190.
Extant manuscripts of Acts of the Apostles that are dated prior to the fourth century provide scant biographical evidence about Paul. However, not only should they be included in the biographical database, but these manuscripts should also be treated as the historian would treat any ancient manuscript – as a piece of evidence like any other.

**Chronology**

The final impact of using the critical text is that we imagine it is possible to create a chronology of texts that will allow us to map Paul’s life though time. The critical text provides us with an illusion of ‘completeness’ that lures us into this false sense of hope that a timeline is actually possible. The scholar-constructed corpus provides the ‘authentic’ letters that form the basis of that timeline. However, Rainer Riesner, for example, in his review of scholarly efforts, names seven different chronologies. Some rely only on the ‘authentic’ letters, while others rely on Acts as well. All assume, mistakenly, that Paul’s life can be summed up by the evidence obtained in the letters found in the critical text. The ‘completeness’ of Codex Sinaiticus, on which the critical text stands, lures us into imagining that a complete story about Paul’s life can also be found by simply mining the Pauline Corpus of the critical text.

___

David Parker has recently called for a new methodology that “offers a different way of reading the Gospels...which treats seriously the fact that they are manuscripts” and which allows the scholar to “see what the consequences are of starting with that fact.”152 J.K. Elliott sees in his method a commitment to the notion: “that the repository of Christian tradition is to be found not in any one MS but in all of them.”153 In this line of thinking, each ancient papyrus or uncial is considered an ‘original’ rather than simply a carrier of tradition, and they do not mistakenly or correctly represent a lost autograph, but are traditions themselves with their own unique history at a particular time in history.154 In his study of the Gospels, for instance, Parker noted that the evidence points, not to an early standardized text, but a “text with its variants [that] remained fluid for centuries.”155 This method is also applicable to Pauline studies.

T.C. Skeat had earlier noted this variability in manuscripts as well as the drive towards more uniformity in the fourth century:

The different sequences in Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus, and the different contents alert us to the fact that these were pioneering times [in the mid-fourth century] when books and collections of books were being gathered from previously independent and isolated codices to form what was


154 Parker, 209.

155 Parker, 205.
intended to be an authoritative and demonstrable assemblage of books that defined the compass of the Christian canon in Greek.\textsuperscript{156}

Though earlier evidence betrays a vibrant variability and fluidity in the Christian writings, both the variability and the “gelling of ecclesiastical opinion in the fourth and fifth centuries”\textsuperscript{157} is not easily evident in the critical text.

In summary, the critical text, because it is constructed for the purpose of creating of a ‘more original text,’ is not a suitable database of ‘historical evidence’ for two principal reasons: it is a compilation rather than a collection of manuscripts, and its standardized text places a veil over the characteristics and historical transmission of extant manuscripts. Secondly, it relies on later manuscripts (especially Codex Sinaiticus), thus hiding the differences between the content of the three earliest collections of the letters of Paul. In short, though the critical edition of the New Testament contains ‘empirical traces’ of the life of the ancient Paul, it is a secondary source, not a primary source of ancient evidence.

To summarize this chapter thus far, two methodological problems exist in the production of Pauline biography. The first problem is that Paul's “breath of life” (his subjectivity) is left under-theorized; and the second problem is that the critical text of the New Testament is not suitable as the exclusive database for historical evidence. As I stated earlier in this

\textsuperscript{156} T.C. Skeat, \textit{The Collected Biblical Writings of T.C. Skeat} (Brill, 2004), 283.

\textsuperscript{157} Skeat, 283.
chapter, I intend to outline an alternative methodological practice that addresses these problems.
Contribution of Sartre and Historical Sociology

The works of Jean-Paul Sartre, specifically his text, *Search for a Method*, and the writings of historical sociologists who bring a corrective approach to both historical and sociological research, will be my primary conversation partners. Jean-Paul Sartre may seem like a strange bedfellow for Pauline biography, but I will demonstrate how he provides: a) a historical-biographical method, and b) an Existentialist-Marxist philosophy that allows us to theorize Paul as a unique human actor moving through ancient time, starting from a specific ancient social-historical location, and projecting himself towards his imagined future. The Sartrean framework, in short, calls for the integration of biography, history and social world.

Sartre’s work also fits with the project of historical sociology, that is—how to interpret how “organized (patterned) social relations are produced, maintained, and changed by social action deeply grounded in processes that are always historically based.” Like Sartre, historical sociologists still argue that an “empirical remnant from the past...testifies to the factual actions/situations that created or accompanied the remains and relics so deposited in the historical record.” Because it is not possible to write the complete or total life of

---


160 Bryant, 498.
an ancient man or understand the work of that man (without a full transcription of the facts) any reconstruction or “[h]istoriographic composition is…ultimately disciplined by the empirical and analytical constraints that are placed on interpretations by the available source materials.”161 A sound method for collecting historical evidence is therefore the first pre-requisite for any historical study. Sartre provides us with a well-reasoned methodological framework in which to interpret the evidence of the ‘empirical record’ and Historical Sociology provides us with a more in-depth discussion concerning the construction of that record.

Historical Sociology and Sartre’s ‘progressive-regressive’ biographical method are both committed to linking facts (“things done, deeds, accomplishments”) with evidence (the empirical remnants – “the manifestations or vestigial traces of those actions and occurrences), and with interpretation (“the reconstructed or synthesized facts…inferred from the empirical data).162 Therefore, Sartre’s Marxist-Existentialist philosophy, exemplified with assistance from Historical Sociology, provides a lens through which to interpret the “processual and structural logic of situated social action.”163

161 Bryant, 501.
162 Bryant, 499, 514.
163 Bryant, 514.
The goal of Chapter Two is to describe the basic concepts of Sartre's Marxist-Existentialist philosophy from *Search for A Method*. While a discussion of his philosophy may initially seem tangential, it will become clear that, for Sartre, philosophy and biographical research go together. Chapter Three provides a description of the basic elements of Sartre’s *progressive-regressive* method, and a description of how that method is applied and adapted (with the help of Historical Sociology). Chapter Four presents the biographical evidence gathered according to the method described in Chapter Three. Chapter Five describes how I create a *biographical ensemble* from the evidence accepted as biographical ‘facts’; how I ‘situate’ individual biographical facts (e.g. *apostolos*) within the social world of first century ancient Mediterranean world by means of social-historical studies; and how that ensemble is also placed in the Jewish/Greco-Roman ‘waves of history.’

Reading *through biography* is the methodological outcome of applying Sartre’s Marxist-Existentialist framework to the interpretation of texts. Through the Sartrean lens, a *biographical reading* makes Galatians *the work*, the *objectification* of a moment in time of the movement of Paul’s human *project* to act upon his social situation, and to leave behind its animating “scarcity”. When read through a *biographical lens*, a re-interpretation of Galatians ensues – one that is connected to Paul’s social situation, to the shape of his *project* of apostleship, and to the future he envisions. Chapter Six describes the steps involved in creating the illustrative *biographical reading* of Galatians that takes RP’s *biographical ensemble* (constructed from the biographical evidence and social situation described in Chapter Four and Five) as its starting point.
CHAPTER TWO

An Overview of Sartre’s Historical Anthropology

[T]he nature of the present individual's experience of both himself and his world is increasingly becoming the absent centre of the sociopolitical world.”

[M]en make their history on the basis of real, prior conditions...but it is the men who make it and not the prior conditions.”

Jean-Paul Sartre, best known for his work, Being and Nothingness (BN), was widely hailed as one of the most important statements of existentialist philosophy in European thought, especially in post-war France. According to Peter Caws, Sartre’s popularity:

…corresponded to a moment in which social structures, in France at least, were in effective dissolution. As the German occupation and the Vichy government collapsed, together they left a void in which, for a time there were no rules, so that existing subjects could have the experience of making their own, engaging in authentic praxis, standing forth towards things and one another in this heady and quasi-total freedom.

Caws’ characterization of Sartre might seem to imply that Sartre had a naively optimistic view of human freedom, drawn too narrowly from a brief moment of historical chaos.


165 Jean-Paul Sartre, 87.

Indeed, for many scholars, this view of BN has been enough for scholars to determine that Sartre’s philosophy has already fulfilled its purpose in laying out a full phenomenology of the existentialist position. Mark Poster, however, suggested in the 1970s that BN, written during World War II, is actually an example of Sartre’s political commitment to a radical social theory. He argued that the “inadequacy of French idealism in grasping world issues, its separation of reason from history, led Sartre to search for new ways of thinking.” Sartre presented his philosophy of radical freedom, pointedly and purposefully “at the worst moment of Europe’s time of troubles.” At a time when the occupation of France by Germany invited French collaboration with Nazi Germany in exchange for the maintenance of French autonomy, Sartre wrote about the nature of Being and posited the centrality of human freedom and human responsibility.

While Sartre famously captured the popular attention of the French people with BN, he also attracted the vehement critique of many Marxists over time. Mark Poster described the strands of this critique:

A continental sensation in the 1940s and 1950s, existentialism was advertised by Sartre as the new form of humanism actually more progressive than Marxism. Most commentators have not agreed with Sartre’s self-interpretation. They have seen in Sartre’s thought subjectivism, nihilism, and most commonly, a reliance on Descartes that precluded an association with socialist politics or radical social theory. In this interpretation, Sartre is no


168 Mark Poster, 79.
more than an extreme individualist, trapped in a morose world-view in which “hell is other people” and “man is a useless passion.” An irrationalist who flirted with the “absurd”, Sartre could not represent the oppressed masses in their plight. To these anti-Sartreans there is something almost obscene in the self-absorption of the existentialist. Nothing could be further from the struggles of the proletariat and from the social determinism of the Marxist view of history than Sartre’s narcissistic philosophy of anxiety.169

Sartre’s later work addresses some of these criticisms, but he also held relentlessly to the need for an analysis that included the singular and free human actor and thus, a non-determinist view of history. Pietro Chiodi has argued that Sartre simply could not imagine Marxism without Existentialism or Existentialism without Marxism, and so he attempted to create “a meeting between Marxism and Existentialism...to make use of the latter as a means to ascend from the “Marxism of [his] day” towards an authentic Marxism as existentialist realism.”170 Search for a Method is written in protest to an idealist/positivist Marxist method that, according to Sartre, erased all evidence of human freedom. Whether one believes that Sartre had been in conversation with Marxism from the beginning of his career171 or agrees with Raymond Aron that his thought changed after the war “from emphasis on [human beings] as total freedom to [humans]-in-the-world trying to act,”172 it

169 Poster, 72.


is clear that, after the Liberation of France in 1944, Sartre espoused an Existentialist Marxism that held onto both human actors and social structures.\textsuperscript{173}

To understand the vehement criticisms of Sartre’s work, it is important to outline the shape of the French Marxist tradition. Arthur Hirsch, in his book \textit{The French New Left}, argues that Marxism had arisen in the 1840s “in the context of rapid industrialization accompanied by revolutionary social upheaval …[and] represented a synthesis of German dialectical philosophy, British political economy, and French theories of socialism with the age-old moral eschatology of the oppressed.”\textsuperscript{174} It came late to France, and in these later forms, it was a “peculiar blend of positivism and evolution… [that] espoused a scientistic economic determinism rooted in mechanistic materialism.”\textsuperscript{175} Furthermore, he argued, it was a Marxism identified with Stalinism with its “economic determinist view of history and society [in which the] economic base entirely determined the political-cultural superstructure of society. Any kind of autonomy of super-structure from base was denounced as illusory.”\textsuperscript{176} Hirsch notes that the political agenda of the PCF (\textit{Parti Communiste Française}) also reflected the rigidity and authoritarianism of this ideology:

\footnotesize
\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textsuperscript{173} Poster, 78.
  \item \textsuperscript{175} Hirsch, 8.
  \item \textsuperscript{176} Hirsch, 12.
\end{enumerate}
[M]any leftist intellectuals who were politically sympathetic to the working class and socialism found this mental machinery deeply disturbing. For, not only was Stalinism intellectually constraining but the expression of any reservations or disagreements with it was greeted with hostility and suspicion. The Party claimed for itself exclusive right to determine the form and content of Marxist theory.\textsuperscript{177}

These historical events drew many intellectuals to Marx’s newly discovered manuscript, \textit{Paris Manuscripts of 1944}, and to renewed engagement with Hegel’s \textit{Phenomenology of Spirit}.\textsuperscript{178} In Marx’s early work they found the concept of alienation, and “it appeared that Marx himself [had] envisioned the emergence of a dehumanizing ‘crude communism’”\textsuperscript{179} that they were experiencing in Stalinism. The philosopher Alexandre Kojève, a Russian immigrant teaching in France, “laid the basis for a Marxist reading of Hegel which emphasized class struggle.”\textsuperscript{180} Merleau-Ponty, another rising philosopher seeking to integrate phenomenological insights within a Marxist framework, took Alexandre Kojève’s ideas and used them to posit the notion of the historical conditioning of reason “as an antidote to the traditional tenets of French rationalism and French Marxism”.\textsuperscript{181} His ideas undermined the authority of traditional Marxism and the PCF because it became clear that

\begin{flushright}
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\end{flushright}
“reigning dogmas” only represented particular stages in the totalizing movement of consciousness, rather than absolute truths.

Peter Caws argues that the structuralism that was “just beginning to be thought of in a few localities remote from Paris”\(^\text{182}\) at the beginning of Sartre’s career also downplayed the role of individual human beings. Roland Barthes, for example, spoke about “an act of knowledge without the knowing subject.”\(^\text{183}\) Lévi-Strauss “attribute[d] to myth the power to think and act without the involvement of individual subjects.”\(^\text{184}\) In their shared diminution of the acting subject, both Structuralism and Stalinism looked uncannily similar.

Sartre had no patience for either Stalinist Marxism or Structuralism without a human actor. Despite the growing influence of these philosophical-political frameworks, his early life and subsequent economic/educational status had contributed to his refusal to give up on freedom. Simone de Beauvoir, Sartre’s life partner and collaborator, would later claim that it was their “conditioning as young petit-bourgeois intellectuals that led [them] to believe [themselves] free of all conditioning whatsoever.”\(^\text{185}\) A sense of freedom, in other words,


\(^\text{184}\) Caws, 297.

was inherent in their privileged social situation. Sartre stated that he had always been in sympathy with the working classes, but admitted it took the war to provide him with the experience of a mode of Being without choice:

I remained inactive, doing nothing but writing, while in perfect sympathy with the Left. I lived through the whole period from 1918-1939 as through the dawn of a lasting peace. It took the war to open my eyes. There I was seeing myself as a minute and gleaming atom, and then along came massive forces which took hold of me and flung me on to the battlefront without asking my opinion.\textsuperscript{186}

Sartre now personally understood limitations to human freedom, but he did not displace Existentialism for Marxism in order to account for his experience. Instead, his war experiences led him, Pietro Chiodi argues, from a sympathetic, but detached inaction to a philosophy of commitment.\textsuperscript{187} After France’s Liberation, his writings portrayed his desire to defend existentialism, and to bring existentialism and Marxism together. Materialism and Revolution (1946), Existentialism is a Humanism (1946), Search for a Method (1957), Critique of Dialectical Reason (1960), and the first parts of the biography of Gustave Flaubert entitled, L’Idiot de la famille (1971) are all products of this desire. In all of these works, one can see his commitment to ‘keeping alive’ the freedom of the human actor while also anchoring that freedom soundly in historical-social conditions.

\textsuperscript{186} De Beauvoir, 396-97.

\textsuperscript{187} Chiodi, vii.
As Sartre engaged more with Marxism, his popularity decreased with French readers. Sociologists also didn’t have much use for his existentialist philosophy. Peter K. Manning has argued that sociology:

…assumed that man's [a person’s] behaviour was almost wholly determined by forces external to him and beyond his control. It was widely assumed that this external, almost changeless and timeless, reality could be appropriately studied by means of methods and techniques utilizing scientific categories used in advance, eschewing the reality of persons in everyday life, and designed to obtain data that were easily manipulated to produce verifiable and reproducible (i.e. valid and reliable) results independent of the time and place in which they were gathered.

After the events of May 1968, young French intellectuals were focused on the work of Michel Foucault, feminist thinkers such as Julia Kristeva, the psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan, and the philosopher Jacques Derrida. Structuralism replaced existentialism, and then post-structuralism was born in reaction to structuralism, and postmodernism in reaction to humanism. And even though “the theme of structure and agency has also been a fundamental issue in contemporary social theory” in the last twenty years, rarely has Sartre’s name been invoked. Sociologists and social theorists such as Foucault, Anthony
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Giddens, Pierre Bourdieu, Roy Bhaskar, and Jürgen Habermas have continued to grapple with the relationship between structure and agency, but a quick perusal of journal articles and books from the 1970’s to the present time reveals that, while questions have taken many turns, the answer has not yet been found.\textsuperscript{192} Consequently, James J. Valone’s earlier words still hold: “Sartre's proposal to preserve the irreducibility of the subject and the irreducibility of the social offers a challenge to the social sciences, particularly sociology, to develop an approach and methodology which provide access to both subjectivity and sociology.”\textsuperscript{193}

A return to Sartrean philosophy and methodology is a possibility at this particular time in history. Positivism, post-structuralism and post-modernism have added to the conversation about history, social structure and subjectivity, but they have left old questions unanswered. In many ways, we are still having the same conversation that Sartre was having with Marxism – how do we theorize the human actor in history without eliding human freedom or creating an ahistorical or rigid structuralist account? Sartre’s works are still significant because he attempted to create a method that retains a role for free and creative human

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{192} This is apparent in the continued scholarly conversation amongst scholars: See Sing C. Chew and J. David Knottnerus eds., \textit{Structure, Culture, and History: Recent Issues in Social Theory} (Landham, MD: Rowham & Littlefield, 2002) for a history of the sociological discussion of social structure and John Levi Martin, \textit{The Explanation of Social Action} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011) for a recent critique of sociological attempts to provide explanations for human behaviour.

\item \textsuperscript{193} James J. Valone, “Peeping through the keyhole: Sartre and Sociology,” \textit{International Philosophical Journal} 25, no. 3 (September 1985), 299.
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actors while also situating them within "variegated, contingent, and dynamically reflexive/social relations."\textsuperscript{194} Philosophers, sociologists and cultural anthropologists are still searching for ways to theorize "an individual social being with a biography not the same as that of anyone else."\textsuperscript{195} Therefore, although theorists have added much to the debate since Jean-Paul Sartre, because he stands outside the present flow of theory, he provides another lens through which to tackle this question.

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the basic concepts of Sartre’s Marxist Existentialist philosophy in order to use this philosophy for the analysis and interpretation of the life of Paul. Biographical methodology, I would argue, is inseparable from philosophy because the nature of human existence must be addressed when ‘writing a life’. Unless the collected biographical facts, and the description of the ancient social world in which they are embedded, are gathered into a reconstruction containing an explicit philosophy or ontology of human action, an inevitably implicit philosophy/social theory of human existence will guide our interpretations.

**An Overview of Sartre’s Overall Theory**

Because philosophy is commonly separated from social theory (human existence from social structures) in the categorization of knowledge in the academy, it will often seem out

\textsuperscript{194} Larry W. Isaac, 5.

of place to use the term ‘philosophy’. However, given that Sartre’s philosophy is both Existentialist and Marxist, he transcends that division. The following paragraphs summarize the basic concepts of his philosophical framework, and Chapter Three will describe the concepts used in his corresponding progressive-regressive method.

**Human Consciousness and Nothingness**

In Sartrean thought, there is no God who stands apart from the universe, a transcendent creator and/or controller of human consciousness, and no inner soul which determines the nature of human life. No mental or spiritual reality exists independent of matter. According to Sartre, consciousness is not contained ‘in the mind’; it is inseparable from the body, and can only be accomplished *by* the body. It does not, however, *inhabit* the body; it is wholly body, and “exists its body.” Therefore, according to Hazel E. Barnes, “Sartre says paradoxically that his philosophy is a materialism… [because] it gives… due weight to both matter and consciousness.”


It is not surprising then that Sartre was opposed to a description of consciousness that created a mind-body split, and attributed human *being* to either mind/Spirit or reduced it to physical processes.
Sartre believed that, at the core of human existence, there was only nothingness: “Nothingness lies coiled in the heart of being – like a worm.”\(^ {197}\) The first action of negation that the human being engages in is the act of negating nothingness, and this is the birth of consciousness. Consciousness is therefore *praxis* rather than substance, and because it is not a substance, it "has no inside; it is nothing but the outside of itself and it is this absolute flight, this refusal to be a substance, which constitutes it as a consciousness."\(^ {198}\) Consciousness is birthed by the action of revealing something, and all "consciousness is consciousness of something."\(^ {199}\) Barnes has attempted to put this concept into everyday terms:

> We as human beings confront a brute, concrete reality that existed before the evolution of conscious life. Into this undefined being, what we call consciousness introduces significance, differentiation, form, meaning, and our own purposes. Through our bodies we can use this universe, but there is nothing there that could properly be said to be responsive to us – only indifferent.\(^ {200}\)

But why is a discussion of consciousness important to the field of New Testament studies? Pauline biographers, I would argue, often interpret Pauline texts as if they reflect the hypostasized substance of Paul's thought and action, without imagining a human being (or

---


\(^ {199}\) Sartre, *BN*, 11.

\(^ {200}\) Hazel E. Barnes, *Sartre's Ontology*, 14.
groups of human beings) whose praxis, in part, “birthed” these texts. This leads to reading strategies that equate the reality of the life of Paul with the content of the critical text. To understand Pauline texts as only instances of the praxis of human consciousness would not allow us to read the Pauline corpus as if it were a transparent window that provides, not only a ‘pure’ reflection of Paul’s life, but completely frames that life as well. Consciousness as praxis cannot be fully captured by its products.

Sartre’s philosophy also challenges us to accept that negating nothingness is the origin of human being. If we were to apply this notion, for instance, to a reading of Paul’s ‘call’ or ‘conversion,’ it invites us to stand at some distance from Paul’s account. When God enters the text, biblical interpreters often name God as the cause of human action – without separating God from the human account of God. Because Paul states that he has acted in particular ways because God called him to do so by way of a revelation of Jesus Christ, his statement is largely taken as factual. Sartre would argue that this is an idealist interpretation that elides human action. To reconstruct the free, creative action of the ancient actor of the Pauline texts, we need to utilize a philosophy of human existence in which there is no "I", no social situation and no Divine Being 'outside' of human life that can fully explain human praxis because it causes or controls it. This is not to negate the importance of Paul’s interpretation of the events of his life (though one could be curious about why this one and not another) – but rather to understand Paul’s account of ‘his call’ as Paul acting within his particular situation away from the scarcity of his social situation towards a future he envisions.
Bodies and Consciousness

Sartre believed that corporeality preceded consciousness: “the very nature of the for-itself [consciousness] demands that it be body.”201 This means that consciousness is contingent on the body, my body “manifests my contingency”202 and “represents the individualization of my engagement in the world.”203 My body enables my perspective --- if I see an object to the left of me, and the person sitting to the left of me sees it to the right of them – both are correct because of the individualization of our bodily engagement in the world. Furthermore, according to Sartre, my body is not simply 'mine', but also exists as the “body-for-others” which is, in the words of Martin Jay, “frozen into an object by the look of other subjectivities.”204 Our actions are limited by what our senses perceive, by the looks of others upon our bodies, by the capabilities and limitations of our bodies, and our insertion in the field of other instruments (bodies) “since every instrument is utilizable and even apprehensible only by means of another instrument.”206 We are interdependent beings, not
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just emotionally, but bodily. The Marxist historian E.P. Thompson describes this interrelationship of thought, body, social world and relationships:

...the real is not "out there" and thought within the quiet lecture-theatre of our heads, "inside here". Thought and being inhabit a single space, which space is ourselves. Even as we think we also hunger and hate, we sicken or we love, and consciousness is intermixed with being; even as we contemplate the "real" we experience our own palpable reality. So that the problems which the "raw materials" present to thought often consist exactly in their very active, indicative, intrusive qualities. For the dialogue between consciousness and being becomes increasingly complex -- indeed, it attains at once to a different order of complexity, which presents a different order of epistemological problems --when the critical consciousness is acting upon a raw material made up of its own kind of stuff: intellectual artefacts, social relationships, the historical event. ²⁰⁷

In North American society, we are embedded in a culture that preaches that we can change our lives by changing our thoughts, as if they are separate from our bodies. This privileging of mind/mental activity over body/manual activity is so prevalent that it is not surprising that Pauline biographers pay very little attention to Paul's body, or if they do, they often imagine that he could leave it behind. The 'look' of others upon Paul’s body/action is rarely examined as an ingredient in his understanding of his life. The 'others' are often quickly named his opponents, wrong in their judgments of Paul, and bearing no significant impact on his life. ²⁰⁸ Given that a ‘broken’ or ‘limited’ body in the ancient and contemporary
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world is an ‘inferior’ one, when Paul laments or admits a bodily limitation, it is not surprising that most interpreters imagine his laments are ironic or metaphorical. It is also the rare scholar who questions, for instance, how far Paul had to walk between cities, what he ate while he was travelling, or where he slept. Sartre is therefore useful for Pauline biography because he reminds us that a life cannot be understood without understanding human action as always embodied.

**Independence of Consciousness and Things**

Central to Sartre’s philosophy of consciousness is his claim that consciousness and the objects of consciousness are independent of each other:

> Consciousness is consciousness of something. This means that transcendence is the constitutive structure of consciousness; that is, that consciousness is born supported by a being which is not itself. This is what we call the ontological proof....To say that consciousness is consciousness of something means that for consciousness there is no being outside of that precise obligation to be a revealing intuition of something...What can properly be called consciousness is consciousness of consciousness...To say that consciousness is consciousness of something is to say that it must produce itself as a revealed-revelation of a being which it is not it and which gives itself as already existing when consciousness reveals it.

---


Although this foray into philosophical argument may seem off tangent, these arguments are very significant. As a direct realist, Sartre opposed the objectivity of human perception, and a dualistic relationship between subject and object. Unlike Barthes, who argued that “the real is never any more than a meaning, which can be revoked when history requires it,” and Hayden White, who disallowed the distinction between "real" and "imaginary," Thomas Flynn notes that Sartre believed "because there is an event in-itself,… one can distinguish [between] the interpreted and the interpretation." Sartre refused to abandon the being-in-itself (brute existence). He affirmed the possibility of a multiplicity of interpretations, but he kept facts separate from the diversity of interpretations by attributing these different perspectives to: “the ‘for-others’ character of the event” while holding on to the “in-itself [which] accounts for its factical condition.” Being-in-itself (être-pour-soi) is the mode of existence of inanimate objects without


214 Sartre opposed historical relativism, but argued for the unity of the 'event': "Its content is entirely human, but the unity itself insofar as it is existence in-itself is radically nonhuman." According to Flynn, this “is the facticity of the for-others” which is described in Thomas R. Flynn, “Sartre and the Poetics of History” in The Cambridge Companion to Sartre, ed. Christina Howells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 218.
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consciousness, and therefore without the ability to act. Sartre argued that this is not the
mode of existence of human beings. Flynn provides a helpful summary of these terms:

Sartre acknowledges three distinct, irreducible dimensions of being, which,
inspired by Hegel, he terms being-in-itself, or the nonconscious, being-for-itself or consciousness, and being-for-others or the interpersonal, the public. He employs powerful metaphors to capture the difference between these three realms. The in-itself is inert, opaque, “sticky”, and so forth. It is the
sphere of brute fact, of chance, and of our facticity. The for-itself is spontaneous, translucent, the internal negation (“nihilation”) of the in-itself, a “hole”, in being. Finally, the for-others is the domain of other for-itselfs as other: correlative to our embodiedness, it is our liability to have the meaning of our projects “stolen” from us by the look (le regard) of the Other. 216

Flynn notes this conceptualization of the in-itself led Sartre to believe:

the historian must move on three planes…that of the for-itself, where he
tries to show how the decision appears to itself for the historical personage;
that of the in-itself where that decision is an absolute fact...finally that of the
for-others where the pure event is grasped, dated, and surpassed by other
consciousness’s as being of the world. 217

Although Sartre separated the ‘factual condition’ from interpretation, he was not a naive
realist who believed that our perceptions always mirror the actual properties of the objects
we perceive. He argued that a child, for instance, might think that the railroad tracks come
together in the distance. A pilot in a storm might mistake the sea for the sky. These
erroneous inferences drawn from our perceptions do not, however, prove that our

_____________________
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perceptions are untrustworthy. To see anything at all is to see that thing with particular organs, from a particular position in the world, and under particular conditions.

Sartre accordingly opposed Descartes, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Kant and Hegel because they took up this question concerning the relationship between objects in the world and our ideas about them and chose to focus their challenge on the objectivity of our human perceptions. What these philosophers misunderstood, he argued, was the distinction between things and consciousness, and the embodied nature of consciousness. Sartre countered that “consciousness cannot exist except as consciousness of a being other than itself, and that being, he assumes, is the contingent being of the physical world.” Facts are not just interpretations even if there are multiple perspectives or interpretations for one event. Furthermore, “consciousness is not alone in the world it has created from the brute ‘in-itself’, indeed it has not created the world individually, but rather as part of an intersubjective community.” Sartre retains the ‘fact’ without denying the influence of our embodiment on our interpretation of brute existence.

Consequently, Sartre offers a helpful antidote to a discipline plagued by challenges to the status of historical knowledge. Joseph Bryant outlines this dilemma. He argues that, on the
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one hand, positivists have insisted that historical reconstructions are not persuasive because "the evidentiary materials preserved in the historical record are, in most cases, too fragmentary and unrepresentative for the formulation of generalizable and testable propositions." On the other hand, postmodern interpreters “maintain that what passes for ‘factual’ about the past is, in actuality, a fabulatory product of the present, a ventriloquial simulation keyed to whatever master narrative or hegemonic discourse informs the historian’s emplotment needs and strategies.”

Sartre’s Marxist-Existentialist philosophy is neither congruent with the positivist nor the postmodern practice of history. The objects of the empirical record which attest to that past are l'être en soi (objects of brute existence) attesting to ‘the past’ which is no more, but is available through its ‘remains’ as an object for interpreting human actors.

Biblical scholars have fallen into the trap set by poststructuralist and postmodern theorists. The postmodern critique of modernist historiography resulted in a move away from historical research to other reading strategies that do not seek to find the ‘world behind the text’ or re-construct the life of the texts’ author. Sartre’s separation of the in-itself from the for-itself, and from the for-others of a human life, however, creates the possibility for a new analytical triad to: a) collect and describe the ‘empirical record’ from which we can re-construct the in-itself (the remains of the past); b) theorize the for-itself (how that life
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appeared to the historical personage) within an explicit methodological framework; and c) separate each of these from the for-others aspect (our contemporary investments). We can follow each three aspects of our work systematically, ethically and transparently, but Sartre also reminds us that the ancient life of Remembered Paul always exceeds the for-others account that we create.

**Need and Scarcity**

Sartre believed that the concrete starting point of human action is found in the "material conditions" which are “lived in the particularity of particular situations.”

These social-economic conditions, he argued, do not simply exist "out there in the world” but are internalized by human beings. They would not ‘provoke’ human action if a human being "did not feel the diminution in their flesh in the form of a need or of a fear based on bitter experiences." In his thinking, human “need is the first totalizing relation between the material being, man [human being] and the material ensemble of which he is a part.”

What all human beings share in common, Sartre argues, is that the “living body… is in danger in the universe, and the universe harbours the possibility of the non-being of the organism.” Material conditions may provide possibilities for human action, but they also
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create scarcity for all human beings, through which human need is shaped. Flynn notes that:

Sartre came to recognize how the economic conditions the political in the sense that material scarcity, as... Marx insisted, determines our social relations. In Sartre's reading, scarcity emerges as the source of structural and personal violence in human history as we know it. It follows, he believes, that liberation from such violence will come only through the counter violence of revolution and the advent of a “socialism of abundance.”

Therefore, in Sartre’s view, every human being is embedded in a social situation which creates a scarcity that the human actor desires to escape. Although this could be interpreted, within a particular Marxist lens, as simply referring to economic scarcity and alienation from the means of production, Nik Farrell Fox has elaborated the concept’s broader interpretation:

In conditions of scarcity, the gratification of one’s individual need is at the same time a threat to everyone else. Conflict becomes inevitable in this way as the result of material scarcity which casts each as the potential enemy and thief of the possibilities of the other... In such conditions it is inevitable that some people are designated in some way as ‘expendables’ and as ‘non-human’ in relation to the provision of scarce resources.

People and events appear within the “compass of scarcity,” that is, within the reality of a society “still incapable of emancipating itself from its needs.” Therefore, each human

———


228 Sartre, SM, 132.
action, however rudimentary, must be “determined both in relation to the real and present factors [of scarcity] which condition it and in relation to a certain object, still to come, which it is trying to bring into being.”229

If Sartre’s emphasis on scarcity applies to any time in history, it certainly applied to the historical period in which Remembered Paul lived, in the shadow of Roman rule. Yet, the negative realities of human existence—sickness and disease, bodily injury and deformity, hunger and famine and fatigue, as well as the physical and emotional effects of physical violence, oppressive social structures, and the social-biological needs for touch, relationship, belonging and community—are often downplayed or absent from biblical interpretations. It is important to return to a Sartrean emphasis on scarcity and human need because, failing to do so, creates interpretations that appear to be based on the assumption that Remembered Paul’s economic needs were irrelevant (because they were fulfilled), and that motivations for action, as a result, reside on a ‘higher’ level of need (e.g. identity, intellectual success, or religious excellence). If scarcity is the common experience (in some form) for all human beings, then it must show itself in our biographical reconstructions.

**Anxiety and Making Meaning**

Sartre asserted that if there was an anchoring origin built into human existence, there would be no reason for human beings to experience existential dread as they do. However, if
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nothingness, as Sartre claimed, is the origin of consciousness, then consciousness is our attempt to escape from nothingness (and its resulting anxiety) by means of the human action(s) of "projecting [consciousness] into the 'me'". Sartre argued that this strategy of escape is never completely successful, and there is "an anxiety which is imposed on us…which we cannot avoid." ²³⁰ Sartre argued that Humanism is the human response to this nature of being:

Fundamentally it is this: man is constantly outside of himself; in projecting himself, in losing himself outside of himself, he makes for man's existing; and, on the other hand, it is by pursuing transcendent goals that he is able to exist; man, being the state of passing-beyond, and seizing upon things only as they bear upon this passing-beyond, is at the heart, as the centre of this passing-beyond. There is no universe other than a human universe, the universe of human subjectivity. ²³¹

In light of Sartre's ideas about consciousness, David Sherman notes that Sartre believes that “being does not have a ‘meaning’ that is waiting to be ‘revealed,’ but this does not mean that there is no "meaning of being." He goes on to say:

A basic part of what it is to be a human being is to attribute meaning to the world… Sartre has no interest in conferring a meaning on (or otherwise deifying) being at the expense of the meaning conferring subject, for he believes…the individual’s conscious experience of the world is at the heart of the phenomenological impulse. ²³²


²³² Sherman, 91.
Sherman makes it clear that Sartre's theorization of nothingness brings consciousness and the meaning of being resolutely within the temporal movement of concrete things and human action. This places the action of ‘meaning-making’ into the centre of one’s material existence. This is not the meaning-making of cognitive behavioural therapy or the Rational Subject – rather it is human praxis that is deeply embedded within the material possibilities and constraints of the particular life.

In much of biblical interpretation the meaning of the biblical text is totally divorced from the life of the ancient person in whose name the words were penned. The questions are often: “What does the text say?” and “What does the text mean?” To apply this aspect of Sartrean philosophy to biblical interpretation requires that we remember that the ‘texts’ that we examine are the products of an ancient human life (or lives), who were/are human being(s) in the process of making sense of their particular world. Seen in this light, ‘Paul’ was not finding truths about God, his apostleship, or the relationship between Jew and Gentile, he was creating them, and the particularity of that creation arises from the action of a human being particularly embedded in material and social conditions. If we take this as our methodological starting point, we must examine ‘Pauline’ texts without imposing a restrictive barrier a priori -- a boundary by which we know in advance the God by which the freedom and action of the human being is ignored. If human consciousness is praxis aimed at negating nothingness (and the anxiety of that being), the importance of human meaning-making must be re-instated when reading ‘Pauline’ texts, not simply as the
disembodied production of knowledge for its own sake, but as the products of human actors seeking to make meaning of human being.

Many scholars have interpreted the meaning of Pauline words or phrases by matching them with occurrences of the same words or phrases in other ancient texts. The assumption seems to be that we can discover the meaning that Paul was making if we understand what the other person ‘meant’ -- as if all women or men use words for the same purposes. For instance, E.A. Judge assumes that when Paul refers to himself as an idiōtēs tō logō he cannot really mean he was unskilled in speech because an ancient educated aristocrat also once used the same phrase and was clearly not untrained in speech. The human actor (and the diversity of ancient material conditions in which actors lived) is completely taken out of the picture when word matching is used to explain a human life. However, to take nothingness as origin (rather than group membership or family of origin, or shared linguistic conventions, for example) means that the actions (and products) of meaning-making in the Pauline letter collection must be understood as responses to problems of his particular human experience. Even if Paul the Jew grew up with social practices, texts and historical events that were, to a large degree, similar to those of many other ancient Jews in the Mediterranean, these shared experiences are only the starting point. They tell us about a set of ‘common beliefs, but they do not tell us how Paul internalized and externalized them according to his human project. If Philo, Josephus or Cicero used a word that Paul

uses, assuming we could know what they each meant, we cannot assume that this is what
Paul meant. What a ‘normal’ human being would do tells us only about the backdrop of a
life, not how a particular human being engaged that backdrop.

Jonathon Z. Smith describes the relationship between religion and meaning-making:

Religion is the quest, within the bounds of the human, historical condition,
for the power to manipulate one's "situation" so as to have "space" in which
to meaningfully dwell. It is the power to relate one's domain to the plurality
of environmental and social spheres in such a way as to guarantee the
conviction that one's existence 'matters'.

The failure to take into account the particular life situation in which Paul finds himself has
led to idealist-theological accounts of ‘Pauline thought’ which exist apart from the life
which produced them. Sartre understood this practice as form of violence in which we use
people as things. Failure to acknowledge the nature of human existence (people as
meaning-making human actors) also leads to a form of idealism: deterministic
structuralism. In structuralist accounts, people are interpreted as the ‘carriers’ of social
structures or the effects of external causes. In theological accounts, social structures are
replaced by the omnipotent actions of a Divine Being which cause human action.

Ignoring that meaning-making is central to human existence also fits with an academic
culture in which ‘objective’ and ‘professional’ have been defined and practiced in ways
which fail to acknowledge the relational aspect of our own knowledge, that is, they fail to
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take into account that we can only comprehend the lives of others as we attempt to understand our own:

Thus significations come from [human beings] and from his [/her] project, but they are inscribed everywhere in things and in the order of things. Everything at every instant is always signifying, and significations reveal to us [human beings] and relations among [human beings] across the structures of our society. But these significations appear to us only insofar as we ourselves are signifying. Our comprehension of the Other is never contemplative; it is only a moment of our praxis, a way of living – in struggle or in complicity – the concrete, human relation which unites us to him [or her].

In Sartre’s view, not only are meanings created rather than found, our meaning-making activity always occurs in relationship with other human actors.

**Human Beings in Groups**

Although Sartre has been characterized as an individualist, much of his writing in *Critique of Dialectical Reason* is focused on explaining human groups. The human actor who seeks to surpass a situation of lack or need, and to make meaning of their being, does so in contact and relationship with other human actors also doing the same. Therefore, history results "from the confrontation of [human] projects." Each human being acts (creating history), and "the consequences of our actions always end up by escaping us, since every concerted

---
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enterprise, as soon as it is realized, enters into relation with the entire universe, and… this infinite multiplicity of relations goes beyond our intentions.” A Sartrean researcher searches for “the life”, not within the human psyche, but within a complex web of human relations because the unique individual is found ”conditioned by his human relations.” The majority of these groups, Sartre argues, are “local, definite, immediately given,” and are fluid collections of human actors:

[T]he group never has and never can have the type of metaphysical existence which people try to give to it. We repeat with Marxism: there are only [human beings] and real relations between [human beings]. From this point of view, the group is in one sense only a multiplicity of relations and of relations among those relations.

This multiplicity of relations, Sartre argues, does become fetishized so that ”the market [for instance], at first a simple complex of human relations, tends to become more real than the sellers and their customers.” In the same way, a person’s social ‘class’ might become a conceptualization that is based in the group and is mediated by the group even as the group is mediated by the conceptualization of ‘class’. To say that I grew up in a ‘working class’
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household is to create a conceptualization that then takes on a life of its own. To say that Remembered Paul was a ‘simple’ man, an ‘aristocrat’, a ‘manual labourer’ or a ‘Jew’ (without an understanding of ancient groups in which RP was embedded) often leads to interpretations that say more about our conceptualization of groups in contemporary history than about RP’s life.

This emphasis on the group leads Sartre to search Gustave Flaubert's writings for clues about his life in the social groups Flaubert was embedded in at particular times in his life-history, including "his family group as a reality lived and denied". He placed Flaubert within bourgeoisie society, but he did not name the family or bourgeois society as the ‘cause’ of Flaubert’s particular actions. Instead, consistent with his philosophy, he argued that the child experienced his bourgeois family as "universality lived in particularity". Human actors are embedded in groups, and group membership conditions human action, but it does not control it.

To write a biography of the Remembered Paul, it is therefore important to examine how his group memberships also conditioned and animated his ancient life. To understand RP the apostle, it is necessary to place him within a group of co-workers, within a larger group of apostles (some whom he applauds and others he demonizes), amongst other followers of Christ, and an Israelite within the multiplicity of ‘Jewish’ groups in the first century. The interpretive tendency of creating an ‘inside’ with Paul in the centre (the correct Christian

\footnote{Sartre, SM, 142.}
way) and an ‘outside’ (seen through all that Paul opposes) has led to demonizing reconstructions of ‘Jew’ and ‘law’, for instance, that rely on a failure to recognize group diversity, and the sometimes contentious nature of group membership in any time and place.

**Human Actors: Both Free and Not Free**

French structuralism was, in Sartre's eyes, a theory of the human world that dispensed with human beings. As a result, "all his major criticism of the structuralists turn on their failure to make room for human subjectivity and praxis." Sartre refused to abandon contingency, heterogeneity, or the freedom of humans acting upon the social situation which conditions them. Human action, he believed, has a reciprocal relationship to history in the human "interiorization of exteriority" and also in the "exteriorization of interiority."

Social structures provide limitations and possibilities for human agency, but they do not determine human action. Human beings are not simply passive products of social forces or the sum of conditioned reflexes.

Sartre also did not treat all structures equally. In line with Marxist thought, he placed greater weight on economic structures:

> economic conditions - no matter how much influenced they may be by other political and ideological conditions - are nevertheless, in the final analysis,

---

the determining conditions, constituting from one end to the other the guiding thread which alone puts them in a position to understand.\textsuperscript{245}

However, in the continuation of his thought, he also reaffirmed human freedom and refused economic determinism:

There does not exist, as one would like to imagine now and then, simply for convenience, any effect produced automatically by the economic situation. On the contrary, it is men themselves who make their history, but within a given environment which conditions them.\textsuperscript{246}

Sartre believed that the “material conditions of [a person’s] existence circumscribe the field of [her] his possibilities.”\textsuperscript{247} Yet, he did not accept the structuralism that was espoused by Levi-Strauss and Althusser. Caws summarizes Sartre’s view:

The totality appears as a thing without man, a network of oppositions in which each element is defined in terms of another, where there is no fixed point, but only relations, only differences. But this thing without man is at the same time matter worked by man, bearing the trace of man….If you admit the existence of such a system, you must also admit that language exists only as spoken, in other words in act. Each element of the system refers to a whole, but this whole is dead if nobody takes it up for his own purposes, makes it work.\textsuperscript{248}

To counteract this problematic thinking, Sartre developed his concept of the practico-inert in \textit{Critique of Dialectical Reason}. Caws summarizes his thought:

\begin{quote}
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The practico-inert...consists of everything we encounter ready-to-hand, as there waiting for us, at our disposal that has been devised and put in place by the praxis of our fellows and predecessors. So it includes not only tools and buildings, parks and fields, books and records, but also customs and traditions and language itself. Our life is conducted in its terms; we have serial relation to it, in that each of us makes his or her own way in relation to the installations and expectations we encounter, and this has led to a perception of the practico-inert as alien and oppressive, but...the other side of this coin is its character as liberating and facilitating. Any given episode of that life is an intersection of our freedom with its fixity.\textsuperscript{249}

The practico-inert, therefore provides limitations on a human life. Human life is not completely free, there is a fixity which cannot be transcended. For this reason, Sartre acknowledged the influence of structure, but he refused to give up existence for structure. The human actor, conditioned and limited by structures, is also free, within those structures, to find a way surpass them.

There are Pauline scholars who have included an examination of social structures in the ancient social world when interpreting texts, but I would argue that they have generally created determinist or generalizing analyses which have not shown “in concrete detail, how an individual life interiorizes the meaning of its historical context, and how it [a human actor] projects itself through this context in an irreducibly particular way of its own.”\textsuperscript{250} Sartre provides us with a reminder to examine linguistic, institutional, historical, familial,

\textsuperscript{249} Caws, 310.

\textsuperscript{250} Yirmiahu Yovel, “Existentialism and Historical Dialectic” \textit{Philosophy and Phenomenological Research} 39, no. 4 (June, 1979), 494.
and economic structures in the ancient world in which Paul lived, to understand the powerful impact of these structures, and to refuse them ultimate control over a human life.

**Human Projects**

Sartre used the concept of *the project* to explain the movement of human action whereby human beings attempt to "go beyond" their particular situation, to wrench themselves from material scarcity, and to inhabit a better situation, the better future they envision. It is the *project* that is the “mediation between two moments of objectivity [that] can account for history; that is, for human creativity.” In relationship to “the given” or the “in-itself” (the conditioning material conditions and brute existence which characterize human existence), the *project* as *praxis*, is negativity. That is, the goal of human action is to negate the limitations inherent in that social situation. Yet, in relation to the future that is aimed at, *praxis* is positive. Because a human being acts within the perspective of an envisioned future, the *project* is therefore both a backwards and forward-looking movement.

By projecting ourselves toward our desired future, so as to escape the material contradictions of our existence, these contradictions are both unveiled and revealed in our very action (even though this action is richer than its contradictions and gives us access to a social world in which new contradictions will involve us in new conduct). Thus we can say, through human action, we continually surpass our racial, social class or gender

---

conditioning, for instance, and that these forms of conditioning are made manifest by means of this very surpassing.

Putting the project(s) of human actors in tension with conditioning social structures allows Sartre to avoid idealism:

There are two ways to fall into idealism: The one consists of dissolving the real in subjectivity; the other in denying all real subjectivity in the interests of objectivity. The truth is that subjectivity is neither everything nor nothing; it represents a moment in the objective process (that in which externality is internalized), and this moment is perpetually eliminated only to be perpetually born.252

As I stated in Chapter One, Pauline scholarship has been beset by one or both of these forms of idealism. Therefore, the notion of project is important for Pauline biographers because it provides a methodological wedge/lens by which we can ensure that we create the needed gap between ‘the text’ of the Corpus of the Remembered Paul, and the historical life (lives) that gave rise to it. Biographies that do not make explicit their theories about ‘the direction’ of RP’s life usually have made assumptions about what motivates human beings, but these assumptions are drawn too easily from contemporary dominant discourses. Michael Grant, for instance, stated that Paul was a tentmaker because his father was a merchant “and the merchant’s son learnt the same craft in his turn.”253 Paul was motivated by family tradition.

252 Sartre, SM, 33.

253 Michael Grant, Saint Paul, 13.
Murphy-O’Connor presumes that Paul grew up in Tarsus, and to explain his departure, he argues: “we must presume the normal…He ventured out into the world, as young men have ever done, only when he had finished his basic education.” Sartre’s concept of project foregrounds the need to challenge our own stereotypes (e.g. gender, class, and race) with a methodological framework that requires us to define the work (the writings of Paul as explained further in Chapter Three) of Paul as the objectification of his project – an instance of his movement, a human acting on his social situation of scarcity towards the abundance of his envisioned future.

The Movement of Human Freedom in Time

Sartre’s understandings of the subjective features of time are in line with the practice of Historical Sociology. Larry W. Isaac describes a historical-sociological approach to time:

Good sociological explanation of how and why a social process unfolds, or works the way it does, requires a socially structured logic that is itself explicitly grounded in concrete, active temporalities of social life. This is so because social life occurs in temporal regimes that structure, order, and regulate human lives. However, we are not only in temporal orders (clocks, schedules etc.) but by means of time conscious and coerced behaviour we come to internalize forms of temporality itself. Time is not only the rhythmic unfolding of events but is internal to us and the stories we tell.

254 Murphy-O’Connor, Paul: A Critical Life, 46.
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Thus, the movement of human action is embedded firmly within the concrete historical situation. Human freedom is not a once-and-for all action. Historiality (a Sartrean term) is the perspective of a subject that must actively make itself in history rather than the perspective of a subject that is wholly made by history.\textsuperscript{256} As Aronson states, Sartrean human actors are perpetually in motion:

What happens from generation to generation (and also in space) is the perpetual fall and transformation of subject into object. What was goal becomes starting point. But as a result, disorder. Instead of the unity of a single consciousness the intermediate result is both disorder and preparation for order: it is mediation. But if one must start all over from the beginning, the mediation is lost, it becomes obstacle. What was the Same becomes the Other. Christianity as subjective operation of liberation becomes, for the next generation, crystallized given and the principle of human government. Perpetual opposition between the given order which is disorder for the newcomers (the established order) and the living disorder (negation of order) which is subjective order. Everyone returns to the other the characterization of "disorder". Thus the situation always remains the same: a disorder (which is subjective order of the living operation transformed into object) starting from which consciousness exercises its negativity.\textsuperscript{257}

Sartre argues that "the dialectical temporality of history entails seeing humans as not being in time but rather as seeing time created by them."\textsuperscript{258} The roles that we inhabit, he asserts, do not remain static over a frozen life, yet they are also not discarded rapidly within a disjointed life. There is direction and openness in that movement. Sartre suggests that "life

\textsuperscript{256} Sherman, 105.
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develops in spirals, [and] it passes again and again by the same points but at different levels of integration and complexity."\textsuperscript{259} This understanding of temporality involves both past and future in which the present given is a previous given surpassed (the past), and the future is the present given negated.\textsuperscript{260} For Sartre, when this reality is ignored, the present givens which are surpassed get represented as "past determinations ruling men [human beings] in the way that a cause rules its effects."\textsuperscript{261} Instead, he argues, "society is presented to each man [or woman] as a perspective of the future and that this future penetrates to the heart of each one as a real motivation for his [or her] behavior."\textsuperscript{262}

Biblical scholars have generally limited their understanding of movement in the life of Paul to the construction of the chronology of Pauline texts. The problem with this approach is that it creates movement in a human life by means of the idealist method of simply chronologically ‘ordering’ Pauline texts or thought with a few references to external events. Sartre reminds us that movement in a life is related to a human existentialist project that is also grounded in an objective concrete situation. The ‘past’ which cannot be changed (but exists as an object in human memory) and the present situation are continually being re-formed in relation to the future envisioned, and the future envisioned is the surpassing of
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human need which is created by the objective social situation. The movement of an ancient human life is therefore much greater than the order of the ‘traces’ of that human project.

In summary, the description of Sartre’s Marxist-Existentialist philosophy (and its basic concepts) provides a philosophical-methodological framework which can serve as a corrective to Pauline biography. Sartre’s philosophy provides a theory of subjectivity and human agency that eliminates neither human beings acting upon their social situation, nor the fixity of that situation which both constrains and enables them. Chapter Three provides an account of how this philosophy is then translated into a biographical-historical-social methodology (using Sartre’s progressive-regressive method as the starting point) used to interpret ‘Pauline’ texts and write a ‘Pauline’ biography.
CHAPTER THREE

The Methodological Framework

Jean-Paul Sartre’s research question was: “Who must Gustave Flaubert have been in order to have…the possibility of portraying himself as a woman?”263 Furthermore, what was it about the social-historical period in which Flaubert lived, and his particular biography that allowed him to write his first and most famous published novel, Madame Bovary and then say afterwards: “I myself am Madame Bovary”?264 In line with Sartre’s belief that there is a dialectical relationship between the life of a human actor (that is, their particular social situation) and the work they produce (whether a literary work or a Pauline biography), he did not view Flaubert’s novel as “the mere expression or illustration of an author’s vision or personality,”265 but rather the objectification or “the incarnation of an active project.”266 That is, any meaning we might ascribe to the work of human action, the resulting ‘products’ we can touch, read, view, hear, taste or touch, must incorporate this inseparable relationship that exists between human subjects and the objects they produce. To understand the work, one must also understand that is inseparable from the life -- from the possibilities and
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limitations for action that are conditioned by the social situation in which human action is embedded. Thus, to interpret the meaning of *the work*, one must also understand *the life*.

Sartre provides the following explanation:

> The work poses questions to the life. But we must understand in what sense; the work as the objectification of the person is, in fact, *more complete, more total* than the life. It has its roots in the life, to be sure; it illuminates the life, but it does not find its total explanation in the life alone…The life is illuminated by the work as a reality whose total determination is found outside of it – both in the conditions which produce it and in the artistic creation which fulfills it and *completes it by expressing it*. Thus the work – when one has examined it – becomes a hypothesis and a research tool to clarify the biography."267

As stated in Chapter Two, Sartre used the term *project* to explain the movement of human action from present social situation (scarcity, lack, need, possibilities) towards an *envisioned future*. For this reason, Ann Ferguson states, in Sartrean biographical interpretation, “to appreciate the force of literature’s intervention in the world requires the [interpreter] to ground the literary text in the existential *project* of its author.”268 And to interpret the *project*, one must ground that interpretation also in the social world – in a *particular* biography and in a socially-situated *envisioned future*.

Sartre translated this Marxist-Existentialist philosophy into a methodological framework which he entitled *progressive-regressive*. It provides the concepts and methods for a

267 Sartre, *SM*, 142.
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historical-biographical method that allowed him to interpret Flaubert’s literary texts as representations of how he was able to transform his own world “on the basis of given conditions,”\(^{269}\) -- an interpretation that is an objectification of Sartre’s *project* to demonstrate how human beings “themselves make their history but in a given environment which conditions them.”\(^{270}\) He utilized a basic historical method (examining primary and then secondary sources of evidence) with a well-reasoned theoretical framework. Combining Marxism with Existentialism allowed him to ‘materialize’ his existentialism and ‘enliven’ Marxist analyses. Similarly, a cross-disciplinary approach allows Sociologists to ‘ground’ their analyses in historically-grounded accounts, and historians to produce sociologically-informed narratives from historical evidence.

Sartre utilized two movements: the *regressive* movement (an examination of *the life* and *the work*) and the *progressive* movement (or interpretive) aspect of the method, in which the researcher seeks to describe the *movement* of human action, *the project* through which a human actor “aims at the production of [themselves] in the world as a certain objective totality.”\(^{271}\) This method (elaborated further by methodological discussion in Historical Sociology), with modifications to account for the realities of studying an *ancient* life and the life of an *apostolos* rather than a published author of literary works, provides a useful

\(^{269}\) Sartre, *SM*, 91.
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framework (due to its improved historical method and theoretical interpretive framework) for interpreting ‘Pauline’ texts.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe how the basic concepts and methods of Sartre’s progressive-regressive method will be translated into methods (with help from Historical Sociologists) for identifying and collecting the ancient artefacts, the historical evidence for the life and the work of Remembered Paul (RP). The first adaptation is to refer to Remembered Paul rather than Paul. In line with Sartre, I wish to keep alive the notion that the ‘remains’ of the life attest to the existence and the work of the Historical Paul. However, the nature of that evidence reveals that the letters as we have received them betray the traces of earlier editing activities. To acknowledge the gap between actions objectified by Paul, the empirical ‘memory’ of those actions, and our hand in re-construction, I have chosen the term Remembered Paul. The reconstruction of the work of Remembered Paul: The Work (also RP: The Work) will be presented in this chapter.

The remaining regressive and progressive steps of this method will be illustrated in later chapters. Chapter Four will provide a visual representation of the biographical evidence obtained from RP: Biographical Evidence. The concepts of scarcity, social situation, and the process needed to embed particular biographical facts within larger social structures will be described and applied in Chapter Five. The concepts of project and envisioned future, and the process of interpretation of RP: The Work in Chapter Six, are further discussed and operationalized in that chapter.
Constructing Each Empirical Record

An examination of the work and the life of Remembered Paul requires the construction of an empirical record/database of evidence for each, and a delineation of their contents. This is one of the challenges of applying Sartre’s method to ancient history. While Sartre simply collected published copies of Flaubert’s literary works, and found written traces of biographical information, the nature of evidence is somewhat more complicated for this study. Furthermore, because Sartre was a philosopher, he was more interested in philosophical concepts than providing detail about data collection methods. However, with the help of methodological discussions in historical sociology, the strengths of his method can be utilized, and the weaknesses strengthened by this cross-disciplinary approach.

Each of these empirical records will be constructed on the basis of primary data – that is, extant manuscripts which, in the first case of RP: The Work, attest to ancient collections and fragments of the ‘letters of Paul’ (representing the work: the objectifications of his project) and, in the second case, RP: Biographical Evidence, contains statements either attributed to ‘Paul’ or made about ‘Paul’ that contain biographical evidence (descriptions of the life of Paul). Not only does this method replicate Sartre’s reliance on primary data, but it is also considered basic to good historical method. However, given that the critical edition of the New Testament is usually employed to identify the evidence of the work and the life of Paul, it is necessary for me to explain this further.

I have previously critiqued the use of the critical edition of the New Testament as the primary source for historical research about Remembered Paul. Because it is constructed
with the methods of text criticism, it presents us with a ‘standardized’ text, a compilation of primary sources arranged according to the notion of a ‘more original text’. I listed four impacts: a) our marginalization of Hebrews; b) our assessment of differences between manuscripts on the basis of a ‘complete’ New Testament (e.g. discussion about ‘missing’ Pastoral Epistles); c) our reliance on internal analysis and circular reasoning to explain manuscript differences (division of corpus into authentic, deuter-Pauline and Pastoral letters); and d) our muddled use of Acts alongside our marginalization of non-canonical sources.

According to traditional historical method, the historian compiles primary datum relevant to the research question posed, numbers each artefact to identify one from another, and arranges all artefacts, minimally, in chronological order (or some other form of classification). According to the application of this method, the extant, numbered and dated papyri, uncial and minuscule that contain ‘Paul’s’ ‘writings’ (evidence of the work) and/or auto/biographical statements (evidence of the life) should provide the basis of the database.

Although the critical edition of the New Testament is dependent on primary sources for its text, it is a secondary and modern compilation of that primary data, constructed with methods used for constructing the ‘more original text’. As a consequence, although it may succeed for that purpose, it presents the following barriers to historical research: a) the extant primary sources upon which it is based, although (or when) numbered and listed in the critical apparatus, do not appear in their original form; b) primary sources are also not arranged in chronological order (e.g. the order of Pauline letters in Nestlé-Aland is not
attested in any extant manuscript); and c) because the text is reliant on fourth century Codex Sinaiticus and later manuscripts to determine the contents of the Pauline Corpus, it masks the differences between earlier and later Pauline letter collections (e.g. p⁴⁶, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus); d) Although the UBS³ text, on which Nestlé-Aland is based, was constructed by a committee, the critical edition doesn’t provide a description of the textual theory they employed or how they employed internal or external criteria, thus making it difficult to assess their decisions. These characteristics, common to secondary sources, make it difficult (if not impossible) for researchers to glean the primary data, on which it is based, from its text.

The scholar-constructed text with ‘authentic’ letters, deuto-Pauline letters, Pastoral Epistles, partitioned letters, lost letters, and interpolations, though an attempt to bring to light the differences with and between various texts ‘hidden’ by the critical edition, is also problematic because it too is a modern secondary source, heavily reliant on the notion that the Pauline Corpus contains ‘authentic’ letters amongst pseudonymous letters.²⁷² This idealist categorization is not based on material evidence. If one were able to see the hands of three different scribes or the variants of earlier texts in the scholar-constructed ‘Pauline Corpus’ that G. Zuntz found in p⁴⁶ (in two manuscripts: Chester Beatty II in Dublin and

²⁷² G. Zuntz, 2. He similarly criticizes scholars for relying on the text of Westcott and Hort: “It is characteristic that the editor of the latest full commentary on one of the New Testament Epistles – a work otherwise of great labour and merit – has felt justified in taking their sixty-year-old text, en bloc, for the basis of his exposition.”
Inv. 6238 at the University of Michigan),\textsuperscript{273} it would be more difficult to identify any letter as ‘authentic’ in an already edited text.\textsuperscript{274} When we examine the critical edition of the New Testament, searching for differences in language, vocabulary, writing style and theology, the idea that these differences may be the result of the material production of texts rather than the ‘mind of Paul’ gets lost. Similarly, Harry Gamble’s assertion that the Pauline letters (except Romans) “remain fundamentally the same in all known witnesses” thus making it difficult to maintain that the “editor of [the] “first edition” of the Pauline letter-collection was also the agent responsible for redacting various letters and letter-fragments into composite units”\textsuperscript{275} also tells us that the letters themselves were edited even prior to collation. Again, this material evidence is not evident in the text of the critical edition. Finally, the scholar-constructed secondary source, because it is based on the critical text, does not rely on historical evidence, either for selection or ordering of letters of the Pauline Corpus. Without a study of the primary sources (each papyrus, uncial, miniscule), we simply do not have access to all the needed historical information. Therefore, just as Sartre defined the work of Flaubert on the basis of primary sources: the actual writings of Flaubert, a data collection method based on primary evidence (ancient extant manuscripts) is also needed for this study.
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Issues Related to the Use of Primary Evidence

Before I describe how each of these ‘empirical records’ or ‘databases’ will be constructed, several methodological limitations must be addressed upfront.

Reading Papyrus

The first limitation is that I am not a papyrologist, and thus I bring the danger that arises from this weakness. Bruce Frier has cautioned scholars in the field of ‘new papyrology’ that cross-disciplinary work is very difficult because the proper examination of a papyrus requires: “a cautious reconstruction that proceeds document by document, with each new papyrus first subjected to careful analysis as an artefact in its own right, and then linked to the corpus of other surviving papyri.”276 Similarly, Roger S. Bagnall, the author of Reading Papyri, Writing Ancient History notes that papyrology is one of “the most resolutely technical and positivistic disciplines of antiquity” because of “the enormous investment of time and expertise, in paleography and philology, that is necessary for reading and interpreting the texts.”277 These technical hurdles have, he argues, “formed an almost insuperable barrier to the use of the papyri by historians not trained in papyrology.”278 He


278 Bagnall, Kindle Version, Location 154.
notes that the “risk of making serious errors in using the papyri is greatly enlarged for those who cannot control the texts they use, for these texts often contain errors of reading and restoration.”

Despite these cautions, Bagnall, unlike Frier, encourages such cross-discipline approaches.

With these cautions in mind, I am still proposing a methodology that is based on the use of primary evidence. Because the application of the method in this dissertation is for illustrative purposes only, I have chosen to proceed, even with inadequate knowledge. For this reason, my ‘reading’ of papyri and uncials will be limited to available transcriptions and translations. I am aware that these edited and translated versions of papyri are restorations which Bagnall argues, “represent to a large extent an exercise in circularity.” Editors, he argues, “can restore with confidence in a document only what they already know, either from the remains on the papyrus, or from parallels.”

He goes on to say:

Restorations are mainly a device for presenting an analysis and interpretation of a text in a readily usable fashion; a continuous text is, after all, far more readable than a block of discontinuous words and a mass of notes. A translation of such a restored text is similarly a device of presentation, a means of clarifying an interpretation. But the historian who would use such texts must always keep in mind that restorations are a form of presentation of an argument, not simply another form of primary evidence messed up with some funny brackets.
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I have a choice either to use the critical text (a collation of restorations), or the transcriptions (also restorations) of individual manuscripts. Either way, my analysis will be permeated with the argumentation that informed these manuscripts. I do not have the expertise by which to be aware of all of these biases or to challenge them. By choosing, however, to examine extant manuscripts, and by ordering them chronologically (given that Bagnall notes that “the most basic and important point is the very simple one that assembled evidence must always be broken down by date and provenance.”), I hope to outline a methodological historical-sociological-biographical framework that can be improved upon by those scholars who have these skills.

**Dating**

Primary evidence must also be dated. I have relied on the most recent scholarly article for the dates of New Testament manuscripts. Paleographers Pasquale Orsini and Willy Clarysse have recently written an article entitled, “Early New Testament Manuscripts and their Date: A Critique of Theological Paleography” (2012). They have critiqued the dates of manuscripts provided by Philip Comfort and David Barrett as well as Karl Jaroš, arguing that their dating is theologically motivated and based on unsound techniques. The “graphic framework” these scholars used, they argued, was inadequate because “there is no historical approach to the graphic evidence”, and their “paleographical analysis and comparative

---
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method are based on impressionistic suggestions and on the shape of single and separate
signs.” In contrast, Orsini and Clarysse based their dating method on “the general outline
of Greek scripts from second to fifth century,” and have claimed to provide a more in-depth
dating method.282 Therefore the dates provided, when available, will be consistent with
their papyrological analyses.

Provenance and Text Type

I chose not to view the extant manuscripts through the lens of ‘text-type’ because there is
hardly agreement amongst scholars about the classification of texts, or how to use text type
alongside dating of manuscripts to determine a ‘more original reading.’ Kurt and Barbara
Aland, for instance, have proposed some changes, for instance, to the traditional approach
of classification of ‘types’ because of weaknesses they have identified.283 They have stated
that there are no text-types before the fourth century,284 and Epp also concludes there “is a
continuing and genuine disagreement, if not contention, as to whether or not 'text-types'
existed in the earliest centuries....285 Although, a critical evaluation of these arguments is
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Documents 45, Eerdmans, 1993), p. 37
also beyond my area of expertise, because I am examining the ancient manuscripts to determine which letters are the agreed-upon letters of Paul, an analysis of their text-type is not needed. Where differences in readings may occur in the text of Galatians, I have chosen to privilege the joint text of $p^{46}$-B, and choose the earliest as the most original.

An analysis of provenance would be helpful, and would add another helpful layer of knowledge about the manuscripts, noting agreement or disagreement across geographical regions, but this is also outside the scope of this dissertation.

**Transcriptions of Primary Sources**

The following resources have been used to obtain transcriptions and translations of the extant manuscripts (primary sources) assigned to *RP: The Work* and *RP: Biographical Evidence*. They include: *The Complete Text of the Earliest New Testament Manuscripts* edited by Philip W. Comfort and David P. Barrett,286 the website of the Institute for New Testament Textual Research (Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung, INTF),287 the website for Codex Sinaiticus Online;288 translations of *Acts of Paul* (including 3 Corinthians), D. Edgar’s translation of Chester Beatty II which I accessed from the Chester


Beatty website,\textsuperscript{289} and information about P.Mich. 6238 from the University of Michigan website.\textsuperscript{290} I have also relied on Greek analytical concordances and lexicons to assist me with philological and translation tasks. Such sources bring their own weaknesses. For instance, online databases may contain errors. Changes in scholarship also take place. I initially used the dates provided by Comfort and Barrett, but Orsini and Clarysse recently added new information. My goal, however, is not to provide the technically perfect illustration of my method, but to provide enough detail that it can be replicated, changed, and improved upon.

\textbf{Construction of RP: The Work}

In the case of Flaubert, \textit{the work} was comprised of a \textit{collection} of his literary works. These works represented the objectification of Flaubert’s human action – instances of the objectification of his overarching \textit{project}. Sartre collected a variety of his literary works and placed them within a larger collection because their variety enabled him to explore the complexity of human action, for instance, how Flaubert could portray himself as a monk in one literary work and a woman in another. He then examined their content for clues about Flaubert – for instance, how he represented himself and others in a novel, clues to how he could variously imagine himself and others with limitations and possibilities that provided
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Sartre with a hypothesis about his life. In the same way, the work of Remembered Paul can be examined for similar clues (e.g. the details of his representation of himself as a ‘slave of Christ’ or an ‘apostle to the Gentiles’). Sartre argued that “the life is illuminated by the work”, and that it exists as a “reality whose total determination is found outside of it…in the conditions which produce it…and in the artistic creation [as an example of human action] which fulfils it and completes it by expressing it.”

The goal of examining the work is to look for clues as to how Flaubert or RP was “making [something out] of what he has been made.”

**Already Edited Sources**

The only material traces for the work of the ancient Paul are the ancient manuscripts which contain either a set of letters we know as ‘Pauline’, or a fragment of one or two of these letters contained in one or more collections. The earliest evidence is found in p⁴⁶, as already stated, an already-edited collection of ‘his’ letters. In addition, there is internal evidence that suggests that secretaries were involved in the writing of these letters, and that the collection of letters is not complete. All of these factors unsettle the notion that we can identify authentic Pauline letters – that is, letters that Paul wrote himself. Therefore, Paul

---

291 Sartre, 142.

292 Sartre, 91.


294 See 1 Cor. 5:9; 2 Cor. 2:4; 2 Cor. 7:8-9; Eph. 3:3-4; and Col. 4:16.
will be referred to as Remembered Paul, and the extant evidence for ‘his’ letters will be understood as the material traces that attest to ancient representations (rather than copies) of his communications. Such a characterization does not erase the ancient human actor from our analysis, but accepts that ‘remains’ of a life attest to an ancient life, but are never ‘copies’ of the life. This approach is in line with Bryant’s desire to steer “a reflexive course between dated empiricist dogmas on the one hand and a trendy illogical subjectivism on the other…” He argues that a “historical social science guards against the illusions of an unmediated factual transparency, while also forestalling the projective imposition of grand conceptual schemes that violate the contextual integrities of other times, different places.”

**Collecting the Primary Evidence**

In order to re-identify the work (the letters of Remembered Paul) on the basis of primary evidence, I first created a list of New Testament manuscripts containing text from any ‘Pauline’ letter contained in the Pauline Corpus of the critical edition of the New Testament. Rather than beginning with the set of commonly accepted authentic letters, I intended to take the evidence as it came in the ancient artefacts. All fourteen letters contained in the canonical text were attested in either one or more New Testament papyri or in one or more New Testament uncial. Therefore, it was theoretically possible, when I began, that all letters

---

295 Bryant, 490.
should be considered *the work* of Remembered Paul. In fact, without attention to the differences between them, they could be accepted in just that way.

**Extant Collections and Fragments of Letters**

Secondly, I examined the ‘Pauline’ content of the New Testament manuscripts. I began with an examination of the various *collections* of Pauline letters. I chose *p*⁴⁶, Codex Vaticanus, and Codex Sinaiticus because they are the first three extant collections and because, after Codex Sinaiticus, no new Pauline letters are introduced, thus representing a ‘gelling’ of the content of the Pauline corpus by 360 CE. I could have chosen to define *p*⁴⁶ as the earliest extant collection of *the work* and included only letters which were originally found in its manuscripts. However, though I have been critical of the shape of this argument (it begins with Codex Sinaiticus as ‘complete’ and evaluates earlier manuscripts on the basis of this codex as the standard), I determined it also necessary to examine the extant manuscripts which contain only *fragments of a letter(s)* to determine if there was sufficient primary evidence to include other letters not extant in its collection, namely: Titus, Philemon, 2 Thessalonians, and 1 and 2 Timothy.

The following Table A presents the content and ordering of the ‘Pauline’ letters in the first three extant *collections* that I examined, and that of the Pauline Corpus of Nestlé-Aland. Table B presents a list of all the extant manuscripts containing a *fragment of one or more* letters up to a midpoint date (the midpoint between the earliest and latest date given) of 360 CE (the date of Codex Sinaiticus) or a *collection of letters*. Each set of manuscripts were
needed for my analysis. Again, I chose the date of Codex Sinaiticus as the terminus date because, after this collection, there are no new letters introduced to the Corpus.

**TABLE A: Content and Ordering of ‘Pauline’ Letter Collections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Codex Vaticanus</th>
<th>Codex Sinaiticus</th>
<th>Nestlé-Aland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>1 Corinthians</td>
<td>1 Corinthians</td>
<td>1 Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Corinthians</td>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>1 Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>Galatians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>Ephesians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td>Philippians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td>Colossians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td>1 Thessalonians</td>
<td>1 Thessalonians</td>
<td>1 Thessalonians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thessalonians</td>
<td>2 Thessalonians</td>
<td>2 Thessalonians</td>
<td>2 Thessalonians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews to 9:14</td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>1 Timothy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Timothy</td>
<td>2 Timothy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Timothy</td>
<td>Titus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>Philemon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philemon</td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

296 Note the varying locations of Hebrews.

297 Note the difference of order for Galatians and Ephesians between p46 and the other collections.
TABLE B: Papyrus/Uncial Fragments with One or More ‘Pauline’ Letters to 360 CE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papyrus</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p(^{10})</td>
<td>300-350 CE</td>
<td>Romans 1:1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{12})</td>
<td>250-300 CE</td>
<td>Heb. 1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{15})</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>1 Cor. 7:18-8:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{16})</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>Phil. 3:10-17; 4:2-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{17})</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>Heb. 9:12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{27})</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Rom. 8:12-22, 24-27; 8:33-9:3, 5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{30})</td>
<td>175-225 CE</td>
<td>1 Thess. 4:12-13, 16-17, 5:3, 8-10, 12-18, 25-28; 2 Thess. 1:1-2; 2:1, 9-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{40})</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Rom. 1:24-27; 1:31-2:3; 3:21-4:8; 6:2-5, 15-16; 9:17, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{49})</td>
<td>250-350 CE</td>
<td>Eph. 4:16-29; 4:31-5:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{55})</td>
<td>250-350 CE</td>
<td>1 Thess. 1:3-2:1, 6-13 [also includes John 1:3-2:1, 6-13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{89})</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>Heb. 6:7-9, 15-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{92})</td>
<td>250-350 CE</td>
<td>Eph. 1:11-13, 19-21; 2 Th 1:4-5,11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{113})</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Rom. 2:12-13, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{114})</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Heb. 1:7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{118})</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Rom. 15:26-27,32-33; 16:1,4-7,11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{123})</td>
<td>350 CE</td>
<td>1 Cor. 14:31-34; 15:3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{126})</td>
<td>350 CE</td>
<td>Heb. 13:12-13,19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{87})</td>
<td>200-250 CE</td>
<td>Phlm. 13-15, 24-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{32})</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Titus 1:11-15; 2:3-8(^{298})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uncials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncial</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0185</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>1 Cor. 3:6-9; 4:1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0221</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>Rom. 5:16-17, 19, 21-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0228</td>
<td>300-400 CE(^{299})</td>
<td>Heb. 12:19-21, 23-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{298}\) As I will explain, RP: The Work has been constructed on the basis of all of these manuscripts except p\(^{87}\) and p\(^{32}\).

All manuscripts have been included, no matter how fragmentary, and they have been listed in chronological order according to the papyrological dating decisions of Orsini and Clarysse. The midpoint between the earliest date and the latest date that they provided is the date I have recorded. Although I chose to limit the database to extant evidence dated up to 360 CE, the compiled set of letters, the work of RP, according to my method of analysis, would not change had I included each and every manuscript.

Results of Analysis of Collections and Fragments

An analysis of both the three earliest extant collections of ‘Pauline’ letters (TABLE A) and the extant fragments of individual letters (included in TABLE B) revealed the following:

Agreed-Upon Letters of all Collections

Most of the individual letters which are attested in manuscript fragments of one or two letters (this eliminates 1 and 2 Timothy), except for Titus, Philemon and 2 Thessalonians, are attested in all three of the earliest extant manuscripts containing collections of the letters. That is, Romans, Hebrews, 1-2 Corinthians, 1 Thessalonians, Galatians, Colossians, Ephesians, and Philippians are agreed-upon letters in p46, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus. An examination of later extant manuscripts also reveals that this earliest corpus of agreed-upon letters remains constant throughout history.

300 P. Orsini and W. Clarysse, 443-474.
Letters in Two out of Three Collections

Given that the individual letters of Philemon (p\textsuperscript{87}), Titus (p\textsuperscript{32}) and 2 Thessalonians (p\textsuperscript{30} and p\textsuperscript{92}) were not found in all three collections, but found in one or more collections, it was necessary to determine if this non-agreement amongst the three collectors provided grounds for including them in the work of Remembered Paul. I discovered the following: i) Titus and Philemon first appear in a collection of letters in Codex Sinaiticus but are not found in p\textsuperscript{46} or Vaticanus; and 2 Thessalonians is found in both Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus. These results suggested the possibility that 2 Thessalonians may have been contained in one of the ‘missing pages’ of p\textsuperscript{46}, meaning that it belonged in the collection of agreed-upon letters.

To evaluate this possibility, I looked for clues of a relationship between p\textsuperscript{46} and 2 Thessalonians. I discovered that 2 Thessalonians, attested in P.Oxy 1598 (p\textsuperscript{30}), and dated between 175 and 225 CE\textsuperscript{301} followed the text of 1 Thess. chapter 4. The papyrus of p\textsuperscript{92} (dated between 250-350 CE), in addition to 2 Thessalonians, contained the preceding first chapter of Ephesians.\textsuperscript{302} Because 2 Thessalonians is included in the Pauline Corpus of both Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus; because, where extant, it is found in a manuscript alongside an agreed-upon letter, and because this observation is supported by scholars who

\textsuperscript{301} Orsini and Clarysse, 118.

\textsuperscript{302} Comfort & Barrett, 615.
believe it was contained in the ‘missing pages’\textsuperscript{303} of p\textsuperscript{46}, I determined there was sufficient primary evidence to include it the collection of letters of \textit{RP: The Work}. Thus, according to an examination of the primary evidence so far, I determined that the Pauline Corpus (\textit{RP: The Work}) should include the previously listed agreed-upon letters with the addition of 2 Thessalonians making it now a ten letter corpus.

\textbf{Extant Letter Fragments in One Collection}

The next step was to search for evidence of a possible connection between p\textsuperscript{87} (Philemon) and p\textsuperscript{52} (Titus) with p\textsuperscript{46} or Codex Vaticanus (if Vaticanus contained one letter ‘missing’ from p\textsuperscript{46}, there may be evidence for more). Comfort and Barrett previously argued that “the handwriting [of p\textsuperscript{87}] is nearly identical” to the handwriting of Chester Beatty II.\textsuperscript{304} If this observation was borne out by other scholars, this would suggest such a connection for Philemon. Orsini and Clarysse, however, state that p\textsuperscript{46}, p\textsuperscript{52}, p\textsuperscript{87}, and p\textsuperscript{104} all share a specific type of bureaucratic and chancery script.\textsuperscript{305} Given that p\textsuperscript{52} and p\textsuperscript{104} do not contain texts of the Pauline Corpus but have similar handwriting to p\textsuperscript{46}, it is clear that a stronger connection to p\textsuperscript{46} is needed. Yet the only papyrus fragment that places Philemon alongside the agreed-

\textsuperscript{303} Both Epp and Duff as discussed in Chapter 1.

\textsuperscript{304} Comfort & Barrett, 607.

\textsuperscript{305} Orsini and Clarysse,
upon letters is the 8th century Papyrus p61 (containing Rom. 16:23-27; 1 Cor. 1:1-2.4-6; 5:1-3.5-6.9-13; Phil. 3:5-9.12-16; 1 Thess. 1:2-3; Tit 3:1-5.8-11.14-15; Phlm. 4-7).\textsuperscript{307}

Similarly, the tiny fragment of Titus attested in p\textsuperscript{32} (dated to the second century) is also only attested alongside agreed-upon letters in p61. It is also attested in the Sahidic Michigan MS. Inv 3992 (a papyrus codex dated to the fourth century\textsuperscript{308} which contains the Gospel of John, an unknown text, Titus, 1 Corinthians and Psalms in that order).\textsuperscript{309} In the case of Titus, there is only 8th century evidence for inclusion in the Pauline corpus of agreed-upon letters, and this evidence is made ambiguous because of its inclusion in a more diverse collection of writings. On the basis of this material evidence, I determined that Titus and Philemon could not be included.

**Letters in One Collection but not Extant in Letter Fragments**

At this point it became necessary to examine the content unique to Codex Sinaiticus (1 and 2 Timothy) to determine if there is evidence for a connection to the corpus of agreed-upon letters. I discovered that they are not extant in any NT papyrus,\textsuperscript{310} and only included in

\textsuperscript{307} http://nttranscripts.uni-muenster.de/AnaServer?NTtranscripts+0+start.anv

\textsuperscript{308} http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_the_Coptic_New_Testament_manuscripts#Sahidic_manuscripts


post-Codex Sinaiticus uncialss. Although other scholars claim that they were quoted by early Christians such as Polycarp in the second century, this evidence is ambiguous and does not place them within the set of agreed-upon letters. Furthermore, though two letters written to Timothy are mentioned in the Muratorian Fragment, this is a fourth century document, and again this evidence does not place them within the collection of agreed-upon letters. 311

Support for Results of Analysis

On the basis of an examination of the primary evidence, I concluded that RP: The Work should include the agreed-upon texts as defined by this analysis. My observations are supported by Zuntz’s conclusion that the letter collections of p46 and Codex Vaticanus may have been drawn from the same cluster of manuscripts. 312 He claimed that the errors, for instance, shared by p46 and Vaticanus (B) “demonstrate the close interrelation between p46 and B.” 313 On the basis of his study of p46 he concluded:

311 Robert W. Wall, First and Second Timothy and Titus (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2012), 19-23. Although Wall takes a different line of reasoning with which I do not agree, he does dispute the early date of the Muratorian Fragment and the disputed existence of patristic use of the ‘pastoral epistles’.

312 RobertWaltz,”CodexVaticanus”NewTestamentManuscripts. http://www.skypoint.com/members/waltzmn/ManuscriptsUncials.html#uB: “B has many significant readings not found in either the Alexandrian (Aleph A C 33 etc.) or the “Western” (D F G latt) witnesses. Several good examples of this come from Colossians: In 2:2, B (alone of Greek witnesses known to Hort; now supported by p46 and implicitly by the members of Family 1739) has tou theou Christou; in 3:6, B (now supported by p46) omits epi tous ulious tēs apeitheias.

313 Zuntz, 62.
Direct dependence of B upon p⁴⁶ being evidently out of the question, we conclude that these two manuscripts belong to one and the same ancient and narrow branch of the tradition. The generally high quality of this branch is too well established to be markedly impaired by the occurrence of these errors; none the less they contain a notable reminder of the renewed warning against the mirage of a ‘neutral’ text. Moreover, they raise a problem which we shall have to bear in mind: how is it to be explained that these errors do not reappear in the later tradition and not even in the typical allies of the Vaticanus?³¹⁴

In addition, Robert Waltz, although he differs with Zuntz, in that he sees five different text-types in the Pauline Corpus, also asserts the existence of a p⁴⁶-Vaticanus (B) group of manuscripts.³¹⁵ This would make sense again of all but Philemon and Titus up to 360 CE.

T.C. Skeat had also argued that Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus “witness to a gelling of ecclesiastical opinion, in the fourth-fifth centuries” even though “the situation remained fluid…”³¹⁶ Noting the significant differences between Vaticanus and Sinaiticus in the

³¹⁴ Zuntz, 62.

³¹⁵ Waltz, 156: Zuntz showed that “B and p⁴⁶ had a special kinship, and second, that these manuscripts were not part of the mainstream Alexandrian text...Zuntz called his proposed fourth text-type "proto-Alexandrian" and lists as its members p⁴⁶ B 1739 (and its relatives; Zuntz was aware of 6 424** M/0121 1908; to this now add 0243 1881 630 2200) so bo Clement Origen. It appears to me that even this classification is too simple; there are five text-types in Paul -- not just the traditional Alexandrian, Byzantine, and "Western" texts, but two others which Zuntz combined as the "Proto-Alexandrian" text... From the "Proto-Alexandrian" witnesses, however, we must deduct Family 1739, which appears to be its own type. Family 1739 does share a number of readings with p⁴⁶ and B, but it also shares special readings with the Alexandrian and "Western" texts and has a handful of readings of its own. It also appears to me that the Bohairic Coptic, which Zuntz called Alexandrian, is actually closer to the true Alexandrian text. This leaves B with only two full-fledged allies in Paul: p⁴⁶ and the Sahidic Coptic. I also think that Zuntz’s title “Proto-Alexandrian” is deceptive, since the p⁴⁶/B type and the Alexandrian text clearly split before the time of P⁴⁶. As a result, I prefer the neutral title p⁴⁶/B type (if we ever find additional substantial witnesses, we may be able to come up with a better name).

ordering and content of texts, he argued that these differences “alert us to the fact that these were pioneering times when books and collections of books were being gathered from previously independent and isolated codices to form what was intended to be an authoritative and demonstrable assemblage of books that defined the compass of the Christian canon in Greek.”

His emphasis on their differences also leaves open the possibility of the $p^{46}$-Vaticanus (B) connection that Zuntz and Waltz have affirmed.

Because of the Christianization of the Roman Empire, and the production of Christian Bibles in the middle of the fourth century, I had earlier hypothesized that differences, if found between the collection of letters attested in $p^{46}$ and the collections in Codex Vaticanus or Codex Sinaiticus, may arise as a result of new ecclesiastical concerns. After the completion of this analysis, I would conclude that, if there is evidence of ecclesiastical bias in the Pauline Corpus, it is found in the additional content of 1 and 2 Timothy in Codex Sinaiticus. Such an observation is in line with previous analyses of the Pauline Corpus which categorize these letters as evidence of institutionalized Christianity.

---


318 Skeat, 283.

F.G. Kenyon had earlier ascertained that Vaticanus was older than Sinaiticus, on the basis of the absence of the Eusebian canons and its older archaic style.\textsuperscript{320} G. Cavallo has also dated Codex Sinaiticus to 360 CE, a decade later than Vaticanus in 350 CE.\textsuperscript{321} These dates create further distance between these two Christian Bibles, and they affirm the possibility that 1 and 2 Timothy were not considered letters of Remembered Paul prior to the fourth century. Because Titus and Philemon are extant prior to the collection of Codex Sinaiticus, but not found in the earliest two collections p\textsuperscript{46} or Codex Vaticanus (350 CE), their connection with the earliest p\textsuperscript{46}-Vaticanus Pauline Corpus is ambiguous. Thus again, the dates of the manuscripts do not disconfirm this observation.

**Primary Sources of Agreed Upon Letters**

In conclusion, constructed on the basis of primary evidence, the work of Remembered Paul is the set of agreed-upon letters resulting in the following ten letter Pauline Corpus: Romans, Hebrews, 1-2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians and Philippians. Because this is a collection of letters of Remembered Paul rather than Historical Paul, there is no need to sub-divide these letters nor to harmonize their differences. The diversity of their content attests, perhaps, to a diversity of ‘traditions’ about Remembered Paul. I also am not wishing to claim that these are letters written by


Paul, to slip into language about authenticity. They are, however, the consistently agreed-upon letters, included to represent Paul’s communication.

The extant manuscripts include the papyri listed in TABLE B (except p\textsuperscript{87} and p\textsuperscript{32}); Chester Beatty II/P.Mich. Inv. 6238 (p\textsuperscript{46}), and Codex Vaticanus. Given the fragmentary nature of the papyrus fragments, I will rely primarily on p\textsuperscript{46} and Codex Vaticanus and include data of papyrus fragments when available.

**Chester Beatty Papyrus II/P. Mich. Inv.6238 (p\textsuperscript{46})\textsuperscript{322}**

This 86 leaf manuscript (out of a possible 104) is the first extant collection of the Pauline Corpus.\textsuperscript{323} Fifty six of its leaves are housed in Dublin Castle, Ireland, and the remaining thirty leaves are housed at the University of Michigan. There are 18 leaves missing which correspond to the missing pages: 1-13, 16-19, 186-189, and 192-205.\textsuperscript{324} I have listed the combined texts of p\textsuperscript{46} as presented on INTF’s website. A more detailed description is provided in Chapter Four.

\textsuperscript{322} [http://www.lib.umich.edu/reading/Paul/discovery.html](http://www.lib.umich.edu/reading/Paul/discovery.html): “The codex known as p\textsuperscript{46} actually exists today divided between two collections. Fifty-six leave of p\textsuperscript{46} constitute Papyrus 2 of the Chester Beatty Collection in Dublin, Ireland, while another thirty leaves make up inventory number 6238 of the University of Michigan Papyrus Collection.”


\textsuperscript{324} [http://www.lib.umich.edu/reading/Paul/contents.html](http://www.lib.umich.edu/reading/Paul/contents.html)
The earliest possible date for this papyrus, according to Comfort and Barrett, is the early second century because of similarity in handwriting to the following: P. Oxy8; P.Oxy 211; P.Oxy 841; P.Oxy 2337 and especially P.Oxy 3721 which are also dated to this period.\textsuperscript{325}

Young Kyu Kim has more recently assigned the collection to 81-96 CE (during the reign of Domitian), however this earlier date is not supported by the majority of scholars.\textsuperscript{326}

Nestle-Aland, and Orsini and Clarysse date it even later than Comfort and Barrett: between 200 and 225 CE.\textsuperscript{327}

This is the content as described on the website of INTF:


As indicated earlier, it does not contain one of the agreed-upon letters: 2 Thessalonians. To include this letter, it is necessary to utilize Codex Vaticanus.

\textsuperscript{325} Comfort and Barrett, 193.

\textsuperscript{326} Comfort and Barrett, 204.

\textsuperscript{327} Orsini and Clarysse, 470.

\textsuperscript{328} \url{http://nttranscripts.uni-muenster.de/AnaServer?NTtranscripts+0+start.anv}. 
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Codex Vaticanus

Codex Vaticanus is housed in the Vatican Library in Rome, Italy. According to U. Benigni, Codex Vaticanus “is a quarto volume written in uncial letters of the fourth century, on folios of fine parchment bound in quaterns.” Furthermore:

Each page is divided into three columns of forty lines each, with from sixteen to eighteen letters to a line, except in the poetical books, where, owing to the stichometric division of the lines, there are but two columns to a page. There are no capital letters, but at times the first letter of a section extends over the margin. Several hands worked at the manuscript; the first writer inserted neither pauses nor accents, and made use but rarely of a simple punctuation. Unfortunately, the codex is mutilated; at a later date the missing folios were replaced by others. Thus, the first twenty original folios are missing; a part of folio 178, and ten folios after fol. 348; also the final quaterns, whose number it is impossible to establish. There are extant in all 759 original folios.

Unlike Chester Beatty II, Codex Vaticanus contains a collection of Pauline letters, but within a larger collections of texts including:

- Genesis to 2 Chronicles as normal; 1 Esdras; 2 Esdras (Ezra-Nehemiah); the Psalms; Proverbs; Ecclesiastes; Song of Songs; Job; Wisdom; Ecclesiasticus; Esther; Judith; Tobit; the minor prophets from Hosea to Malachi; Isaiah; Jeremiah; Baruch; Lamentations and the Epistle of Jeremiah; Ezekiel and Daniel…The extant New Testament of the Vaticanus contains the Gospels, Acts, the General Epistles, the Pauline Epistles, and the Epistle to the Hebrews (up to Hebrews 9:14, καθαριει).

- Greg Goswell has also described the numbering of its’ pages:

In Vaticanus, there are twenty-one chapters in Romans (numbered 1–21), twenty-one in 1 Corinthians (22–42), eleven in 2 Corinthians (43–53), five in Galatians (54–58), six in Ephesians (70–75), four in Philippians (76–79), six in Colossians (80–85), four in 1 Thessalonians (86–89), four in 2 Thessalonians (90–93), and five in the extant portion of Hebrews (59–64) (which breaks off at 9.14 in the middle of the word kathariei).
with the implication that Hebrews had five more divisions (65–69).\textsuperscript{329}

He notes that a “study of the scribal hand shows that the numbers were not written by either of the two scribes of the manuscript, so that these numerals are a later scribal addition.”\textsuperscript{330}

Codex Vaticanus follows the Septuagint, but does not contain 1-4 Maccabees and the Prayer of Manasseh; Genesis 1:1-46:28a; Psalm 105:27-137:6b or 2 Kings 2:5-7. In the New Testament, it doesn’t contain Acts 37: 15:34, 27:7, or 28:29; Rom. 16:24 or 1 Peter 5:3.\textsuperscript{331} It has a distinct chapter division, found again only in Codex Zacynthius and codex miniscule 579.\textsuperscript{332} A detailed description of its contents, and images of its pages, can be accessed at the CSNTM website.\textsuperscript{333}

**Construction of RP: Biographical Evidence**

The second empirical record, *RP: Biographical Evidence* has been constructed from the extant manuscripts as well. In contrast to *RP: The Work*, which identifies a set of agreed-upon letters to represent the work of RP, any manuscript (papyrus, uncial, miniscule, lectionary, version of the Bible, critical edition of the New Testament, and even a recent


\textsuperscript{330} Goswell, 52.


\textsuperscript{333} http://images.csntm.org/Manuscripts/GA_03/Vaticanus-Scripture-Index.pdf
magazine article) which contains statements of biographical evidence (to be assessed for constructing the *particularity* of the historical-biographical- social situation, *the life* of the Remembered Paul) is eligible for this empirical record. Manuscripts dated from the second century to the present, as well as a variety of evidence sources (e.g. canon lists, extant patristic evidence, recent journal articles) could be included. However, to prevent an unwieldy amount of data for analysis, I have arbitrarily limited the collection of data to sources with a midpoint date no later than 400 CE (between 350 and 450 CE) for Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements and extended it to 500 CE for Contemporary and Historian manuscripts.

It is traditional in biographical research to give greater priority to evidence that is received by those sources closest to the person being studied. However, since such sources contain ‘subjective’ bias, they are usually placed within a larger collection of evidence. For instance, Sartre examined Flaubert’s “furiously subjective statements” found in the literary works included in *the work* for an understanding of his “unique childhood drama,” but he also examined “objective testimonies” obtained from “facts collected by Flaubert’s contemporaries,” and statements made by historians that verified Flaubert’s statements

334 Sartre, SM, 143. Sartre examined “both social structures…and a unique childhood drama” and studied biography to confirm “the hypothesis of the original project.” (p. 148). I am departing from his method here because, although Sartre links childhood drama with an ‘original choice’ or ‘original project’ (which brings unity to action), we do not have access to enough detail about Remembered Paul’s early life in the Pauline Corpus to make this connection. Furthermore, although this question lies beyond the scope of this dissertation.

335 Sartre, SM, 143.
and those of his contemporaries. He desired a cross-section of biographical evidence to avoid the distortions contained in either autobiographical statements or those of distant witnesses. For this reason he collected autobiographical statements made by Flaubert, the statements made by his Contemporaries (those who knew the man or his work), and those of Historians. Thus his biographical evidence was collected across time and space.

The Sartrean mode of biographical reconstruction differs significantly from the traditional approach of Pauline scholars. Pauline biographers generally employ the following method: a) they identify which Pauline letters they consider ‘authentic’; b) they comb this collection for autobiographical statements that can be attributed to Paul; and c) they search Acts for additional biographical information (which they sometimes use as if it were autobiographical). This method is problematic for several reasons: autobiographical is equated with ‘authentic’ even though the Pauline Corpus is an already edited collection; scholars often fail to distinguish between historical ‘autobiographical’ and ‘biographical’ evidence; the veracity of autobiographical statements gleaned from ‘authentic’ letters is often uncritically affirmed; and the ancient life ‘behind the text’ is often reduced to the content of biographical statements (e.g. Paul is upset when people are turning away from his gospel, and the interpretation is that the people are wrongly turning away – nothing more), thus erasing Remembered Paul the human actor from ‘his’ texts. For these reasons, Sartre provides a helpful corrective. His broad database of biographical evidence avoids a naïve acceptance of autobiographical statements while also taking them seriously, amongst the biographical statements of others, in all of their diversity.
Adapting Sartre’s Method

Modifications to Sartre’s method are required for a study of Remembered Paul because we do not have access to statements made by Paul about himself, except those that are also contained in RP: The Work. There are also no biographical statements about Paul that are made by those Sartre would have considered his contemporaries as Baudelaire was for Flaubert (both born in France, and both in 1821, and both writers), and therefore no historians to verify these statements. The independent statements made by those who could be considered Historians (based on the time lag between RP’s life and their statement) are centuries removed. Therefore, any construction of RP: Biographical Evidence will appear somewhat arbitrary due to the nature of the ancient data. However, unlike the traditional method of using ‘authentic’ letters of the critical text as the source for Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements, I will apply this categorization method (clearly defined) to primary data. My goal is to create a manuscript-based construction of RP: The Life that takes all of the data into account, but also privileges the evidence provided by the agreed-upon letters.

The following paragraphs describe how biographical evidence will be collected, and which manuscripts will be included in each category:

Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon Statements

Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements (“I” or “We” statements) made by Remembered Paul will be gleaned only from the agreed upon letters as found in the extant
manuscripts which contain them. Furthermore, the evidence collected will only be accepted as biographical ‘fact’ if the statement is attested in more than one manuscript containing agreed-upon letters, and at least one of those attestations must be found in the p^{46}-Vaticanus joint collection (which includes all the extant manuscripts prior to Codex Sinaiticus) because it is on the basis of this collection that the agreed-upon letters are identified. That is, if an agreed-upon letter of p^{46} contains the statement, “I am an Israelite,” it will be taken as evidence, but not considered ‘fact’ unless that statement is also attested in at least one more agreed-upon letter in a manuscript of any date.

This is a departure from use of ‘authentic’ statements, because it adds the testimony of Hebrews, 2 Thessalonians, Colossians and Ephesians. It also does not exclude any later biographical evidence, though privileging the agreed-upon Pauline Corpus for biographical facts. I have chosen to name these statements Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon even though they could also be named Agreed-Upon Biographical Statements. My purpose is to keep the memory of Historical Paul, ‘alive’ so to speak, while recognizing the gap between the evidence and the life. The following manuscripts are included in this database:
### TABLE C: Primary Sources of Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papyrus</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p(^{10})</td>
<td>300-350 CE</td>
<td>Romans 1:1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{12})</td>
<td>250-300 CE</td>
<td>Heb. 1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{15})</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>1 Cor. 7:18-8:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{16})</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>Phil. 3:10-17: 4:2-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{17})</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>Heb. 9:12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{27})</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Rom. 8:12-22; 24-27; 8:33-9:3, 5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{30})</td>
<td>175-225 CE</td>
<td>1 Thess. 4:12-13, 16-17, 5:3, 8-10, 12-18, 25-28; 2 Thess. 1:1-2; 2:1, 9-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{40})</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Rom. 1:24-27; 1:31-2:3; 3:21-4:8; 6:2-5, 15-16; 9:17, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{46})</td>
<td>200-225 CE</td>
<td>See earlier description for contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{49})</td>
<td>250-350 CE</td>
<td>Eph. 4:16-29; 4:31-5:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{65})</td>
<td>250-350 CE</td>
<td>1 Thess. 1:3-2:1, 6-13 [also includes John 1:3- 2:1.6-13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{89})</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>Heb. 6:7-9, 15-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{92})</td>
<td>250-350 CE</td>
<td>Eph. 1:11-13, 19-21; 2 Th 1:4-5,11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{113})</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Rom. 2:12-13, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{114})</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Heb. 1:7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{118})</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Rom. 15:26-27,32-33; 16:1,4-7,11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{123})</td>
<td>350 CE</td>
<td>1 Cor. 14:31-34; 15:3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(^{126})</td>
<td>350 CE</td>
<td>Heb. 13:12-13,19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0185</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>1 Cor. 3:6-9; 4:1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0221</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>Rom. 5:16-17, 19, 21-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0228</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>Hebrews 12:19-21, 23-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>350 CE</td>
<td>Pauline Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Inv 3992</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>1 Corinthians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Statements of Contemporaries:

The statements of contemporaries will be gleaned from manuscripts which contain letters written in RP’s name, but which are not included in the set of agreed-upon letters contained in RP: The Work. They include: Philemon, Titus, 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy. A letter, even a pseudonymous letter, written in the name of the historical personage, indicates some kind of ‘relationship’ to that person.

In the Sartrean method, the statements of contemporaries require verification by historians to be accepted as fact. In place of this form of accountability, I determined that, in order to consider adding these statements to the collection of biographical ‘facts’, the statement, like Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements, must be attested in more than one Contemporary manuscript, and verified by an Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon Statement (making it simply a repeat statement) or by a Historian (thus adding new data). This allows for the possibility of including biographical evidence from non-agreed letters while also accounting for their greater distance from the Pauline Corpus of agreed-upon letters. If a statement is considered for inclusion, further analysis of factors such as date of the manuscript, and consistency with the biographical ensemble constructed (as explained in Chapter Four), is necessary. Given the scarcity of data, I have also included Codex Alexandrinus, despite its later date because this database could also include later manuscripts. The following table presents a list of manuscripts containing Contemporary Witnesses:
TABLE D: Contemporary Witnesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papyrus</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p87</td>
<td>200-250 CE</td>
<td>Phlm. 13-15, 24-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p32</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Titus 1:11-15; 2:3-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Inv 3992</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>Titus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>360 CE</td>
<td>1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>360 CE</td>
<td>1-2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historians

Texts and/or manuscripts are named Historians when they contain an account of the life of Paul (no matter what its date). In addition, letters addressed to Paul, or written about Paul (post 360 CE) are also classified as Historians. Theoretically, there is no need to place a terminus date on this sub-set of the larger database (though I have placed the terminus at 500 CE to ensure a manageable scope for this task). If the date was extended, biographical details found in the manuscripts of the writings of Jerome (De Virus Illustribus PL 23, 646), the Letters between Paul and Seneca, The Coptic Apocalypse of Paul, and Visio Pauli could be included. It is important to note that Historian texts/manuscripts (Acts of the Apostles, Acts of Paul) sometimes pre-date those of Contemporaries


338 J.K.Elliott, 547: “The surviving manuscripts (of which there are many) are very corrupt. The oldest is ninth century.”

I am also making no attempt to differentiate between different genres. I am aware that there is ongoing debate about the similarities and differences between, for instance, *Acts of the Apostles* and *Acts of Paul*. However, I am unconcerned whether an account is categorized as ancient medical treatise or romance novel because I am persuaded that both are examples of ancient historiography. I agree with Charles Puskas who argues that ancient historiography with Peter and Paul as main characters (*Acts of the Apostles*) is more similar in genre to the Gospel accounts of the Historical Jesus than to letters written in Paul’s name. He examined various ancient literary genres and concluded: “The gospels as ancient biographies and *Acts* as Hellenistic historiography, for example, carry generic weight for many today and perhaps those in antiquity.” Like the statement of Contemporaries, the statement of Historians must be attested by more than one Historian manuscript, and also agreed upon by Contemporary and/or Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements. Therefore, the following manuscripts are included in the Historians category:

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Museum MS. 7594</td>
<td>250-350 CE</td>
<td>Deuteronomy, Jonah, Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p72</td>
<td>300-350 CE</td>
<td>2 Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0189</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>Acts 5:3-21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Hamb.1</td>
<td>300-399 CE</td>
<td>Acts of Paul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Berlin inv. 13893</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>Acts of Paul and Thecla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+P.Mich. 3788+1317</td>
<td></td>
<td>Martyrdom of Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Fackelmann 3</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Acts of Paul and Thecla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Ant.I 013</td>
<td>300-399 CE</td>
<td>Acts of Paul and Thecla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodmer X347</td>
<td>300-399 CE</td>
<td>Acts of Paul and Thecla +3 Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>350 CE</td>
<td>Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 Codex Sinaiticus</td>
<td>360 CE</td>
<td>Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient, fol. 3065</td>
<td>300s</td>
<td>1 Clement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


345 J.K Elliott, “Acts of Paul” in *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 353. Elliott notes that there are more than 40 manuscripts that attest to *Acts of Paul*. His translation will be used for the purposes of this dissertation in place of examining each manuscript. He also notes that P.Mich. 3788 contains some lines absent from P.Hamb 1 which he includes in his translation because they agree with the Coptic P.Heid.


347 This manuscript also contains the text known as 3 Corinthians. Because it contains the letter from the Corinthians to Paul before his reply, and because it is included with *Acts of Paul*, I have categorized it as a Historian.
Conclusion

In conclusion, although I have included all the manuscripts, however fragmentary, to ensure that I did not rely on previous scholarly assumptions about the manuscript evidence or bias the construction of RP: The Work or RP: Biographical Evidence with *a priori* assumptions, the reality of the physical evidence is such that it is p46, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus that will provide most of the Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon evidence, and even the evidence of Historian Acts. I have tried to create a balance between honoring the diversity of the content of the manuscripts and the authority of the agreed-upon letters.

The resulting set of agreed-upon letters of RP: The Work (the Pauline Corpus) is neither the first collection of ‘Pauline’ letters, nor the ‘original’ collection because the set of letters is derived from several manuscripts which are dated from the second century to the first half of the fourth century. These are not the ‘authentic’ letters of Paul. They are the letters which are agreed-upon, that is the letters contained in the earliest as well as the latest Pauline collections. Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, Hebrews, Philippians and 1 and 2 Thessalonians are the consistently collected letters, and the consistently attested letters.

This methodology eliminates the problems associated with use of the critical edition of the New Testament, with the circular reasoning embedded in the notion of authenticity, and with the need to choose between or conflate the biographical evidence found in Acts with that of supposedly ‘authentic’ letters. It fits with the witness of the primary data, and allow us to base internal analyses on an empirical record that has met external criteria. It requires
us to deal with the extant data, rather than the theories created to make that data fit with the critical edition of the New Testament and patristic opinion.

Although this method is more methodologically sound, it will not allow me to write an interpretation of RP: The Work that provides a mirror-accurate image of the ancient Paul. Instead, the use of the primary data takes seriously all the manuscript evidence, and the nature of that evidence, and unsettles any notion that we can ‘find’ the historical Paul in the ‘remains’ of the various collections. The corpus of agreed-upon letters includes those we have excluded (Colossians, Ephesians and Hebrews) and excludes those we have named authentic (Philemon). It is a secure base of historical evidence, and changes should only occur if the manuscript evidence has been misrepresented or new manuscript evidence comes to light. There are differences between the letters in this collection (e.g. some letters are written while RP is in prison, some are written even though he has not met the addressees in person). There are a diversity of contexts and a diversity of meanings, and without claims of authenticity, it is not clear why these letters are those agreed-upon.

This methodology improves our method for identification of biographical evidence, and the process for acceptance of that evidence as fact. Witnesses previously ignored have been included (1-2 Timothy, Titus, 2 Thessalonians) as Contemporary Witnesses, and the categorization of witnesses makes clear that the witness of the Agreed-Upon/Autobiographical letters should be privileged for its consistency of attestation rather than its ‘more original’ material. Historian accounts need not be compared with Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon sources because primacy of place is given to letters written
in Remembered Paul’s name over third person accounts. With the removal of the influence of the critical edition of the New Testament, witnesses to biographical facts need not be harmonized or eliminated due to lack of agreement.

While this methodological framework presents a more transparent and historically sound method for Pauline biography, it will only allow for a measure of exactness. Historical Sociologist Larry Griffin offers a realistic voice which will guide the spirit of my engagement with the sources:

The historical record - what we know of real history - is subject to factual disputes and widely varying interpretations....it is unavoidably fraught with epistemological and practical problems. "Correspondence" between a narrative of an event and historical truth cannot be assumed. But all too frequently in historical research imperfect information is all that is available. The options are to use it cautiously or not at all...What is known of the real past through narrative or any other medium, despite obvious limitations, therefore must serve as a criterion against which both the plausibility of historical counterfactuals and the truth content of our explanations are assessed, even as our knowledge of the past is itself being extended, corrected, and deepened by the very research on which its sits in judgment.348

Doughty has argued that Paul (or Remembered Paul) is the “Paul as he was transmitted by the church,” and promoted by “the winners of the ecclesiastical struggle in the second and third centuries.”349 There is no "original" text (only multiple scribal hands, scribal blunders,


omissions and additions)\textsuperscript{350} to confirm or disconfirm this statement. However, using this approach to the collection of biographical evidence provides us, I would argue, with the possibility of adjudicating such claims on the basis of primary evidence.

\textsuperscript{350} Zuntz, 212.
CHAPTER FOUR

The Biographical Evidence

In this chapter, I will present the Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon, Contemporary, and Historian biographical evidence as gleaned from the extant manuscripts according to the method outlined in Chapter Three. I have defined auto/biographical statements in the following way: a) “I/We statements” or “He/They statements” which constitute a social-economic marker (i.e. birth, religion, marital status, labour);351 b) statements about “us”, “we”, or “they” that would indicate his ancient group memberships; and c) biographical statements made, in RP’s words and from his point of view, by his interlocutors.352 To ensure that modern meanings were not assumed for Greek words such as ‘apostle’, ‘minister’, or ‘Jew’, some Greek words which identify a biographical fact353 have been accompanied with philological analysis.

---

351 I chose to exclude statements that appear to be ‘theological’ rather than biographical to limit the focus of this dissertation.

352 Whether RP appears, in the text, to accept or deny their biographical characterization, their words are biographical evidence.

353 I have not completed an exhaustive philological analysis of the biographical facts. The analysis that I have included is there to demonstrate the application of my method. As well, I generally examined words that seemed, to me, too ‘easily’ translated.
As stated in Chapter Three, the Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon Statements have been gleaned from manuscripts containing the agreed-upon letters, with priority given to the p²⁴⁶-Vaticanus joint collection (and manuscripts which attest to any letters it contains). The two pieces of the p²⁴⁶ manuscript have been re-joined, though their original numbering has been retained for the purposes of identification. Chester Beatty II can be identified by numbers from 1-97 and P.Mich Inv 6238 is identified by numbers 3551 – 3620. The University of Michigan provides a link to the Advanced Papyrological System on their website for this information. Folio identification and translation for Chester Beatty II was taken from the translation by D. Edgar and from the website of the Centre for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts. Page numbers and transcription of Codex Vaticanus was also obtained from CSNTM. The transcriptions for remaining manuscripts were taken from the INTF website. It should also be noted, that I have identified chapter and verse as did

355 http://www.cbl.ie/getdoc/4a02241d-54b6-446f-9f34-dblda9a3f0f/Letters-of-Paul-(P46)-English.aspx
356 http://www.csntm.org/Manuscript/View/GA_P46
357 http://www.csntm.org/Manuscript/View/GA_03
358 http://nttranscripts.uni-muenster.de/
the online resources on which I was dependent, though text verses are a 16th century addition by Robert Estienne.359

Chester Beatty II/ P.Mich. Inv 6238

Folio 8 v Rom. 5:17-6:3

Rom. 6:3

[η] [αγνοειτε] [οτι] [οσοι] εβαπτισθημεν εις [χριστον] [ησουν] [εις] [τον] [θανατον] αυτου εβαπτισθημεν (p46)

η αγνοειτε οτι οσοι εβαπτισθημεν εις χριστον εις τον θανατον αυτου εβαπτισθημεν (Vaticanus 03)

η αγνοειτε οτι οσοι εβαπτισθημεν εις χριστον ησουν εις τον θανατον αυτου εβαπτισθημεν (Sinaiticus 01)

From this passage we see that RP self-identifies as a member of an “us” who have been baptized into Christ. Although p46 does not contain this evidence because of words not physically present, the statement in Vaticanus is also attested in Sinaiticus. This evidence identifies RP as a member of a group of Christ-followers.

Folio 8 r Rom. 6:5-14 no biographical information
Folio 11v Rom. 8:15-25 no biographical information
Folio 11r Rom. 8: 27-35 no biographical information

Rom 9:3

ηυχομην γαρ αναθεμα ειναι αυτος εγω απο του χριστου υπερ των αδελφων των συγγενων μου κατα σαρκα (p46)

ηυχομην γαρ αναθεμα ειναι αυτος εγω απο του χριστου υπερ των αδελφων μου (p27)

ηυχομην γαρ αναθεμα ειναι αυτος εγω απο του χριστου υπερ των αδελφων μου των συγγενων μου κατα σαρκα (03)

Here Paul identifies “the brothers” as his kinsmen “according to the flesh”. The manuscript p27 has too many lacunae to be helpful, but Vaticanus makes this connection in agreement with Codex Sinaiticus. Vaticanus Corrector 1 changes “the brothers” of p46 to “my brothers”, and Sinaiticus is in agreement with the corrected Codex Vaticanus. RP is prepared to be cursed and cast away from Christ on behalf of his brothers. Although the change from “the brothers” (p46) to “my brothers” (Vaticanus, Sinaiticus) may indicate a difference in understanding within the agreed-upon/core group letters, this is not explored further.

Romans 9:4

οιτινες εισιν ισραηλειται [*: ων η υιοθεσια και η δοξα και η διαθηκη και η νομοθεσια και λατρεια και επαγγελια / C: ων η υιοθεσια και η δοξα και η διαθηκη και η νομοθεσια και λατρεια και επαγγελια] (p46)

360 C+number= Corrector 1, and *= non-corrected text.
οιτίνες εἰσιν [C2: ἱσραηλῖται / *: ἱσραηλεῖται] ὁν η υἱοθεσία καὶ η δοξα καὶ η διαθήκη καὶ η νομοθεσία καὶ η λατρεία και αἱ επαγγελίαι (03)

οιτίνες εἰσιν ἱσραηλεῖται ὁν η υἱοθεσία καὶ η δοξα καὶ η διαθήκη καὶ η νομοθεσία και ἡ λατρεία και αἱ επαγγελίαι (01).

Paul’s brothers are Israelites, and the adoption, glory, covenant\textsuperscript{361}, the giving of the law, the temple service, and the promises belong to them. This provides further understanding of RP’s description of the ethnic community to which he belongs.

**Folio 12 r**  Rom. 9:10-22  no biographical information

**Folio 13v**  Rom. 9:22-32

**Rom. 9:24**

ους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς οὐ μονον [εξ] ἱουδαίων ἀλλα καὶ εξ εθνῶν (p\textsuperscript{46})

ους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς οὐ μονον εξ ἱουδαίων ἀλλα καὶ εξ εθνῶν (03, 01)

The group that Paul belongs to is ethnically diverse and includes those called by God from the ἱουδαῖον and ethnōn (non-Jews).

**Folio 13 r**  Rom. 10:1-11  no biographical information

\textsuperscript{361} Sinaiticus has the plural form, disagreeing with p\textsuperscript{46}, the corrector of p\textsuperscript{46}, and Vaticanus.
There are three witnesses to the statement that Paul is an Israelite, from the descendants of Abraham, a member of the tribe of Benjamin.

Paul names himself an *apostolos* of the Gentiles, and he glorifies/magnifies/gives honor to his *diakonian*. *Apostolos* means “messenger” or “envoy.” 363 The simplest meaning of

diakonian is “service” (including forms of manual labour such as table service). See also 1 Cor. 12:5; 2 Cor. 3:7, 8, 9; 4:1; 5:11.

Folio 15r  Rom. 11:24-33  no biographical information
Folio 16v  Rom. 11:36-12:8  no biographical information
Folio 3554  Rom. 12:10-13:1  no biographical information
Folio 3555  Rom. 13:2-11  no biographical information
Folio 3556  Rom. 13:12-14:8  no biographical information
Folio 18v  Rom. 14:9-21  no biographical information
Folio 18 r  Rom. 14:22-15:9  no biographical information
Folio 3557  Rom. 15:11-19

Rom. 15:15

tολμηροτέρως δε εγραψα υμιν αδελφοι αναμιμνησκων απο μερους ως επαναμιμνησκων υμας δια την χαριν την δοθεισαν μοι απο του θεου (p^{46})
tολμηροτέρον δε εγραψα υμιν [*: □ / C2: αδελφοι] απο μερους ως επαναμιμνησκων υμας δια την χαριν την δοθεισαν μοι [C2: υπο / *: απο] του θεου (01)
tολμηροτερος δε εγραψα υμιν □ απο μερους ως αναμιμνησκων υμας δια την χαριν την δοθεισαν μοι απο του θεου (03)

RP states that he wrote to them firmly/boldly to remind them, and his reminder was made on the basis of “the grace” that was given to him by God. The word *charis* was common in Greek with a range of meanings including: beauty, goodwill towards someone, gratitude for, and favour. According to Dunn, the word *charis* “did not have a particularly theological or religious connotation.” He suggests that that when RP’s “converts read the word *charis*, the language of benefaction would usually have been the most immediate context of meaning for their understanding of the term.”

364

Rom. 15:16

δια το ειναι με λειτουργον ιησου χριστου εις τα εθνη ιερουργουντα το ευαγγελιον του θεου ινα γενηται και η προσφορα των εθνων ευπροσδεκτος ηγιασμενη εν πνευματι αγιω (p^46)

εις το ειναι με λειτουργον χριστου ιησου □ ιερουργουντα το ευαγγελιον του θεου ινα γενηθη □ η προσφορα των εθνων ευπροσδεκτος ηγιασμενη εν πνευματι αγιω (03)

εις το ειναι με λειτουργον χριστου ιησου □ ιερουργουντα το ευαγγελιον του θεου ινα γενηθη □ η προσφορα των εθνων ευπροσδεκτος ηγιασμενη εν πνευματι αγιω (01)

Remembered Paul is a *leitourgon* of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles, (a sacred priestly server of the message^{365}, a servant with sacral connotations)\(^{366}\) so that the offering of the Gentiles may be acceptable because it is sanctified by a holy spirit. Similarly, Epaphroditus is a co-worker, an apostle, and also named *leitourgon* in Phil. 2:25-30, a priestly server,


366 Arndt and Gingrich, 471.
ministering to RP’s need (Folio 88r) when the Philippians were deficient in providing such services (*leitourgias*). RP, it would seem, is using sacred language that is grounded in material and physical activity. For instance, *leitourgesai* is used in Rom. 15:27 to refer to the Gentiles’ responsibility to provide material resources for “the poor” saints in Jerusalem. Therefore, RP is a sacred servant of Christ who delivers the message, as is Epaphroditus who brings him material resources, and as the Gentiles in Rome are expected to do as well for those in need in Jerusalem.

**Rom. 15:17-18**

οὐ γάρ τι τολμήσω λαλεῖν ὦν οὐ κατειργασάτο χριστός δι' εμοῦ □ εἰς υπάκοην εθνῶν λόγω καὶ ἐργῷ (p⁴⁶)

οὐ γὰρ τολμὼ τι λαλέει ὄν οὐ κατειργασάτο χριστός δι' εμοῦ λόγων εἰς ακοήν εθνῶν λόγῳ καὶ ἐργῷ (03)

οὐ γὰρ [*: τολμῆσο τι / C2: τολμὼ τι] λαλέει ὄν οὐ κατειργασάτο χριστός δι' εμοῦ □ εἰς υπάκοην εθνῶν λόγω καὶ ἐργῷ (01)

In Christ Jesus, RP has a basis on which to boast of his work for God, because he does not speak of anything which is not the direct result of Christ working through him for the obedience of the Gentiles. Herein is the basis of his authority for his work.

**Rom 15:19**

ἐν δύναμει αὐτοῦ σημείων τε καὶ τερατῶν [ἐν] δύναμει πνεῦματος θεοῦ ὡστε μὲ αὐτὸ [ιερουσαλήμ] καὶ κυκλὼ μεχρὶ [του] [ὐλλυρικού] [πεπληρωκεναι] (p⁴⁶)

ἐν δύναμει □ σημείων □ καὶ τερατῶν εν δύναμει πνευματος □ ὡστε μὲ αὐτῳ ἱερουσαλημ καὶ κυκλω μεχρι του υλυρικου πεπληρωκεναι το ευαγγελιον του χριστου (03)

ἐν δύναμει □ σημείων □ καὶ τερατῶν εν δύναμει πνευματος θεου ὡστε μὲ αὐτο ἱερουσαλημ καὶ κυκλω μεχρι του υλυρικου πεπληρωκεναι το ευαγγελιον του χριστου (01)
Paul claims to have proclaimed the message of Christ from Jerusalem to Illyricum.

**Folio 3558   Rom. 15:20-28**

**Rom 15:20**

ουτως δὲ φιλοτιμομαι ευαγγελιζεσθαι ουχ οπου ονομασθη ο χριστος ινα μη επ αλλοτριον θεμελιον οικοδομω (p$^{46}$)

ουτως δε φιλοτιμουμενον ευαγγελιζεσθαι ουχ οπου ονομασθη δε χριστος ινα μη επ αλλοτριον θεμελιον οικοδομω (03, 01)

RP’s ambition is to proclaim the message only where it has not been introduced so that he does not build on anyone else’s work (foundation). See also 1 Cor. 3:10-18 (Folio 41). This evidence reminds us that RP is one of a group of many messengers of Christ.

**Rom 15:22**

διο και ενεκοπτομην πολλαις του ελθειν προς υμας (p$^{46}$, 03)

διο και ενεκοπτομην τα πολλα του ελθειν προς υμας (01)

Referring back to Rom. 15:21, Paul was hindered from coming to see them in Rome because he did not wish to proclaim the message where it had already been proclaimed.

**Rom 15:23**

νυνι δε μηκετι τοπον [*: εχαι / C: εχειν] εν τοις κλιμασιν τουτοις επιποθιαν δε εχων του ελθειν προς υμας απο πολλων ετων (p$^{46}$)

νυνι δε μηκετι τοπον εχον εν τοις κλιμασιν τουτοις επιποθιαν δε εχων του ελθειν προς υμας απο ικανων ετων (03)
However, there are no more places where the message has not already been delivered.

**Rom. 15:25**

Paul tells them that he is going to Jerusalem to serve the saints (Rom. 15:25). The p\(^{46}\) manuscript reads *diakōnēsai* (the aorist active infinitive of *diakoneω*) which means “to serve”, “to take care of” (i.e. deliver a letter, take care of someone’s needs).\(^{367}\) The aorist infinitive also has the meaning of a task that has been begun and will be completed. Rom. 15:26 clarifies that this service entails taking the contribution that Macedonia and Achaia have made for the impoverished saints in Jerusalem. Rom. 15:27 clarifies that the gift is one of *sarkikoi* (material resources).\(^{368}\)

---

\(^{367}\) Arndt and Gingrich, 184.

\(^{368}\) Arndt and Gingrich, 742-743.
Once Paul has delivered to Jerusalem what has been collected, he intends, by way of Spain, to visit people in Rome.

**Folio 3559  Rom. 15:29-16:3**

**Rom 15:31**

The Greek word *diakonia* means aid “in terms of alms and charitable giving” (Act. Thomas 59). His ‘service’ is the collection to be delivered to the poor in Jerusalem (Rom. 15:31). Paul anticipates some question about the acceptability of the *diakonia* with references to the ones disobeying in Judea.

**Rom. 16:2**

---

369 Arndt and Gingrich, 184.
Although p⁴⁶ does not provide the necessary evidence that Phoebe (a minister of the church in Cenchrea see Rom. 16:1) was also Paul’s patroness/benefactor as she was for others, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus indicate that she played this role in Paul’s life. Therefore, this will be accepted as a biographical fact.

Romans 16:3

ασπασασθε πρισκαν και [ακυλαν] [τους] -- (p⁴⁶)

[Romans 16:3]

Vaticanus and Sinaiticus agree that Prisca and Aquilla were Paul’s co-workers. The Chester Beatty II contains a kai to indicate that another name will follow, but the Aquilla is missing.

Folio 3560 Rom. 16:4-13

Romans 16:7

ασπασασθε ανδρονικον και ιουλιαν τους συγγενεις μου και τους συναιχμαλωτους μου οιτινες εισιν επισημοι εν τοις αποστολοις μου και προ εμου γεγονεν εν χριστω (p⁴⁶)

[C2: ασπασασθε / *: ασπασθε] ανδρονικον και ιουλιαν τους συγγενεις μου και τους συναιχμαλωτους μου οιτινες εισιν επισημοι εν τοις αποστολοις μου και προ εμου γεγονεν εν χριστω (03)

ασπασασθαι ανδρονικον και ιουλιαν τους συγγενεις μου και συναιχμαλωτους μου οιτινες εισιν επισημοι εν τοις αποστολοις [Z2: οι / T: ο] και προ εμου γεγονεν εν χριστω (01)
Adronicus and Julia/Junian are Paul’s kinsmen, prisoners at the same time, in his estimation, notable amongst the apostles, and “in Christ” before he was.

Rom 16:11

Herodian is Paul’s kinsman.370 Although scholars have used RP’s reference to this man as an indication that RP is a Herodian, a name does not always indicate familial origins. Slaves were named by their masters, and those names could be taken from the place where they were bought, the master they were bought from, or the master to whom they belonged.371

Rom 16:13

Paul names Rufus’ mother as his mother.

370 Douglas J. Moo, Romans (Zondervan, 2009), n.p. “Herodian is a name otherwise unattested. He was probably a freed slave who took the name of the Herodian family he served.” See books.google.ca/books?id=VbTgXVnP-6YC&dq=slave+with+Roman+name+Herodian&source=gbs_navlinks_s. 371 Varro On the Latin Language 8.6, 10, 21, 83 from Matthew Dillon and Lynda Garland, Ancient Rome: From the Early Republic to the Assassination of Julius Caesar (Oxford: UK: Taylor & Francis, 2005), 302.
Rom 16:21

ασπαζεται υμας τιμοθεος ο συνεργος μου και λουκιος και ιασων και σωσιπατρος οι συγγενεις μου

Rom 16:22

ασπαζομαι υμας εγω ο τερτιος ο γραψας την επιστολην εν κυριω

The agreed-upon letters name Tertius as the writer of the letter.
Folio 3574- Heb. 8:7  no biographical information
Folio 3580  Heb. 5:8- 8:7  no biographical information
Folio 29v  Heb. 8:8 – 9:9  no biographical information
Folio 3581  Heb. 9:10-16  no biographical information
Folio 3582  Heb. 9:18-25  no biographical information
Folio 31-37  Heb. 9:26- Heb. 13:11  no biographical information
Folio 37r  Heb. 13:12-20

Heb. 13:19

περισσοτέρως δὲ παρακάλω τούτο ποιησαι ἵνα ταχίον ἀποκατασταθῶ [ὑμῖν] (p46)

περισσοτέρως δὲ παρακάλω τούτο ποιησαι ἵνα ταχίον ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν (01)

RP urges ‘the Hebrews’ to pray for ‘us’ so that he might be restored to them. Vaticanus does not contain text following Hebrews 9:14. However, this verse is confirmed by Sinaiticus.

Folio 38v  Heb. 13:21-25; 1 Cor. 1:1-4

Heb. 13:22

παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς αδελφοί ανεχέσθε τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως καὶ γὰρ διὰ βραχέων [C: επεστείλα / *: απεστείλα] ὑμῖν (p46)

παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς αδελφοί ανεχέσθε τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως καὶ [C2: γὰρ / *: □] διὰ βραχέων επεστείλα ὑμῖν (01)
RP wrote them to them by means of a few words.⁷³² Although there is no direct mention of RP in this letter, by virtue of Hebrews’ existence in the collection of agreed-upon letters, this statement is considered Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon. This verse is therefore taken in conjunction with other verses to assess his level of literacy and/or education.

**Heb. 13:23**

γινωσκετε τον αδελφον ημων τιμοθεον απολελυμενον μεθ ου εαν ταχιον ερχηται οφομαι υμας (P⁴⁶)

RP tells them that Timothy has been freed, and if he arrives in time, will come along with him.

**1 Cor 1:1**

παυλος κλητος αποστολος χριστου ιησου δια θεληματος θεου και σωσθενης ο αδελφος (p⁴⁶, 03)

RP is an apostolos of Jesus Christ.

**Folio 38r 1 Cor. 1:4-14**

**1 Cor. 1:14**

ευχαριστω ει μη κρισπον και γαιον (p⁴⁶)

ευχαριστω □ οτι ουδενα υμων εβαπτισα ει μη κρισπον και γαιον (03)

---

⁷³² Arndt and Gingrich, 147.

RP only baptized Crispus and Gaius.

**Folio 39v  1 Cor. 1:14-23**

1 Cor. 1:17

ου γαρ απεστειλεν με ο χριστος βαπτιζειν αλλα ευαγγελιζεσθαι ουκ εν σοφια λογου ρα μη κενωθη ο σταυρος του χριστου (p46)

(03, 01)

RP claims that Christ did not send him to baptize, but to proclaim the message – though not by means of a word of wisdom (could be eloquent speech or intellectual reasoning). 373

**Folio 3583  1 Cor. 2:3-11**

1 Cor. 2:3

– εν ασθενεια και εν φοβω και εν τρομω εν πολλω εγενομην προς υμας (p46)

καγω εν ασθενεια και εν φοβω και εν τρομω □ πολλω εγενομην προς υμας (03, 01)

373 Arndt and Gingrich, 477.
RP admits to the Corinthians that he came to them in weakness, and trembling with fear/apprehension/anxiety. The weakness that causes him to come with fear may have been a bodily weakness (frailty, sickness or disease), economic weakness, or weakness caused by a lack of influence.\textsuperscript{374}

**1 Cor. 2:4**

καὶ ο λόγος μου καὶ το κήρυγμα μου ουκ εν πειθοῖς σοφίας εν αποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δύναμεως (p\textsuperscript{46})

καὶ ο λόγος μου καὶ το κήρυγμα μου ουκ εν πειθοῖς σοφίας λογοῖς αλλὰ εν αποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δύναμεως (03)

καὶ ο λόγος μου καὶ το κήρυγμα μου ουκ εν πειθοῖς [*: λογοῖς / *: λογοῖς] αλλὰ εν αποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δύναμεως (01)

RP tells the Corinthians that his speech was not with persuasive [words of] wisdom, but a demonstration of spirit and power.

**Folio 3584 1 Cor. 2:11-3:5**

**1 Cor. 3:5**

[tις] [ουν] εστιν απόλλως τις δε εστιν — (p\textsuperscript{46})

τι ουν εστιν απόλλως τι δε εστιν παύλους διακονοι δι ων επιστευσατε και εκαστῳ ως ο κυριος εδωκεν (03)

[*: τι / C2: τις] ουν εστιν απόλλως [*: τι / C2: τις] δε εστιν παύλους διακονοι\textsuperscript{375} δι ων επιστευσατε και εκαστῳ ως ο κυριος εδωκεν (01)

---

\textsuperscript{374} Arndt and Gingrich, 115.

\textsuperscript{375} Arndt and Gingrich, 184.
RP and Apollos are *diakonoi*, and the Corinthians came to believe through them.

**Folio 41v 1 Cor. 3:6-15**

**1 Cor. 3:6**

εγώ εφυτεύσα απόλλως εποτίσεν αλλά ο θεός ηυξάνεν

(p.46 01 03)

According to RP, he planted the ‘field’ and Apollos watered it. This evidence indicates his perception (at least) that he initiated the work with the Corinthians, and Apollos maintained it.

**1 Cor. 3:8**

ο φυτευών δε και ο ποτίζων εν εισιν εκαστός δε τον ιδίον μισθόν λημψεται κατά τον ιδίον κοπόν

(p.46 01)

ο φυτευών δε και ο ποτίζων εν εισιν εκαστός δε τον ιδίον μισθόν [*: λημψεται / C2: λήψεται] κατά τον ιδίον κοπόν (03)

According to RP, he and Apollos will each receive wages for their particular work/labour/toil.376

---

376 Arndt and Gingrich, *mistas* and *kopos*, pages 523 and 443.
1 Cor. 3:9

RP and Apollos are co-workers. The Corinthians are the ‘field’ they work in, and God’s ‘building’ which they are working on. See also 1 Cor. 9 for his use of farming metaphors.

RP goes on to say that he laid the foundation of the building, “someone else is building upon it.” (1 Cor. 3:10). That builder will receive a wage (misthon) for the work if that work survives the fires on the Day of judgement (1 Cor. 3:14).

Folio 41r 1 Cor. 3:16-4:3

1 Cor. 4:1

Paul names himself (and Apollos?) as upēretas christou (servants, helpers, assistants) and oikonomous musteriw (managers, administers of the mysteries) of God.

Folio 42v 1 Cor. 4:4-10

1 Cor. 4:9

377 Arndt and Ginrich, 842 and 560.
Paul describes the group of apostles to which he belongs as “a spectacle to the world,” as last, and as “though sentenced to death.”

1 Cor. 4:10

In comparison to his addressees in Corinth, he, like the others in this group, are *astheneis* (social humiliation, physical weakness) and *atimoi* (dishonorable, without value, without rights or privileges).

**Folio 42r 1 Cor. 4:11-20**

1 Cor. 4:11

– [πει] νοιμεν και διψωμεν και γυμνευομεν και κολαφιζομεθα και αστατουμεν (p₄₆)

αχρι της αρτι ωρας και πεινωμεν και διψωμεν και κολαφιζομεθα και αστατουμεν (03)

αχρι της αρτι ωρας και πεινωμεν και διψωμεν και γυμνευομεν και κολαφιζομεθα και αστατουμεν (01)

---

RP belongs to a group of people (Sosthenes? 1 Cor. 1:1) who are presently hungry (peinōmen) and suffering from thirst (dipsōmen).\(^{380}\) They are also poorly clothed (yumniteuō),\(^{381}\) they are being physically beaten (e.g. struck with a fist),\(^{382}\) and they are homeless/without a permanent home.\(^{383}\)

**1 Cor. 4:12**

αι κοπιωμεν εργαζομενοι ταις ιδιαις χερσιν λοιδορουμενοι ευλογουμεν διωκομενοι ανεχομεθα (p\(^{46}\) 01 03)

Paul belongs to a group of workers who are continually physically tired and weary\(^{384}\) from work with their hands.

**1 Cor. 4:13**

δυσφημουμενοι παρακαλουμεν ως περικαθαρματα του κοσμου εγενηθημεν παντων περιψημα εως αρτι (p\(^{46}\) 03)

βλασφημουμενοι παρακαλουμεν ως περικαθαρματα του κοσμου εγενηθημεν παντων περιψημα εως αρτι (03)

---

\(^{380}\) Arndt and Gingrich, 200. These two verbs, placed together, “to denote the severest privations”.

\(^{381}\) Arndt and Gingrich, 167.

\(^{382}\) Arndt and Gingrich, 441 kolaphizō. The present passive indicative is used in the text. According to the authors, this verb is “found almost exclusively in Christian literature” and means “strike with the fist, beat, cuff”.

\(^{383}\) Arndt and Gingrich, 117 astateō. The present active indicative, first person plural. This indicates a homeless, unsettled or vagabond existence.


167
Paul also describes the apostles as being slandered as filth.\textsuperscript{385}

Folio 43-44 1 Cor. 4:20-7:2 no biographical information

Folio 45\textsuperscript{v} 1 Cor. 7:4-12

1 Cor. 7:8

λεγὼ δὲ τοῖς ἁγαμοῖς καὶ ταῖς χηραῖς καλὸν αὐτοῖς εὰν μεινωσίν ὡς καγὼ (01)

λεγὼ δὲ τοῖς ἁγαμοῖς καὶ ταῖς χηραῖς καλὸν αὐτοῖς εὰν μεινωσίν ὡς καὶ εγὼ (p\textsuperscript{46})

λεγὼ δὲ τοῖς ἁγαμοῖς καὶ ταῖς χηραῖς καλὸν αὐτοῖς αὖ μεινωσίν ὡς καγὼ (03)

Paul is unmarried.

Folio 45\textsuperscript{r}-47\textsuperscript{v} 1 Cor. 7:12-8:7 no biographical information

Folio 47\textsuperscript{r} 1 Cor. 8:7-9:2

1 Cor. 9:1

ουκ εἰμι ἐλευθερὸς οὐκ εἰμι ἀποστόλος οὐχὶ ἤσσουν τὸν κυρίον ἡμῶν εώρακα οὐ τὸ ἐργὸν μου ύμεις ἐστε εἰς κυρίῳ (01)

385 Fritz Rienecker, \textit{A Linguistic Key to the New Testament}, Translated, with additions and revisions, from the German Sprachlicher Schlussel zum griechischen Neuen Testament, Edited by Cleon L. Rogers, Jr. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1976): 51-52: “The word was also used of condemned criminals of the lowest class who were sacrified as offerings for the cleansing of a city” (51) of the world we became the scrapings of a dirty vessel, (52).
Paul asserts that he is a free man, and an apostle. He associates ‘free’ status with apostleship, and with his argument that he has the right to food and drink.

**Folio 48v  1 Cor. 9:4-12**

1 Cor. 9:6:

η μονος εγω και βαρναβας ουκ εχομεν εξουσιαν μη εργαζεσθαι  (p₄₆ 01  03)

The Greek form of Paul’s question indicates that he expects that the addressees would agree that he and Barnabas do not have the freedom/right not to work for a living. This confirms the earlier statement that Paul and others are required to do manual labour. Given that this verse is followed by questions about food and drink, and he is not given the right to share in their material benefits (*sarkika*), it appears that Paul is an apostle who receives fewer benefits than Cephas and “the brothers.”

**Folio 48r  1 Cor. 9:12-20**  no biographical information

**Folio 49v  1 Cor. 9:20-10:1**  no biographical information

**Folio 49r  1 Cor. 10:1-10**  no biographical information

---

386 J.W. Wenham, *The Elements of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 73: The Greek word *mē* or *mēti* is used to indicate a hesitant question or a question which expects a “No” answer.
Folio 50v-55v  1 Cor. 10:11-14:14  no biographical information

Folio 56r  1 Cor. 14:16-23

1 Cor. 14:18

ευχαρίστω τῷ θεῷ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν μαλλὸν γλώσσαις λαλεῖν (p\(^46\))
ευχαριστο τῳ θεῳ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν μαλλὸν γλώσσαις λαλο (03)
ευχαριστο τῳ θεῳ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν μαλλὸν γλώσση λαλο (01)

Paul speaks in ‘tongues’ more than the others in the Corinthian assembly. According to Arndt and Gingrich, there is “no doubt about the thing referred to, namely the broken speech of persons in religious ecstasy”\(^{387}\) found in Hellenistic religions. This may provide information about the ‘religious’ group that Paul belongs to.

Folio 56v-57r  1 Cor. 14:24-15:5  no biographical information

Folio 57v  1 Cor. 15:6-15

1 Cor. 15:8

εσχατον δὲ παντὸν ὁσπερεί τῷ εκτρωματὶ ὑφθη καμοί (p\(^46\), 03, 01)

1 Cor. 15:9

ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰμὶ ο ἐλαχιστὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων ός ὦκ εἰμὶ ἰκανός καλείσθαι ἀποστόλος διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν εκκλησίαν δ θεού (p\(^46\))

---

\(^{387}\) Arndt and Gingrich, 162. They report that the phenomenon was found in Hellenistic religions.
εγώ γαρ είμι ο ελάχιστος των αποστόλων ος ουκ είμι ικανός καλείσθαι αποστόλος διότι εδίωξα την εκκλησίαν του θεού  

1 Cor. 15:10

χαριτί δέ θεού είμι ο είμι καί η χαρίς αυτού η είς εμε κενή ουκ εγενήθη ἀλλὰ περισσότερον αυτῶν παντῶν εκοπίασα ουκ εγώ δέ ἀλ η χαρίς του θεού η είς εμε (03, 01)

χαριτί δέ θεού είμι ο είμι καί η χαρίς αυτού η είς εμε ου κενη εγενηθη αλλα περισσοτερον αυτων [C1: παντων / *: απαντων] εκοπίασα ουκ εγώ δε αλλα η χαρίς του θεού [C2: η / *: □] σον εμοι (01)

χαριτι δε θεου ειμι ο ειμι και η χαρις αυτου εις εμε ου κενη εγενηθη αλλα περισσοτερον αυτων παντων εκοπιασα ουκ εγω δε αλλα η χαρις του θεου συν εμοι (03)

Remembered Paul claims that Christ appeared to James and then all the apostles, and last of all, as if to one born at the wrong time, he appeared to RP who is the least of the apostles, and unworthy of being called an apostle because he had pursued/hassled/persecuted the assembly of God.

Folio 58r – 59r 1 Cor. 15:17 – 15:50 no biographical information

Folio 59v 1 Cor. 15:51-16:2

1 Cor. 16:1

περὶ δὲ τῆς λογίας τῆς [C: εἰς / *: εἰ] τοὺς αγίους ὀσπέρ διετάξα ταῖς εκκλησίαις τῆς γαλατίας [οὖτως] [καὶ] ὑμεῖς ποιησάτε (p46)

περὶ δὲ τῆς λογίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς αγίους ὀσπέρ διετάξα ταῖς εκκλησίαις τῆς γαλατίας οὖτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιησάτε (03, 01)

RP gave the same instructions to the Corinthians concerning the “collection” for “the saints” as he gave to the assemblies of Galatia. This provides information concerning the locations of this work.
Paul wrote the greeting with his own hand.

Paul is an apostle of the Christ (see also Rom. 11:13, Eph. 1:1, and Gal. 1:1).
RP and Timothy were persecuted/accused/chased/hassled. This is the same verb that RP uses in Gal. 1:13 and is translated “violently persecuting” (NRSV).

**Folio 65r-69v 2 Cor. 4:13 – 9:7 no biographical information**

**Folio 3585 2 Cor. 9:7-10:1**

2 Cor. 10:1

αὐτὸς δὲ ἡγὼ παῦλος παρακάλω υμᾶς διὰ τὴν πραυτῆτος — εἰς υμᾶς (p46)

αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ παῦλος παρακάλω υμᾶς διὰ τῆς πραυτῆτος καὶ επιεικείας τοῦ χριστοῦ ὡς κατὰ προσωπὸν μεν ταπείνως εἰς υμίν απόν δὲ θαρρῶ δι’ υμᾶς (03)

αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ παῦλος παρακάλω υμᾶς διὰ τῆς πρααυτῆτος καὶ επιεικείας τοῦ χριστοῦ ὡς κατὰ προσωπὸν μεν ταπείνως εἰς υμίν απόν δὲ θαρρῶ εἰς υμᾶς (01)

In this case, p46 has lacunae. Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, however, both contain the phrase, *prosōpon men tapeinos*, an assertion that Paul had an abject or despicable physical appearance388 among the Corinthians.

**Folio 3586 2 Cor. 1-11**

2 Cor. 10:10

οἱ αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ μεν ἐκ βαρείας καὶ ἐσχηρὶ ὅ τε παρουσία τοῦ σώματος ασθενῆς καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐξουθενημένης (p46)

οἱ αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ μὲν φασιν βαρείας καὶ ἐσχηρὶ ὅ τε παρουσία τοῦ σώματος ασθενῆς καὶ ὁ λόγος εξουθενημένης (03)

388 Arndt and Gingrich, 804.
οτι αι [*: επιστολαι μεν / C2: μεν επιστολαι] φησιν βαρεια και ισχυραι η δε παρουσια του σωματος
ασθενης και ο λογος εξουθενημενος (01)

People are saying that Paul’s letters are weighty and strong, but his bodily presence is
socially humiliating (or diseased) and his speech is despicable/disdainful/amounts to
nothing. 389

Folio 3587 2 Cor. 10:11-11:2 no biographical information

Folio 3588 2 Cor. 11:3-10

2 Cor. 11:6

ει δε και ιδιωτης τω λογω αλλ ου τη γνωσει (p46)

ει δε και ιδιωτης τω λογω αλλ ου τη γνωσει αλλ εν παντι φανερωσαντες εν πασιν εις υμας (03)

ει δε και ιδιωτης τω λογω αλλ ου τη γνωσει αλλ εν παντι [Τ: φανερωσαντες / Z2: φανερωθεντες]
εν πασιν εις υμας (01)

Paul states that he is unskilled in speaking.

2 Cor. 11:7

η αμαρτιαν εποιησα εμαυτον ταπεινων ινα υμεις υψωθητε οτι δωρεαν το του θεου ευαγγελιον
ευηγγελισαμην υμιν (p46 01 03)

Paul states that he preached the gospel of God (dōrean) without payment, en gratis. 390

389 Arndt and Gingrich, 277.

2 Cor. 11:8

The verb, *sulaō*, means “to rob”. According to the Arndt and Gingrich, it is a highly figurative expression for RP’s procedure in accepting financial support from other assemblies who provided *opsōvion* while he was in Corinth. They state that this was similar to “ration (money) paid to a soldier” and that it came to mean “wages”, and its more general meaning is ‘provisions’ (see 1 Macc. 14:32) which may be more appropriate for New Testament texts.

2 Cor. 11:9

καὶ παρων πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔστιν θερισθεὶς οὐ κατεναρκήσα αὐτὸν τὸ γαρ θερίσμα μου προσανεπληρωσαν οἱ αδελφοὶ ἐλθόντες απὸ μακεδονίας καὶ ἐν παντὶ αβαρή ἐμαυτόν ὑμίν ετηρήσα[καὶ] τηρήσω (p.46)

καὶ παρων πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ θερισθεὶς οὐ κατεναρκήσα αὐτόν τὸ γαρ θερίσμα μου προσανεπληρωσαν οἱ αδελφοὶ ἐλθόντες απὸ μακεδονίας καὶ ἐν παντὶ αβαρή ἐμαυτόν ὑμίν ετηρήσα καὶ τηρήσω (03)

καὶ παρων πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ θερισθεὶς οὐ κατεναρκήσα αὐτόν τὸ γαρ θερίσμα μου προσανεπληρωσαν οἱ αδελφοὶ ἐλθόντες απὸ μακεδονίας καὶ ἐν παντὶ αβαρή [*: εμαυτόν ὑμῖν / C2: ὑμῖν εμαυτόν] ετηρήσα καὶ τηρήσω (01)

391 Arndt and Gingrich, 776.

392 Arndt and Gingrich, 602.
Paul states that he kept himself un-burdensome to them (usterēma)\(^{393}\) because, when he had been in need, “the brothers” from Macedonia had made up for his lack. Thus, this confirms that Paul received provisions from Macedonia when he was in Corinth.

**Folio 3589**  
2 Cor. 11:12-22

2 Cor. 11:22

[εβραιοι] [εισιν] [καγω] [ισραηλειται] – (p\(^46\))

εβραιοι εισιν καγω [C2: ισραηλειται / *: ισραηλειται] εισιν καγω σπέρμα αβρααμ εισιν καγω (03)

εβραιοι εισιν καγω ισδραηλειται εισιν καγω σπέρμα αβρααμ εισιν καγω (01)

Remembered Paul is a Hebrew, an Israelite, and a descendant of Abraham as stated elsewhere.

**Folio 3590**  
2 Cor. 11:23-33

2 Cor. 11:23

– παραφρονων λαλώ υπέρ εγώ εν κοποις περισσοτερος εν φυλακαις περισσοτερος εν πληγαις υπερβαλλοντως εν θανατοις πολλακις (p\(^{46}\))

διακονοι χριστου εισιν παραφρονων λαλώ υπέρ εγώ εν κοποις περισσοτερος εν φυλακαις περισσοτερος εν πληγαις υπερβαλλοντως εν θανατοις πολλακις (03)

διακονοι χριστου εισιν παραφρονων λαλώ υπέρ εγώ εν κοποις περισσοτερος εν [*: πληγαις περισσοτερος εν φυλακαις υπερβαλλοντως] / C2: πληγαις υπερβαλλοντως εν φυλακαις περισσοτερος] εν θανατοις πολλακις (01)

\(^{393}\) Arndt and Gingrich, 849.
In his defense to the Corinthians, RP compared himself with the “deceitful workers” (2 Cor. 11:13). He states that, compared to these workers, he received more kopois (hardships, troubles, literally beatings),\(^{394}\) more phulakais (more imprisonments),\(^{395}\) and more plēgais (more blows, wounds, or bruises from beatings by rods or being whipped).\(^{396}\) He was also often en thanatois (many times in danger of death).\(^{397}\) Richard Saller informs us that a man that could be beaten, by Roman common sense, is seen as inherently degraded.\(^{398}\) Remembered Paul was degraded, imprisoned and beaten, and near death on many occasions.

2 Cor. 11:24

υπὸ Ιουδαίων πεντακίς τεσσερακοντα παρὰ μιαν ἐλαβόν (p\(^{46}\))
υπὸ Ιουδαίων πεντακίς [*: τεσσερακόντα / C2: τεσσαράκοντα] παρὰ μιαν ἐλαβόν (03)
υπὸ Ιουδαίων πεντακίς τεσσερακόντα παρὰ μιαν ἐλαβόν (01)

Paul declares that he has received the ‘forty’ minus one from the Ioudaiōn (Jewish leaders) on five different occasions. The word tesserakonta is the Ionic-Hellenistic form of the

\(^{394}\) Arndt and Gingrich, 443.

\(^{396}\) Arndt and Gingrich, 867.

\(^{396}\) Arndt and Gingrich, 668.

\(^{397}\) Arndt and Gingrich, 350.

word *tessarakonta*, and is found primarily in the NT manuscripts and in the LXX uncials. The corrector of Vaticanus is aware of the other spelling that is found in other Greek and Hebrew texts (e.g. Ep. Arist. 105; Test. 12 Patri.; Josephus Ant. 11, 15).\(^{399}\) It is interpreted as “forty lashes” in accordance with the Septuagint’s interpretation of Deuteronomy 25:3 of the Masoretic text.

2 Cor. 11:25

\[
tρις \varepsilonραβδισθην \varepsilon\tau\varepsilonς \varepsilonναυγησα \nuχθημερον \varepsilonν τω \varepsilonβυθω \varepsilonπεοιηκα \ (p^{46})
\]

\[
tρις \varepsilonραβδισθην \απ\varepsilonξ \varepsilonλιθασθην \τρις \varepsilonναυγησα \nuχθημερον \varepsilonν τω \varepsilonβυθω \varepsilonπεοιηκα \ (03, \ 01)
\]

Remembered Paul claims that he has been beaten with rods on three occasions and stoned on one occasion. Vulnerability to corporal punishment is linked to social ranking.

2 Cor. 11:27

\[
\tau \ \kappaο\nu \ \kappaαι \ \mu\gamma\chi\omega \ \varepsilon\nu \ \varepsilonγρυπ\nu\iota\iota\iota\iota \varepsilon\nu \ \varepsilon\lambdaι\mu\omega \ \kαι \ \delta\iota\psi\iota\iota\iota \ \varepsilon\nu \ \varepsilon\nu\sigma\tau\iota\eeta\iota \varepsilon\nu \ \varepsilon\psi\chi\iota\iota \ \kαι \ \gamma\uacute{u}n\nu\iota\iota\iota\iota \ (p^{46})
\]

\*

\[
\tau \ \kappaο\nu \ \kappaαι \ \mu\gamma\chi\omega \ \varepsilon\nu \ \varepsilonγρυπ\nu\iota\iota\iota\iota \varepsilon\nu \ \varepsilon\lambdaι\mu\omega \ \kαι \ \delta\iota\psi\iota\iota\iota \ \varepsilon\nu \ \varepsilon\nu\sigma\tau\iota\eeta\iota \varepsilon\nu \ \varepsilon\psi\chi\iota\iota \ \kαι \ \gamma\uacute{u}n\nu\iota\iota\iota\iota \ (03)
\]

\[
\ [^*; \ \tau / C2: \ \varepsilon\nu] \ \kappaο\nu \ \kappaαι \ \mu\gamma\chi\omega \ \varepsilon\nu \ \varepsilonγρυπ\nu\iota\iota\iota\iota \varepsilon\nu \ \varepsilon\lambdaι\mu\omega \ \kαι \ \delta\iota\psi\iota\iota\iota \ \varepsilon\nu \ \varepsilon\nu\sigma\tau\iota\eeta\iota \varepsilon\nu \ \varepsilon\psi\chi\iota\iota \ \kαι \ \gamma\uacute{u}n\nu\iota\iota\iota\iota \ (01)
\]

\[
399 \ Arndt \ and \ Gingrich, \ 813.
\]
Still enumerating his trials, RP claims that he has been in a state of toil, hardship/exertion, famine and thirst, often deprived of food, and cold without adequate shelter or clothing. See Paul’s earlier description of the existence of the apostles in 1 Corinthians 4:11-13. I am aware of John T. Fitzgerald and others that argue that this is part of a ‘catalogue of hardships’ that is rhetorical rather than biographical.

2 Cor. 11:32

\[\text{ἐν δαμάσκῳ [ὁ [ἐθναρχῆς] [ἀρετα] τοῦ βασιλέως – (p46)}\]
\[\text{ἐν δαμάσκῳ ὁ ἑθναρχῆς ἀρετα τοῦ βασιλέως εφρούρει τὴν πολίν δαμασκηνίων πιάσαι με ἔπ (03)}\]
\[\text{ἐν δαμάσκῳ ὁ ἑθναρχῆς ἀρετα τοῦ βασιλέως εφρούρει τὴν πολίν δαμασκηνίων πιάσαι με θελῶν (01)}\]

Remembered Paul claimed that the ‘ethnarch’ of Aretas who guarded the city of Damascus attempted to seize Paul. Jerome Murphy-O’Connor reports that the “ethnarch at Damascus was merely a sort of ‘consul’ who headed the Nabataean trading colony,” and the authority of such a ‘consul’ was limited to the members of his own colony. Given that Aretas was the Arabian king of Nabataea between 9 BCE and 40 CE, this fact would place Paul in

400 Arndt and Gingrich, 443 & 528 kopos with moxthos.
401 Arndt and Gingrich, 538.
Nabataean-controlled Damascus between 34-37 CE, and perhaps a member of the colony.

**Folio 3591-3595**  2 Cor. 11:33 – Eph. 1:11  no biographical information

**Folio 3599-3601**  Eph. 1:12-2:20  no biographical information

**Folio 3602**  Eph. 2:21-3:10

**Eph. 3:1**

τουτο χαριν εγω παυλος ο δεσμιος του χριστου ιησου υπερ υμων των εθνων (p46)

τουτου χαριν εγω παυλος ο δεσμιος του χριστου ιησου υπερ υμων των εθνων (03)

τουτου χαριν εγω παυλος ο δεσμιος του χριστου [C1: ιησου / #: ] υπερ υμων των εθνων (01)

When Paul’s letter was written to addressees at Ephesus, he was a shackled prisoner.

**Folio 3603-3610**  Eph. 3:11 – Eph. 6:18  no biographical information

**Folio 3611**  Eph. 6:20 – Gal. 1:8

**Eph. 6:20**

ινα αυτο παρησιασωμαι ως [C: δει / #: ]/ [1/ει] με λαλησαι (p46)

υπερ ου πρεσβευω εν αλυσει ινα αυτο παρησιασωμαι ως δει με λαλησαι (03)

υπερ ου πρεσβευω εν αλυσει ινα παρησιασωμαι εν αυτω ως δει με λαλησαι (01)

---

Remembered Paul states to the addressees in Ephesus that he is shackled in prison.

**Folio 3612  Gal. 1:10-22**

**Gal. 1:10**

– εἰ ετὶ ἀνθρώποις ἡρεσκον χριστοῦ δουλὸς οὐκ ἂν ἦμην (p₄⁶)

αρτι γαρ ἀνθρώπους πείθω η τον θεον η ζήτω ανθρώποις ἀρεσκείν εἰ ετὶ ανθρώποις ἡρεσκον χριστοῦ δουλὸς οὐκ ἂν ἦμην (03, 01)

Paul calls himself a slave of Christ.

**Gal 1:12**

ουδε γαρ εγὼ παρα ανθρώπου παρελαβον αυτο ουτε ειδιαχθην αλλα δι αποκαλυψεως ιησου χριστου (p₄⁶)

ουδε γαρ εγὼ παρα ανθρώπου παρελαβον αυτο ουτε ειδιαχθην αλλα δι αποκαλυψεως ιησου χριστου (03)

ουδε γαρ εγὼ παρα ανθρώπου παρελαβον αυτο ουδε ειδιαχθην αλλα δι αποκαλυψεως ιησου χριστου (01)

Paul is claiming here that he obtained the message he is proclaiming, not from other people, but by means of a revelation of Jesus Christ.

**Gal. 1:13**

ηκουσατε γαρ την εμην αναστροφην ποτε εν τω ιουδαισμω οτι καθ υπερβολην εδιωκον την εκκλησιαν του θεου και επορσουν αυτην (03, 01)

ηκουσατε γαρ την εμην αναστροφην ποτε εν τω [C: ιουδαισμω / *: ιουδασμω] οτι καθ υπερβολην εδιωκον την εκκλησιαν του θεου και επορσουν αυτην (p₄⁶)

The term, “assembly of God” (ekklēsian tou theou) is found in the Septuagint in Numbers 16:3; 20:4; Duet 23:1,2; 1 Chronicles 28:8, Micah 2:5 and Psalm 82:1. It simply means the
congregation of God (sometimes congregation, sometimes larger assembly) and in these
citations found in the Tanakh, it is the assembly of Israelites. There are also references in
Qumran literature in 1Qsa 2:4-9. Therefore, RP’s use of this world does not ‘naturally’ link
“assembly of God” simply to a ‘church’ of Christ followers. When RP states that he
persecuted the *ekklesia*, I am relying on Philip Harland’s study, and using
assembly/association rather than ‘church’ to recognize the social, political and cultural
similarities between ‘congregations’ and associations.405

**Gal. 1:14**

καὶ εὑρεκοτόν ἐν τῷ ιουδαίῳ ὑπὲρ πόλλους συνήλικωτας ἐν τῷ γενεί μου
[CV: περισσοτέρους / *: περισσοτέρον οὐς] ζηλωτὴς ὑπαρχόν τῶν πατρικῶν μου παράδοσεων (p46)
καὶ προεκοτόν ἐν τῷ ιουδαίῳ ὑπὲρ πόλλους συνήλικωτας ἐν τῷ γενεί μου περισσοτέρος
ζηλωτὴς ὑπαρχόν τῶν πατρικῶν μου παράδοσεων (03, 01)

RP claims that he had gained some notoriety concerning his previous life in *loudaismō*,
advancing beyond many of his peers because he was a greater *zealot*406 of the ancestral
traditions. *loudaismō* is a Hellenistic Jewish term,407 the nominal parallel to the verb,
*ioudaizein* which, “[o]utside the NT…impies conversion to Judaism, especially by


406 Mark R. Fairchild, “Paul's Pre-Christian Zealot Associations: A Re-examination of Gal. 1:14 and

circumcision." Steve Mason has linked the noun to Maccabean-style activities imposing strict adherence to religious practices (e.g. circumcision). The only NT use of Ioudaismos is found in Gal. 1:14.

Gal. 1:17

οüδε ηλθον εις ιεροσολυμα προς τους προ εμου αποστολους αλλα απηλθα εις αραβιαν και παλιν υπεστρεψα εις δαμασκον (p46)

οüδε απηλθον εις ιεροσολυμα προς τους προ εμου αποστολους αλλα απηλθον εις αραβιαν και παλιν υπεστρεψα εις δαμασκον (03)

οüδε ανηλθον εις ιεροσολυμα προς τους προ εμου αποστολους αλλα απηλθον εις αραβιαν και παλιν υπεστρεψα εις δαμασκον (01)

Paul returned to Damascus.

Folio 3613 Gal. 1:23 – 2:9

Gal. 2:9

και γνοντες την χαριν την δοθεισαν μοι ιακωβος και κηφας και ιωαννης οι δοκουντες στυλοι ειναι δεξιας εδωκαν εμοι και [βαρναβα] κοινονιας ινα ημεις εις εθνη [αυτοι] [δε] εις την περιτομην (p46)

και γνοντες την χαριν την δοθεισαν μοι ιακωβος και κηφας και ιωαννης οι δοκουντες στυλοι ειναι δεξιας εδωκαν εμοι και βαρναβα κοινονιας ινα ημεις εις τα εθνη αυτοι δε εις την περιτομην (03)

και γνοντες την χαριν την δοθεισαν μοι ιακωβος και κηφας και ιωαννης οι δοκουντες στυλοι ειναι δεξιας εδωκαν εμοι και βαρναβα κοινονιας ινα ημεις [T: εις εθνη αυτοι δε εις την περιτομην (01)

408 Kittel, 383.

409 Mason, 467.
Barnabas and RP were blessed by James, Cephas and John to go to the Gentiles, as long as they agreed to “remember the poor”. This information may help situate Paul within the larger group of Christ-followers, as it could indicate the subordinate status of Barnabas and RP to the leaders in Jerusalem. This confirms the link between “the collection” of the diakonian for the poor in Jerusalem with Paul’s apostleship of the Gentiles (Romans 15).

Folio 3614  Gal. 2:9-21

Gal. 2:15

ημεις φυσει ιουδαιοι οντες και ουκ εξ εθνων αμαρτωλοι (p\textsuperscript{46})
ημεις φυσει ιουδαιοι ἐκ και οὐκ ἐξ ἐθνῶν αμαρτωλοί (03, 01)

When Paul states that he is an Ioudaios by birth, he is merely claiming his ethnicity. Ioudaios occurs 107 times in the words of Philo and is a neutral association.\textsuperscript{410} The most common name used by Josephus is Ioudaios and it occurs 1122 times in his work, more than three times the use of “Hebrew” and almost 10x as often as Israelite. Harvey states that its uses “demonstrate and exemplifies the more widespread neutral or general use of the name.”\textsuperscript{411} Sanders has argued that “the factor of nationality was the stronger” association of the name “Jew in early Christian literature, taking priority over its other,


\textsuperscript{411} Harvey, 47.
religious association.” 412 This does not mean that every use was ethnic rather than religious (see John 2:6; Acts 14:1), but that it is primarily a statement about one’s ethnicity, one that would identify that he is not Gentile. Harvey concluded that “no singular religious entity should properly be called “Judaism” (as a singular in this period).” 413 However, Margaret Williams has also noted that though the term “refers mostly to people who have been born Jews whether in Judea/Palestine or elsewhere or converted to Judaism,” it was unusual for Jews to refer to themselves as Ioudaios. In her study of the “Jewish catacombs of Rome, she noted that Ioudaios was attested five times, and in all but one of those cases, the people so described were in some sense on the margin of the Jewish community.” 414

**Folio 3615 – 3616**

Gal. 3:2-29  
no biographical information

**Folio 3617**

Gal. 4: 2-17

**Gal. 4:13**

οιδατε δε οτι δι ασθενειαν της σαρκος ευηγγελισαμην υμιν το προτερον (p46, 03, 01)

Paul here speaks of having some bodily weakness when he brought the message to the Galatians. Judith Z. Abrams has noted that “few men or women lived past fifty” 415 in the

---


413 Harvey, 66.


first century Greco-Roman world. Yet, even though bodily imperfections were acknowledged, blame was often placed, in the words of Foucault, on the individual: “…the bad habits of the soul can entail physical miseries, while the excesses of the body manifest and maintain the failings of the soul.” Such thinking justified, for instance the exposure of children with a visible disability. Whatever the cause of Paul’s socially humiliated body, it would have made him a person marked with a lower social status.

Folio 3618  Gal. 4:20- 5:1  no biographical information

Folio 3619  Gal. 5:2-17

Gal. 5:11

εγώ δε αδελφοι ει περιτομην ετι κηρυσσω τι ετι διωκομαι αρα κατηργηται το σκανδαλον του σταυρου [p460103]

Paul asks his audience why he is being persecuted/hassled if it were true that he is still preaching circumcision (which tells us that Paul did adhere to the need for circumcision at one point, even if he no longer does). What was the diversity of practices concerning circumcision? While outsiders to Judaism (including present-day Christians) often present circumcision as the identifying feature of Jewish identity, Goodman has noted that scholars (and ancient Romans) failed to “guess at the variety which consisted within Second Temple


417 Abrams, 121.

186
Judaism. Outsiders showed no awareness that Jews differed among themselves both in theology and practice." Paul used to regard circumcision as essential.

Folio 3620 Gal. 5:20-6:8

Gal. 6:4

to δε εργον εαυτου δοκιμαζετω και τοτε εις αυτον μονον το καυχημα εξει ουκ εις τον ετερον (p^{46})
to δε εργον εαυτου δοκιμαζετω και τοτε εις εαυτον μονον το καυχημα εξει και ουκ εις τον ετερον (03)
to δε εργον εαυτου δοκιμαζετω εκαστος και τοτε εις εαυτον μονον το καυχημα εξει και ουκ εις τον ετερον (01)

Remembered Paul is exhorting the Galatians that each man should boast only of his own work. See also 2 Cor. 10:12-18.

Gal. 6:6

κοινωνειτω δε ο κατηχουμενος [τον] λογον τω καθηχουντι εν πασιν αγαθοις (p^{46})
koinonwetō de o katēchoumenos ton logon ton kathēchonti ev pasin agathoi (03, 01)

RP is exhorting the Galatians that those who are instructed should share their material goods with their instructor. If he is their instructor, this is another instance of his concern about receiving material support.

---


419 Rienecker, 173.
Gal. 6:11

Writing with ‘large letters’ in one’s own hand gives us information about RP’s rudimentary writing literacy.\(^\text{420}\) (See also 1 Cor. 16:21; Col. 4:18).

Gal. 6:17

William Smith provides the following definition of *stigmata*: “Runaway slaves (fugitivi) and thieves (fures) were branded on the forehead with a mark (stigma), whence they are said to be notati or inscripti (Mart. VIII.75.9).” \(^\text{421}\)


**Php 1:1**

Paul asserts again that he and Timothy are slaves of Jesus Christ.

**Phlp 1:7**

Paul states that he is in *desmois* (shackled).

**Php 1:13**

ωστε τους δεσμους μου /φανεροὺς εν ἡμῖν ἀδελφῶν Χριστῷ γενεσθαι εν ὅλῳ τῷ πρατεριῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πασιν (p46).
The whole imperial guard knows of Paul’s imprisonment.

Folio 87r-87v  Phil 1:17-2:12  no biographical information

Folio 88r  Phil. 2:14-27

Php. 2:25

αναγκαίον δὲ ηγησάμην ἐπαφροδίτον τὸν αδελφὸν καὶ συνεργόν καὶ συστρατιώτην μου ὑμῶν δὲ
ἀποστόλος καὶ λειτουργὸν τῆς χρειάς μου πεμψαί πρὸς ὑμᾶς” (p.46)

αναγκαίον δὲ ηγησάμην ἐπαφροδίτον τὸν αδελφὸν καὶ συνεργόν καὶ συστρατιώτην μου ὑμῶν δὲ
ἀποστόλον καὶ λειτουργόν τῆς χρειάς μου πεμψαί πρὸς ὑμᾶς (03, 01)

Epaphroditus is RP’s brother, co-worker, sacred servant, who provides service to
Remembered Paul’s need.

Folio 88v  Phil. 2:29-3:8

Phil. 3:4 -5

καὶ περ ἐγὼ ἔχω πεποίησιν καὶ εἰς σαρκὶ εἰ τις δοκεῖ ἄλλος πεποίηθαι εἰς σαρκὶ ἐγὼ μᾶλλον (p.46, 03)

καὶ περ ἐγὼ ἔχω πεποίησιν καὶ εἰς σαρκὶ εἰ τις δοκεῖ ἄλλος πεποίηθαι εἰς σαρκὶ [C1: ἐγὼ / *: πε] μᾶλλον (01)

v. 5

περιτομὴς οκταμερος εκ γενοὺς ἱσραηλ. φυλῆς βενιαμιν περιτομὴς εκ γενοὺς ἱσραηλ. φυλῆς βενιαμιν εφετερος εκ εβραιων κατα νομον
φαρισαιος (p.46)

περιτομὴς οκταμερος εκ γενοὺς ἱσραηλ. φυλῆς βενιαμιν εφετερος εκ εβραιων κατα νομον φαρισαιος (03, 01)
Remembered Paul states that he was circumcised on the eighth day, of the race of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew from Hebrews, with an attitude/practice of the law as that of a Pharisee.

**Phil 3:6**

κατά ζήλους διώκων ἐκκλησίαν κατά δικαιοσύνην τὴν εν νόμῳ γενομένος αμέμπτος (p46)
κατα ζήλος διώκων τὴν εκκλησίαν κατα δικαιοσύνην την εν νομω γενομενος (03)
κατα [*: ζήλος / C2: ζήλον] διώκων τὴν εκκλησίαν κατα δικαιοσύνην την εν νομω γενομενος αμεμπτος (01)

Remembered Paul describes himself as persecuting the assembly (notice singular –though does not necessarily eliminate generic use) with zeal, a blameless man concerning righteousness.

**Folio 89r**  **Phil. 3:10-21**  no biographical information

**Folio 89v**  **Phil. 4:2-12**

**Php 4:11**

ουχ οτι καθ [υστερησιν] [λέγω] [εγω] γαρ εμαθον εν οις [ειμι] [αυταρκης] [ειναι] (p46)
ουχ οτι καθ υστερησιν λεγω εγω γαρ εμαθον εν οις ειμι αυταρκης ειναι (01 03)

If this verse is taken with Phil. 4:15, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus indicate that sometimes RP has had enough to eat, and sometimes he has not….that his care of self has been dependent on their support.
Phil. 4:14-Col. 1:12

**Php 4:15**

Remembered Paul states that no other assembly/group of people gave support to him, except the Philippians, after he left Macedonia. This may be significant in terms of RP’s work as an apostle, and the need for self-support.

**Php. 4:16**

The Philippians sent support twice to Remembered Paul when he was in Thessalonica.

**Col. 1:7**
Epaphras is the beloved “fellow slave”422 with Paul and Timothy. This verse indicates the ‘slave’ status of all three men.

Folio 90v – 91r

Col. 1:5-24

no biographical information

Folio 91v

Col. 1:27 – 2:7

Col. 1:29

εἰς ο και κοπιῶ συγνώμονος κατά την ενεργείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ενεργομενὴν ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δύναμι (p⁴⁶ 01 03)

Paul states that he works and strives by means of Christ’s power that works powerfully within him.

Col. 2:1

θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰδεναι ἐλεόν αἰγώνα εὑρω ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν λαοδίκειαι καὶ οσοὶ οὐχ εὐράκαν μου τὸ προσώπον μου ἐν σαρκί (p⁴⁶)

RP claims that he is struggling for those in Colossae, those in Laodicea, and for the ones who have not seen him face-to-face.

Col. 2:5

εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἀπεκλήω ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν υἱὸν εἰμὶ χαιρόν καὶ βλέπων υἱῶν τὴν ταύτιν καὶ τὸ στήρειμα τῆς εἰς χριστὸν πιστεύως υἱῶν (01 03)

422 Arndt and Gingrich, 785. The earliest definition for this word is “fellow-slave".
RP is absent “in the flesh,’ but with them in spirit.

**Folio 92r – 93r**  
Col. 2:18 – 3:24  
no biographical information

**Folio 93v**  
Col. 4:3

-- [ina] [ο] [θεος] [ανοιξη] [ημιν] θυραν του λογου □ λαλησαι [το] [μυστηριον] [του] χριστου δι [ο] και δεδεμαι (p\textsuperscript{46})

προσευχομενοι [C1: αμα / *: ινα] και περι ημων ην ο θεος ανοιξη ημιν θυραν του λογου □ λαλησαι το μυστηριον του χριστου δι ο και δεδεμαι (01)

προσευχομενοι αμα και περι ημων ην ο θεος ανοιξη ημιν θυραν του λογου □ λαλησαι το μυστηριον του [C2: χριστου / *: θεου] δι ον και δεδεμαι (03)

RP is in prison.

**Col 4:10**

ασπαζεται υμας αρισταρχος ο συναχιστωτος μου και μαρκος ο ανεψιος βαρναβα περι ον ελαβετε εντολας εαν ελθη προι υμας δεξασθε αυτον (p\textsuperscript{46}, 03, 01)

Aristarchus, Mark the cousin of Barnabas, and Justus are RP’s only co-workers of the circumcision for the kingdom of God.

**Col 4:12**

Λασπαζεται υμας επαφρας ο εξ υμων δουλος χριστου Ξ παντοτε αγονιζομενος υπερ υμων εν ταις προσευχαις □ ινα σταθητε τελειοι και πεπληρωμενοι εν τοις θεληματι του θεου (p\textsuperscript{46})

ασπαζεται υμας επαφρας ο εξ υμων δουλος χριστου ην αε συναχιστωτος τοις προσευχαις □ ινα σταθητε τελειοι και πεπληρωμενοι εν παντι θεληματι του θεου (03)
ασπαζέται ὑμᾶς ἐπαφρας ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν δοῦλος χριστοῦ ἡσυ σαντοτε αγωνιζομένος ὑπὲρ [C1: ὑμὼν / *: ἡμὼν] εν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑμας επαφρας ο ἐξ ὑμῶν δουλος χριστου ιησου ἀντοτε ἀγωνιζομενος ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑμων / εν ταις προσευχαις ινα [*: σταθήτε / C2: στήτε] τελειοι και πεπληρωφόρημενοι εν παντὶ θέληματι του θεου (01)

Epaphras is with RP and is also a “slave of Christ”.

**Folio 94r**

**Col. 4:16- 1 Thess. 1:1**

**Col. 4:18**

ο ασπασμὸς [τῇ] εμῆ χειρὶ [παυλοῦ] μνημονευετε μου των δεσμῶν η χαρις [μεθ] [ὑμων] ☀ (p46)

ο ασπασμὸς τη εμη χειρι παυλου μνημονευετε μου των δεσμων η χαρις μεθ υμων ☐ (03)

ο ασπασμὸς τη εμη χειρι παυλου μνημονευετε μου των δεσμων η χαρις μεθ υμων [T: ☐ / Z2: αμην] (01)

RP refers again to writing the greeting in his own hand. He is also in bonds.

**Folio 94v**

**1 Thess. 1:9 – 2:3**

**1 Thess. 2:2**

άλλα προσάθοντες [καὶ] [υβρισθεντες] καθως οἴδατε εν [φιλιπποῖς] [επαρρησιασαμεθα] εν τω θεω ημων [λαλησαι] [προς] [ὑμας] [το] ευαγγελιον του θεου [ἐν] [πολλῳ] [αγωνι] (p46)

άλλα προσάθοντες καὶ υβρισθεντες καθως οιδατε εν φιλιπποις επαρρησιασαμεθα εν τω θεω ημων λαλησα προς υμας το ευαγγελιον του θεου εν πολλῳ αγωνι (01)

άλλα προσάθοντες και υβρισθεντες καθως οιδατε εν φιλιπποις [C2: επαρρησιασαμεθα / *: επαρρησιασαμεθα] εν τω θεω ημων λαλησα προς υμας το ευαγγελιον του θεου εν πολλῳ αγωνι (03)

Timothy and RP had suffered and been shamefully mistreated at Philippi.

**Folio 97r-97v**

**1 Thess. 5:5- 28**

no biographical information
Additional Manuscripts Containing Agreed-Upon letters

P\textsuperscript{10} 300-350 CE \hspace{1cm} \textit{Rom. 1:1-7}

παύλος δούλος χριστού ἴσης κλητος αποστόλος αφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ

Remembered Paul is a slave of Christ Jesus, and called to be an apostle.

P\textsuperscript{12} 250-300 CE \hspace{1cm} \textit{Heb. 1:1}

no biographical information.

P\textsuperscript{13} 250-350 CE \hspace{1cm} \textit{Heb. 2:14-5:5; 10:8-22; 10:29-11:13; 11:28-12:17}

no biographical information

P\textsuperscript{15} 300-400 CE \hspace{1cm} \textit{1 Cor. 7:18-8:4}

no biographical information

P\textsuperscript{16} 300-400 CE \hspace{1cm} \textit{Phil. 3:10-17: 4:2-8}

no biographical information

P\textsuperscript{17} 300-400 CE \hspace{1cm} \textit{Heb. 9:12-19}

no biographical information

P\textsuperscript{27} 200-300 CE \hspace{1cm} \textit{Rom. 8:12-22, 24-27; 8:33-9:3, 5-9}

no biographical information

P\textsuperscript{30} 175-225 CE \hspace{1cm} \textit{1 Thess. 4:12-13, 16-17; 5:3, 8-10, 12-18, 25-28}

\textit{1 Thess. 5:27}

[ενορκίζω] υμας τον κυριον [αναγνωσθηναι] την επιστολην [πασιν] [τοις] □ αδελφοις (P\textsuperscript{30})

ορκίζω υμας τον κυριον αναγνωσθηναι την επιστολην πασιν τοις [*: □ / C2: αγιοις] αδελφοις □ (01)

ενορκίζω υμας τον κυριον αναγνωσθηναι την επιστολην πασιν τοις □ αδελφοις □(03)

ενορκίζω [υμας] [τον] [κυριον] [αναγνωσθηναι] την επιστολην [πασιν] [τοις] □ [αδελφοις] □( p\textsuperscript{46})
The manuscript of p⁴⁰ is damaged. However, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus attest that RP commands them to read the letter to all the brothers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Textual Notes</th>
<th>No Biographical Information Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p⁴⁰</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Rom. 1:24-27; 1:31-2:3; 3:21-4:8; 6:2-5, 15-16; 9:17,27</td>
<td>no biographical information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p⁴⁹</td>
<td>250-350 CE</td>
<td>Eph 4:16-29; 4:31-5:13</td>
<td>no biographical information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p¹¹³</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Rom. 2:12-13; 2:29</td>
<td>no biographical information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p¹¹⁴</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Heb. 1:7-12</td>
<td>no biographical information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0220</td>
<td>350-400 CE</td>
<td>Rom. 4:23-5:3; 5:8-13</td>
<td>no biographical information.⁴²³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p⁹²</td>
<td>250-350 CE</td>
<td>2 Thess. 1:4-5, 11-12 Eph. 1:11-13, 19-21</td>
<td>no biographical information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0185</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>1 Cor. 2:5-6, 9, 13; 3:2-3</td>
<td>transcription unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0221</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>Rom. 5:16-17, 19, 21 -6:3</td>
<td>transcription unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0228</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>Heb. 12:19-21, 23-25)</td>
<td>no biographical information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴²³ I consulted Nestle-Aland 27th edition in cases where a transcription was unavailable to determine if this text provided any variants. If no such variant was recorded, I assumed that the papyrus supported the NA critical text. For this reason, I could conclude whether the manuscript contained biographical information.
Codex Vaticanus: Agreed Upon Letters

Given the shared content of Codex Vaticanus with p^46, it was then essential to examine Codex Vaticanus at the spots where p^46 is damaged to recover the text of agreed-upon letters (Romans 1:1-5:17 (Folio 1-7); Rom 6:14-8:15 (Folio 9-10); 1 Thess 2:3-5:5 (Folio 95-96). The missing folios 98-104 of p^46 likely contained 2 Thessalonians as indicated by my analysis of the primary data and other scholars. The following texts contained biographical information:

Missing Folio 1-7  Rom. 1:1-5:17^424

Rom. 1:1

παύλος δοῦλος χριστοῦ ἤθεου κλητὸς αποστόλος αφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ (03)

παύλος δοῦλος ἤθεου χριστοῦ κλητὸς αποστόλος αφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ (01)

Paul is a slave of Jesus the Christ, and an apostle called and set apart to proclaim the message of God.

Missing Folio 9-10  Rom. 6:14-8:15  no biographical information

Missing Folio 95-96  1 Thess. 2:3-5:5  no biographical information

---

^424 The page numbers of the manuscripts are available on the website: http://images.csntm.org/Manuscripts/GA_03/Vaticanus-Scripture-Index.pdf
2 Thessalonians

2 Thess. 3:8

ουδε δωρεαν αρτον εφαγομεν παρα τινος αλλα εν κοπω και μοχθω νυκτος και ημερας εργαζομενοι προς το μη επιβαρησαι τινα υμων (03)

ουδε δωρεαν αρτον εφαγομεν παρα τινος αλλα εν κοπω και μοχθω νυκτος και ημερας εργαζομενοι προς το μη επιβαρησαι τινα υμων (01)

RP reminds them that he, Silvanus and Timothy had worked for their bread, working night and day so as not to be a burden. This testimony of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus supports the reference to manual labour found in 1 Thess. 2:9. RP (and others) worked with his hands even as a commissioned messenger.

2 Thess. 3:9

ουχ οτι ουκ εχομεν εξουσιαν αλλα ενας τους τυπον δωμεν υμιν εις το μιμεισθαι ημας (03, 01)

Remembered Paul asserts that they had a right not to work for a living.

Contemporary Manuscripts

According to the method earlier described, the statements of Contemporaries are drawn from non-agreed upon letters attributed to Paul, and found in various manuscripts. The statement of 3 Corinthians (Bod X) is an ambiguous piece of data because it contains a communication from the Corinthians to Paul and his response. For this reason, I have placed
it within the Historians group. Although I stated earlier that 400 CE is the terminus date for the database (for manageability of the task), I have included Codex Alexandrinus (5th century) here due to the paucity of data. The following manuscripts contain the statements of Contemporaries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Text References</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p^{32}</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Titus 1:11-15: 2:3-8</td>
<td>no biographical information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p^{87}</td>
<td>200-250 CE</td>
<td>Phlm. 13-15, 24-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. Inv 3992</td>
<td>300-400 CE</td>
<td>1 Cor., Titus, Psalms</td>
<td>no transcription available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codex Sinaiticus</td>
<td>360 CE</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Tim. 1:1

παυλός αποστόλος χριστού ιησού κατ επαγγέλιαν θεού σωτήρος ημών και κυρίου ιησού χριστού της ελπίδος ημών (01)

παυλός αποστόλος ιησού χριστού κατ επιταγήν θεού σωτήρος ημών και χριστού ιησού της ελπίδος ημών (02)

In the words of this Contemporary Witness, RP is an apostle of Christ Jesus, according the command of God and ‘our’ lord Jesus Christ. See also 2 Tim. 1:1.

1 Tim. 1:12

χαρίν εχω το ενδύναμωσαντι με χριστω ιησου τω κυριω ημων στι πιστων με ηγησατο θεμενος εις διακοινιαν (02)

χαρίν εχω το [C2: ενδύναμωσαντι με / *: ενδύναμουντι] χριστω ιησου τω κυριω ημων στι πιστων με ηγησατο θεμενος εις διακοινιαν (01)
In the words of the Contemporary witness, RP tells Timothy that he was appointed by Jesus Christ (‘our master’) to *diakonia*. This statement confirms Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements concerning his work of “the collection.”

(‘service’).

1 Tim. 1:13

According to this Contemporary witness, RP was formerly a blasphemer, a persecutor and *ubristēn* (a “violent, wanton, licentious, insolent man”\(^{425}\)). This confirms earlier Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements, but intensifies his former life with a more negative description.

1 Tim. 2:7

\[^{425}\text{http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/morph?l=ubristhn&la=greek#lexicon}\]
The contemporary witness states that RP was appointed a kēruc (translated ‘herald’), an apostle, and a didaskalos (teacher) of Gentiles (see 2 Tim. 1:11). This is the first use of the word ‘herald’, though the verb kērussō has been used in the agreed-upon letters (Gal. 2:2; Col. 1:23; 1 Thess. 2:9). A herald is a public messenger, and the word is interchangeable with apostolos.\footnote{http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dkh%3Druc} RP twice names “teacher” as one of the gifts given the members of the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:28-29; Eph. 4:11), but this is the first instance in which RP has been named a teacher. The statement is in line with RP’s statement in 1 Cor. 4:17 where he states that he teaches “tas odous mou’ in Christ Jesus everywhere in each assembly. Therefore, this evidence is also in line with the Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon evidence.

1 Tim. 3:14

Paul states he is writing these things, hoping to come to Timothy quickly. This evidence concerning RP’s writing activity is in line with Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon data (Rom. 15:15; Gal. 6:11; 2 Thess. 3:17) and Contemporary Phlm 19.

2 Tim. 1:15

\footnote{http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dkh%3Druc}
According to this Contemporary statement, RP states that everyone in Asia has turned away from him, including Phugellos and Hermogenes. Although this statement may refer to a specific incident, it fits with statements within the agreed-upon letters that RP is marginal to the group, or in conflict with the group. Given the statement in 1 Tim. 1:17 indicating that Onesiphorus found RP in Rome, it is possible that this verse could be taken in conjunction with RP’s to the Romans that there is no longer a place for him (*nuni mēkēti topon exon en tois klimasi toutois* Romans 15:23), and that is why he is coming to Rome.

2 Tim. 1:16

δωὴ ελεος ο κυριος τω ονησιφορου οικω οτι πολλακις με ανεψυξεν και την αλυσιν μου ουκ επαισχυνθη ο2

RP states that Onesiphorus has often provided hospitality, and was not concerned that he was chained.427

2 Tim. 2:9

εν ω κακοπαθω μεχρι δεσμων ως κακουργος αλλα ο λογος του θεου ου δεδεται 02

According to the Contemporary witness, RP is a chained prisoner. This statement is in line with other Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements.
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2 Tim. 4:10

δήμας γαρ με εγκατέλειψεν ἀγαπησάς τὸν νῦν αἰώνα καὶ επορεύθη εἰς θεσσαλονίκην κρήσκης εἰς γαλατίαν τίτος εἰς δαλματίαν 01

δήμας γαρ με εγκατέλειψεν ἀγαπησάς τὸν νῦν αἰώνα καὶ επορεύθη εἰς θεσσαλονίκην κρήσκης εἰς γαλατίαν τίτος εἰς δερματίαν 02

According to the Contemporary witness, Demas has deserted or forsaken him, Crescens has gone to Gaul/Galatia, and Titus has gone to Dalmatia. Demas is also mentioned in an agreed upon letter (Col. 4:14) and in Philemon 24. Both contemporaries support the Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statement that Demas is a co-worker of Paul, though his desertion is unique to RP’s communication with Timothy.

2 Tim. 4:11

λουκᾶς εστίν μονος μετ' ἐμού μαρκον ἀναλαβὼν αγα μετ' σεαυτοῦ εστίν γαρ μοι εὐχρήστος εἰς διακονίαν 01

λουκᾶς εστίν μονος μετ' ἐμού μαρκον ἀναλαβὼν αγα μετ' σεαυτοῦ εστίν γαρ μοι εὐχρήστος εἰς διακονίαν 02

According to this Contemporary witness, Luke is present with Paul, and RP desires Mark to come because he is useful to him for/in diakonian (service). Because RP is in prison in this letter, the service he requests from Mark is similar to that which he makes mention of concerning Epaphroditus in Philippians 2:25. Thus this statement confirms the Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statement that others provide service to RP.

2 Tim. 4:16

ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ μοι απολογίᾳ οὐδεὶς μοι [*: παρεγένετο / C2: συνπαρεγένετο] ἀλλὰ πάντες με ενκατέλιπον μη αυτοὺς λογισθῇ 01
The Contemporary witness states that RP had to make at least one “speech in defense,” and no one accompanied him. In fact, everyone deserted him. Again, this statement may confirm RP’s conflictual relationship with other group members.

**Titus 1:1**

παύλος δοῦλος θεοῦ ἀποστόλος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ πιστίν εκλεκτῶν θεοῦ καὶ επιγνώσιν ἀληθείας τῆς κατ ἐυσεβείαν

As stated in the agreed-upon letters, Remembered Paul is a slave. However, this Contemporary witness refers to RP as a “slave of God,” and an apostle of Jesus Christ, in accordance with faith of the chosen ones of God and knowledge and truth. This statement confirms RP’s slavery and apostleship, but provides different rationale.

**Phlm. 1**

παύλος δεσμιος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τιμόθεος ο ἀδελφὸς φίλημον τῷ αγαπητῷ καὶ συνεργῷ ἡμῶν

According to this Contemporary letter, Remembered Paul is a prisoner (see Philm.

---

428 http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0058%3Aentry%3Da&pologi%2Fa
10, 13) when this letter was sent from RP and Timothy to Philemon, Apphia, Archippus, and the church in Archippus’ house (Phlm 2).

**Phlm 9**

δια τὴν αγάπην μᾶλλον παρακαλῶ τοιοῦτος ὦν ὡς παῦλος πρεσβυτῆς νῦν δὲ καὶ δεσμῖος χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ 01

δια την αναγκην μαλλον παρακαλω τοιουτος ων ως παυλος πρεσβυτης νυν δε και δεσμιος χριστου ιησου 02

The Contemporary witness states that RP is an old man (presbutēs), and he is a chained prisoner when sending this letter. This is a new biographical detail which may have been contained in p87, but we have no extant evidence. To be accepted as a ‘fact’, it must be attested by a Historian account/manuscript.

**Phlm 13**

ον εγὼ εβουλομην προς εμαυτον κατεχειν ἵνα ὑπὲρ σου μοι διακονή ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου 02

— — [κατεχειν] ἵνα ὑπὲρ σου μοι [διακονή] [ἐν] τοῖς δεσμοῖς [τοῦ] [εὐαγγελίου] p87

ον εγὼ ἡβουλομην προς εμαυτον κατεχειν ἵνα ὑπὲρ σου μοι διακονή ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου 01

The Contempoary witness states that Paul was hoping that Onesimus could remain with him, and serve him while he is in prison. This is similar to the verse in 2 Tim. 4:11 in which RP states that he is hoping that Mark could be brought for ‘service’ (although the NRSV translates this “useful in my ministry”), similar to his reference to Epaphroditus in Philippians 2:25. Together, these references confirm the Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon evidence that people came to provide service to RP while he was in prison.
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According to the Contemporary witness, RP states: “I Paul, wrote this with my own hand”. This statement confirms Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements that RP had some part in the writing of letters.

Remembered Paul asks Philemon to prepare him a guest room, suggesting that he feels free to ask for shelter.

RP states that Epaphras is also imprisoned with him, confirming his imprisonment and the imprisonment of others.

This statement identifies that Mark, Aristarchus, Demas and Luke are RP’s co-workers. According to 2 Timothy, Demas has deserted him (2 Tim. 4:10), though he was earlier present with him when RP communicated with the Colossians (Col. 4:14). It is possible
that the Mark mentioned here is the same Mark he sent for when writing to Timothy (2 Tim. 4:11). Again, if this is the same person, Mark is the cousin of Barnabas, and, along with Aristarchus, and Jesus called Justus are *oi ovtes ek peritomēs*, the “ones of the circumcision” (Col. 4:11). RP also refers to the “ones of the circumcision” in his description of Cephas’ actions concerning eating with Gentiles (Gal. 2:12). Luke was also present with RP when the letter to Timothy (2 Tim. 4:11) was composed, and when Timothy and RP communicated to the “brothers and sisters” in Colossae (Col. 1:2). In that communication, Luke was named “the beloved physician” (Col. 4:14). Philemon 24 therefore confirms that the Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statement that Mark, Aristarchus, Demas and Luke are present with Remembered Paul on different occasions.

**Historian Manuscripts**

As stated earlier, Historian statements are found in manuscripts containing ‘accounts’ of the life of Remembered Paul.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Acts References</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p8</td>
<td>300-350 CE</td>
<td>Acts 4:31-37; 5:2-9; 6:1-6, 8-15</td>
<td>no biographical information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p29</td>
<td>200-300 CE</td>
<td>Acts 26:7-8, 26:20</td>
<td>Manuscript too damaged to ascertain facts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

– το δωδεκαφυλον [ημων] [εν] εκτενεια νυκτα [και] [ημεραν] [λατρευει εν] ελπιδι κ[αταντησαι] [περι] [ης] [ελπιδος] ενκαλουμαι [υπο ιουδαιων βασιλευ] [Verse 7]

☐ [ει] ο θεος νεκρους [εγειρει] [6-10] – [Verse 8]
They witness that Remembered Paul was beaten, and that he was a Roman citizen. Given that this statement about Roman citizenship is found only in the writings of the Historians, it does not meet the requirements for acceptance as a biographical ‘fact.’

Claudius Lysias indicates that he has learned that RP is a Roman citizen.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p⁵³</td>
<td>350-400 CE</td>
<td>Acts 9:33-10:1</td>
<td>No biographical information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p⁷²</td>
<td>300-350 CE</td>
<td>2 Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2 Peter 3:14

Simon (Simeon) Peter, in his communication to “those who have received a faith as precious as ours” (2 Peter 1:1 NRSV), states that RP, “our beloved brother” wrote to them. In this communication, Peter indicates a positive connection between RP and himself.

### 2 Peter 3:15

Simon (Simeon) Peter indicates that some things in Remembered Paul’s letters are hard to understand. This may or may not stand in contrast to the Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statement made in 2 Cor. 10: 9-10. There RP places into the mouth of his interlocutors that his “letters are weighty and strong.”
Paul was shackled in prison. He was pursued and beaten. The following description is also given: “a man little of stature, thin-haired upon the head, crooked in the legs, of good state of body, with eyebrows joining, and nose somewhat hooked, full of grace: for sometimes he appeared like a man, and sometimes he had the face of an angel.” John of Antioch of the sixth century also describes RP as thin-haired.\textsuperscript{430} Although this description of RP has not

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{P}\textsuperscript{91} 200-300 CE  \hspace{2cm} Acts 2:30-37; 2:46-3:2  
\text{no biographical information}
\item \textbf{0189} 100s-200s  \hspace{2cm} Acts 5:3-21  
\text{no biographical information}
\item \textbf{Hamburg, Pap bil.1} 300-399 CE  \hspace{2cm} Acti Pauli\textsuperscript{429}  
\text{Acts of Paul and Theckla (including 3 Corinthians)  
Martyrdom of Paul}
\item \textbf{P.Berlin inv. 13893} 300-400 CE  \hspace{2cm} Acts of Paul  
\item \textbf{P.Fackelmann 3} 200-300 CE  \hspace{2cm} Acts of Paul and Thekla  
\item \textbf{P.Ant I 13} 300-399 CE  \hspace{2cm} Acts of Paul and Thekla
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Acts of Paul and Theckla 2:3}

\textsuperscript{429} \url{http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/actspaul.html}. I have used this text as the basis on which to examine possible the biographical evidence in Acts of Paul and Thecla and the Martyrdom of Paul. The translation is that of M.R. James, “Acts of Paul” \textit{The Apocryphal New Testament} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925). Following the example of J.K. Elliott, I have used Hamburg Pap. Bil 1 as the representative for all the manuscripts.

been taken very seriously, if thin-haired is a sign of aging in the ancient world, it could confirm the statement in Philemon that RP is an old man (Phlm 9). However, given the ambiguity of the connection, this physical description is not supported by Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon or Contemporary statements.

**Orient, fol. 3065** 300s 1 Clement431

I Clem. 47.1 (lk). Take up the epistle of the blessed Paul the Apostle.

I Clem. 5.5 (lk) Through jealousy and strife Paul showed the way to the prize of endurance.

1 Clement confirms the earlier evidence that RP is an apostle, and there is a suggestion that there was conflict amongst, perhaps, the apostles. Such a statement would confirm RP’s statements about ‘his competition’, and the statements of Contemporaries. For this reason, this statement will be accepted as biographical fact.

**Codex Vaticanus** 350 CE Acts of the Apostles

**Codex Sinaiticus** 360 CE Acts of the Apostles

A number of biographical statements are made in both of these manuscripts of Acts. Some of these statements confirm the testimony of Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon/Core Group

---

431http://lexundria.com/go?q=aposte+Paul&v=lk. 1 Clement is also transcribed and translated by Kirsopp Lake in The Apostolic Fathers (published London 1912), v. I, pp. 3-7: “The older and better preserved is MS. orient, fol. 3065 in the Konigliche Bibliothek in Berlin. This is a beautiful Papyrus of the fourth century from the famous ‘White monastery’ of Shenute. It was published in 1908 by C. Schmidt in Texte und Untersuchungen, xxxii. 1 as Der erste Clemensbrief in altkoptischer Übersetzung.” http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/1clement-intro.html.
letters, but add additional information. For instance, Acts 9:1 describes ‘Saul’ (later Paul) as a persecutor. However, that he persecuted “the disciples of the Lord” is a detail not found in Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon or Contemporary statements. This verse also indicates that Paul had a strong relationship to the High Priest, from whom he asks for letters to give him authority to persecute believers in Damascus and “bring them bound to Jerusalem.” (Acts 9:2). Again, this detail is found only in Acts of the Apostles, though repeated in both Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus. In Acts 22:3 RP self-identifies as zēlōtēs uparxôn (Acts 22:3/Gal. 1:14), and his zeal is linked with his persecuting activities (Acts 22:4-5; Gal. 1:13). This link between zealot and persecuting activities is congruent with the Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon witness, though Historian Acts states that RP has been educated kata akribeian tou patrōou nomou (translated by NRSV: strictly according to our ancestral law), somewhat different than his statement in Gal. 1:14 where he speaks of advancing in Ioudaismos and patrikōnom paradoseōn (ancestral traditions).

There are also biographical statements that are not supported by Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon letters or Contemporary letters. This is true for the following biographical evidence: born in Tarsus (Acts 22:3); educated by the famous Gamaliel (Acts 22:3); a persecutor of The Way, in particular (Acts 22:5), a Roman citizen (Acts 13:38), a Pharisee, the son of Pharisees (Acts 23:6), and a man with strong rhetorical skill (Acts 13, 14 and 17).

In summary, the biographical evidence collected presents a strong Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon set of statements that are almost always attested in p₄⁶, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus. The statements of Contemporaries do not provide
contradictory biographical evidence, but intensify (or embellish) Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements. Historian l Clement confirms Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon/core group statements. Acts of Paul proves a physical description of Remembered Paul, and one detail of this description could be linked with RP’s statement about his age in Philemon.

This collection of biographical evidence, based on the data collection methods described, will be used for the construction of RP’s biographical ensemble in the following chapter. Before beginning that process, however, it is important to two key interpretive concepts that will be utilized to construct the biographical ensemble.

**Sartre’s Key Methodological-Interpretive Concepts**

**Totalization**

Totalization as a method, according to Sartre, is “a theoretical and practical attempt to ‘situate’ an event, a group or a [human being].”

A Marxist method, he argues, attempts the task of ‘situating’ human action by analyzing how independent structures impact human life, but the method fails because there is no attempt to unify the plurality of human signification or the multi-dimensionality of the social and material conditioning which limits and enables human action. It is, of course, necessary for a researcher to identify each

432 Sartre, *SM*, 108
of the social structures in which human actors are embedded, but it is also necessary to understand that each of these conditioning structures “would contain the other within itself.” Therefore Sartre declares: “We will lose sight of human reality if we do not consider the significations as synthetic, multidimensional, indissoluble objects, which hold individual places in a space-time with multiple dimensions.”

It is the same with human meanings:

[All] are given together, not one at a time. The man is locked up inside; he does not cease to be bound by all these walls which enclose him or to know that he is immured. All of these walls make a single person, and this prison is a single life, a single act. Each signification is transformed, continues to be transformed, and its transformation has repercussions on all the others. What the totalization must discover therefore is the multidimensional unity of the act.

In Sartre’s words, attempting to totalize a life is to "search for the synthetic ensemble, [whereby] each fact, once established, is questioned and interpreted as part of a whole." Marxism and Existentialism share an essential emphasis on totalization:

Existentialism, like Marxism, addresses itself to experience in order to discover there concrete syntheses; it can conceive of these syntheses only within a moving, dialectical totalization which is nothing else but history...For us, truth is something which becomes, it has and will have become. It is a totalization which is forever being totalized. Particular facts do not signify anything; they are neither true nor false so long as they are

---


not related, through the mediation of various partial totalities, to the totalization in process.\textsuperscript{436}

All significations are in other significations, he argues, “and all are given together, not one at a time.”\textsuperscript{437} There is a unity of human action that is simplified by positivist methods of research that ignore “both reciprocal interpenetration and the relative autonomy of significations.”\textsuperscript{438}

Furthermore, our actions, our ‘micrototalizations,’ our praxis betrays an external and internal relationship to our social worlds. Sartre states that “the world is outside; language and culture are not inside the individual like stamps registered by his nervous system.” It is the individual who is inside the culture, and who makes meaning from a language that is too rich: “each vocable brings along with it the profound signification which the whole epoch has given to it”, and too limited with “empty spaces, lacunae, and his growing thought cannot find its appropriate expression.”\textsuperscript{439} A “cultural object…wears its history, and we are internally related to the field of cultural objects in which we act.”\textsuperscript{440} Sartre

\textsuperscript{436} Sartre, \textit{SM}, 31.
\textsuperscript{437} Sartre, \textit{SM}, 110.
\textsuperscript{438} Sartre, \textit{SM}, 111.
\textsuperscript{439} Sartre, SM, 113.
criticizes Marxism for “neglecting the particular content of a cultural system and reducing it immediately to the universality of a class ideology” that creates “social instruments” that human actors must use, and which “alienate the one who employs them and [which] modify the meaning of his action [so that] the idea must be considered both the objectification of the concrete man and his alienation. The idea is the man himself externalizing himself in the materiality of language,”\textsuperscript{441} and the language is bears the marks of the social situation. Thus human meaning-making is both singular and universal.

It is not enough to list the biographical ‘facts’ for the life of Remembered Paul as I have done in this chapter. Each biographical statement bears the imprint of the social-historical situation and the culture which gives rise to its possibility. Each socially-historically embedded biographical fact is also dependent on past human action now revealed as the historical situation which conditions and enables human action. Each biographical fact is a part of ‘one life’, and each part is in each other part, and the ‘one life’ is embedded in social structures that contain each in the other. And the historical period in which the ‘one life’ is embedded is the totality of past human praxis that has left remains of limitations and possibilities for human action which is always both singular and universal.

Remembered Paul is, for example, apostolos, socially humiliated, formerly a persecutor, a ‘whippable’ body, a herald of good news, the man who proclaims that his authority is based

\textsuperscript{441} Sartre, \textit{SM}, 115.
on “Christ in me.” Although scholars often examine his statements about his speaking ability apart from his ‘whippability’, or his apostleship separate from statements about material support, to totalize his life is to create a biographical ensemble in which each biographical element contains each element in the other. It is the ‘one life’, the synthesized biographical ensemble that must then be ‘situated’ in a web of overlapping, intersecting, interpenetrating social-historical structures that do not create his response, but create the social field which conditions and enables his action. Religious and ethnic realities should not be separated from the unequal distribution of wealth, labour, education and social status in that ancient world. Each of these are impacted on by the other. That social field is one moment in the larger totalization of human praxis which is lived as history, and therefore the biographical ensemble must also be viewed as impacted on by human praxis which precedes this moment in time, and the historical memory of that time.

**Particularizing The Given**

Totalization also requires the researcher to identify and describe ‘the given’ - the “[social] conditions [which] exist, and…alone, which can furnish a direction and a material reality” for the human actor.449 Sartre argued that human freedom “is a socio-historical product…[not] an ontological one.”450 Therefore an overall description of the historically-situated


450 Sherman, 170.
social world of the Jewish-Greco-Roman Mediterranean in the first century does not go far enough. What is needed is a re-construction of “the particular [human actor] in the social field, in [their] class, in an environment of collective objects and of other particular [women] and men.” For instance, Remembered Paul is an Israelite, and many interpretations have taken “Paul the Jew” as their starting point. However, the data reveals that RP was also formerly a zealot, blameless according to the law, and flogged on several occasions according to Jewish law. To embed his ‘one life’ in history requires then attention the plurality of Jewish-Greco-Roman histories that impacted differently on different human actors to ensure that particularity is not lost.

This regressive aspect of Sartre’s method, the particularization of the biographical ensemble, is not complete until each biographical element and the synthesis of these elements are also situated within the conditioning and enabling social structures of RP’s world. It is necessary to go back and forth between the biographical evidence (each biographical fact), and the elaboration of biography through a description of the relevant aspects of the social world (both limitations and possibilities) within the larger movement of history. Chapter Five describes how to re-construct the biographical ensemble from the evidence collected, how to situate those facts by descriptions of the ancient social world, and how to situate the biographical ensemble within history.

451 Sartre, SM, 133.
CHAPTER FIVE

Creating the Biographical Ensemble

To write history is to describe, in the words of Marc Bloch, how the “great waves of related phenomenon” are “channeled into the powerful vortex of direct experience.” The material ‘traces’ that point back to the memory of ‘direct experience’ of an ancient man named Paulos have been collated in RP: The Work. His biographical ‘remains’ (identified by the evidence of the extant manuscripts) provide the “mediating bridge” between the actual facts of his ancient existence (i.e. the utterances and deeds of Paulos, and his social situation) and the reconstructed biographical ensemble of Remembered Paul, dependent on a critical realist approach to history, which will be described in this chapter. This interpretive approach is dependent on an understanding of the dual/dialectical nature of human existence, and a view of the ‘past’ as also always constitutive of the ‘present’.

Sartre and Historical Sociology share a belief in the dialectical nature of human existence, and the importance of understanding the dialectical logic of situated human agency: a reconstruction/account of a human life (past or present) must account for the social world


453 I am taking a critical-realist approach to history, both avoiding the empiricist, positivist approach that presumes that our knowledge of past human existence (relative and intransitive) is equivalent to the past existence (the intransitive ‘brute’ in-itself), and avoiding the postmodern approach in which, in the words of Goeff Eley, “textuality has become a metaphor for reality in general.” (Spiegel, 41). See Margaret Archer, ed. Critical Realism: Essential Readings (Routledge, 1998) and Gabrielle M. Spiegel, Practising History: New Directions in Historical Writing (Florence, KY: Routledge, 2004).
that conditions human actors, and the actions of human actors acting upon that world.

Bryant has argued that the historical ‘relics’ collected “bring us into rather immediate or direct contact with our subjects, ‘their worlds as experienced,’” and that kind of authenticity” is possible because the primary sources “represent either the meaningful creations or by-products of social activity, or the bio-physical realities which circumscribed human experience.” Bryant describes in historical-sociological terms what Sartre had emphasized in *Search for a Method*:

The dual or dialectical nature of the human condition – that we are both active subjects and conditioned objects - that we reproduce and transform our social worlds and are also made by them – mandates a theoretical logic that synthesizes agency and structures by grounding or embedding events, processes and actors within their determinant and fluxional contexts. Neither historiography nor social science can proceed to full explication independently, given that human actions are simultaneously historical and social, and as such are ordered and directed by inflections both diachronic and synchronic. No meaningful human action can be properly understood apart from its placement within the sequential order that imparts to it momentum or purposeful directionality; and as it is structural locus that determines differential access to the material and psychic resources instrumental in performance, it follows that no sequence of interaction can be explained without reference to the relational, hierarchical matrices within which agents are situated. All historical accounts must accordingly identify and explicate the structures that undergird and make possible events and processes; just as all social science explanations must grasp the temporal dynamics that variously inform the reproduction and transformation of the institutions, cultures, and agents that comprise social formations.  

---

454 Bryant, 1994, 7-8.

455 Bryant, 512-513.
The interpretive method must connect the life with the work in order to understand how the work as the objectification of human action was both made possible and constrained by the biographical realities/the social situation of the human actor. Although it is not possible or necessary to construct the biographical ensemble completely separate from the work, a clearly defined method by which to construct the ensemble will allow the researcher to avoid the method of simply searching the work for biographical facts that support a particular interpretation.

Bryant further notes that a historical-sociological interpretation requires that the narrative reconstruction not only disclose the “structural logic” of situated human action, but also situate those actions within time. He refuses to separate the ‘past’ from the present, and argues that history, in the words of Charles Tilly, is “the cumulative effect of past events on events of the present”:

Another fundamental aspect of the ontology of social phenomena: the fact that present arrangements – institutions, roles, cultural forms – are products of past human actions. The ‘past’ is thus never really ‘past’, but continuously constitutive of the ‘present’, as a cumulatively and selectively reproduced ensemble of practices and ideas that ‘channel’ and impart directionality to ongoing human agency. The present, in other words, is what the past – as received and creatively interpreted by the present – has made it.456

A historical social science takes seriously that one cannot understand ‘the present’ (even ‘the present’ as articulated by the ancient primary sources) unless one

understands that ‘the present’ is as it is by virtue ‘the past’. The material realities that constrained human action in the first century, and the actions that humans took upon their world were, of course, situated within larger waves of history. For this reason, particular aspects of Remembered Paul’s biographical ensemble will be situated within a history of the Jewish-Greco-Roman world.

The following paragraphs present the steps taken to construct the biographical ensemble (a synthesis/totalization of the biographical evidence) and situate Remembered Paul within temporally and socially-structured possibilities and limitations for human action, resulting in the construction of a socially and temporally embedded biographical ensemble.
Constructing the Socially/Temporally Embedded Biographical Ensemble

It is not uncommon for Pauline scholars to isolate one biographical ‘fact’ (e.g. Roman citizenship) and to examine the social-historical context pertaining to that one that fact apart from the remaining biographical evidence. In contrast to this method, the object of study for Sartre is both the ensemble/synthesis of biographical facts and “the particular [human actor] in the social field.”

A biographical ensemble of biographical facts is constructed to demonstrate the “complex, polyvalent unity” of a human life in which each social/biographical determinant is linked to the others “as a collapsed presence…that] all are given together, not one at a time.”

An ensemble allows us to take account of the particularized biographical facts that we have obtained, but put them together, as Sartre argues, into “a single life,” but not just any life.

The biographical evidence, representing both the facts of RP’s ancient social situation, and his self-description of that situation, are “stamped by various aspects of that context.” Because the historical evidence is ‘socially loaded,’ Bryant has argued that, “by subjecting such disparate materials to analytical colligation, historians are often able to draw out from

457 Sartre, SM, 133.
458 Sartre, SM, 110.
459 Sartre, SM, 110.
460 Bryant, 1994. 9.
a single source a wide range of insight and clues about implicated social processes and relations.”^461 Therefore, each element of the biographical ensemble (e.g. Israelite) leads us to investigate the structures, practices, and meanings of the ancient social world from which each element was formed.

**Step One: Collating the Biographical Facts**

The first step is to gather all of the biographical evidence, and identify the biographical facts included in the ‘one life.’ I have identified all the biographical evidence gleaned from the extant manuscripts, and categorized that evidence according to Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon, Contemporary, and Historian witnesses. Given that all historiographical composition should be “ultimately disciplined by the empirical and analytical constraints that are placed on the interpretation by the available source materials,”^462 I have provided a full record of the extant manuscripts I examined, and the biographical ‘facts’ obtained (as well as their source) are summarized in the tables of Appendix A: Statements about Self, Statements about Group Membership and Statements about Present Apostleship. Table A provides a summary of statements accepted as biographical fact, whatever the category of manuscripts, where the statement is in agreement with the Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements, or the Contemporary or

---

^461 Bryant, 1994, 9.
^462 Bryant, 501.
Historian is supported by the other. Only statements made by Contemporaries and Historians that do not meet this requirement have been separated and placed in Appendix A: Disagreement Statements of Contemporaries and Historians.

Step Two: Situating the Biographical Elements

The second step is to elaborate upon each biographical fact statement with relevant social-historical research. For instance, given that RP describes himself as unskilled in speech (e.g. 2 Cor. 11:6), and claims to write only a few words of letters (e.g. Heb. 13:22; 1 Cor. 16:21), where would such biographical facts ‘situate’ him in terms of educational achievement in the ancient social world? And once that level of achievement has been identified, what socially-structured limitations and possibilities for human action would be present?

Social-historical elaboration of biographical facts will allow me to ‘situate’ each element of the biographical ensemble in “organized, patterned social relations that are produced, maintained, and changed by social action deeply grounded in processes that are always historically based,” and avoid placing them first within the web of meanings (often pre-

\[463\] Isaac, 5.
emptively understood first and foremost as ‘theological’) expressed in each letter. Given that each social situation also creates an experience of scarcity, this ‘thick’ description of the biographical facts also provides clues to Remembered Paul’s social/economic/ethnic/religious need. Just as I did not provide exhaustive philological information in the previous chapter, nor am I able to conduct an in-depth social-historical investigation into each biographical fact. A comprehensive application of the method would require many more ‘go arounds’ to account for the richness of the scholarly discussion.

I will purposely privilege the more materialistic accounting/reading of each of the biographical facts, for two principal reasons. The first is to counteract/balance the predominance of metaphorical/idealistic/ironic interpretations that characterize so much of Pauline scholarship. Secondly, a materialist approach should bring us into closer contact with the hard/existential realities that must have informed Remembered Paul’s life given the biographical evidence collected. Geographers Fiona Coward and Clive Gamble have argued that cognitive representation is secondary to materiality. Damasio, they note, has “located the deep roots for the self ‘in the ensemble of brain devices which continuously and nonconsciously represent the state of the living body…[which] provides the raw material for a narrative construction of the secondary ‘core’ and ‘autobiographical’
selves.”\textsuperscript{464} The state of the living body, of course, is also partially dependent on its social situation. Hutchins, they report, argues further that “this process is seen as a precondition for language rather than dependent upon it; thus ‘it seems that symbols are in the world first, and only later in the head.’\textsuperscript{465} Although engagement with the emerging discussion concerning embodied and relational cognition amongst archaeologists, anthropologists, neuroscientists and geographers is beyond the scope of this study, I am relying on their recognition of material life as the source for metaphor, rather than metaphor as an idealist or ‘bird’s eye view’ of human existence. Therefore, while it may seem that I am simply employing the ‘plain sense’ or ‘literal’ meaning of the text, my goal is to begin with material life, and to layer RP’s meanings, the for-itself, in Sartre’s words, on the in-itself (brute existence).

\textbf{Step Three: Clustering the Biographical Elements}

The third step is to cluster the biographical elements into two main themes: a) \textit{RP: The Zealous Israelite}; and, b) \textit{RP: Socially Degraded and Vulnerable Man}. The biographical elements of Israelite have been situated and elaborated with social-historical description. The other biographical elements (speaking ability, writing ability, bodily presence,

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
experiences of capital punishment, and marital status), as I will demonstrate, reveals a man who was socially degraded and vulnerable to hunger, thirst, violence, social rejection and imprisonment. Because it is not apparent, at first glance, how Israelite (and particularly Maccabean-style zealot, Ioudaismos, former persecutor, former proclaimer of circumcision) can exist in one life, and how these ethnic/religious biographical markers are connected to social degradation (specifically references to slavery), I examined the social and material realities for Israelite slaves, focusing on the ethnic/religious/economic/social impacts of slavery. Again, there are many disputed points and much emerging knowledge that I have not addressed, due to the scope of this dissertation.

Step 4: Group Memberships

The fourth step was to place Remembered Paul within the major ancient groups of his milieu. Given that he was only one apostolos of Christ amongst a group of apostles and a self-described former Maccabean-style ‘zealous Israelite’ (amongst a much larger group of ‘zealots’) with a view of nomos similar to those of the Pharisees, it was important to define his particular place in larger groups. Too often RP has been described as “the apostle to the Gentiles” or “the Jew” with little attention to the impact of group membership on his life, and his project. Appendix A: Statements about Group Membership provide the beginnings of such an examination.
Step 5: Temporality and Movement

The biographical ensemble, the life of Paul, must then be situated in time. Sartre’s notion of the project as the movement by which human actors propel themselves away from the scarcity or lack in the original situation towards an envisioned future requires an understanding of how the project is situated in time, and acts upon time. Historical Sociologist Larry Isaac states that “social processes are always, in various ways, local (time/place dependent).”⁴⁶⁶ Given that time “envelops and permeates all social life – implicated in being and becoming, in experience, knowledge, communication, and labor – historical sociologists have emphasized ways in which temporalities are integral to the historical making and remaking…of social organization, structure, and culture.”⁴⁶⁷ Sociologist Ronald Aminzade similarly argues that it is important also to examine social action with reference to the “subjective features of time, its nonlinearity and social malleability.” An examination of temporality can also help us avoid dichotomies of ‘subjectivism and objectivism” by constructing “theories that link the objective temporalities of long-term historical processes to the subjective temporal orientations of social actors.”⁴⁶⁸ He concurs with John Hall who states that “every concrete social action

---

⁴⁶⁶ Isaac, 5.
⁴⁶⁷ Isaac, 5.
⁴⁶⁸ Aminzade, 470.
has a temporal structure embodied in acts of remembrance and anticipation in the actor’s stream of consciousness.”¹⁴⁶⁹

There are also different forms of time which impinge on human action. Larry Griffin identifies “time as context” whereby “time/place form a concrete setting usually employed by the analyst as backdrop or demarcation that periodizes history.”¹⁴⁷⁰ In this form of time, “time brackets context” and the context “indicates some relative regularity in a set of institutional or structural arrangements.” The second form of time is “eventful time” which is “premised on the (potential) power of social events to transform social structures.” Use of this form of time shifts temporality from a broad discussion of ‘period’ to a more active and local unfolding of events which “begins with the understanding that the mutually constitutive interplay of social structure and social action is a fundamental social dynamic continuously occurring in and through time.”¹⁴⁷¹ Finally, time is also subjective and experiential. “Objective time,” Isaac notes, cannot be “divorced from the subjective experience of it or the active process of making and remaking it.”¹⁴⁷² Human beings are not only in time, but time “is internal to us and the stories we tell.”¹⁴⁷³


¹⁴⁷⁰ Isaac, 5.

¹⁴⁷¹ Isaac, 6.

¹⁴⁷² Isaac, 6.

¹⁴⁷³ Isaac, 10.
Because I hypothesized that the memory of the past preceding the Historical Paul’s life would impact on first century Israelites (understanding the present as a way of acting upon the past), and that the impacts would be experienced through particular biography, I organized my examination of history on the basis of the biographical clusters previously constructed: *Israelite Former Zealot* and *Socially Degraded and Vulnerable Man*. Although there are biographical elements which traverse the entire collection of agreed-upon letters (Israelite and Socially Degraded), the elements of the biographical ensemble are particularized further in various letters (e.g. RP states he is imprisoned only in his communication with the Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians). RP responds to accusations about his speaking ability only in his two letters to the Corinthians. Similarly, it is only in his communication with the Galatians, that RP clusters zeal+persecuting activities+*Ioudaismos* (as one aspect of Israelite) and slavery+*stigmata*. Because I intend to apply the biographical method to a reading of Galatians; because *Ioudaismos* has been previously linked with a Maccabean style approach to circumcision, because RP links his *doulos* status and *stigmata* with persecution concerning his message/expectations about circumcision, and because I have identified circumcision as his main topic of conversation with the Galatians, I have focused my study of history on Maccabean zeal and Israelite slavery.

The following paragraphs present the results of following each of the above-named steps:

**RP: Biographical Ensemble**
The Israelite

According to common/agreed-upon/core group knowledge of the ancient manuscripts, Remembered Paul was an Israelite man (Rom. 9:3-4; Rom. 11:1), Ioudaios (Gal. 2:15), a descendent of Abraham, (Rom. 11:1), from the tribe of Benjamin (2 Cor. 11:22; Rom. 11:1) a Hebrew born of Hebrews (Phil 3:5); circumcised on the eighth day, and had a Pharisaical attitude towards the Law (Phil 3:5).\footnote{474} He also described himself as blameless according to righteousness in the law (Phil 3:6). He was an Israelite zealot (i.e. zealous for the ‘ancestral traditions’, a man who previously excelled in Ioudaismos (Folio 3612 Gal. 1:14), and, according to this zeal, had persecuted the assembly. Though he has proclaimed circumcision, in his communication with the Galatians, he claims that he does no longer (Gal. 5:11). Each of these elements concerning his ethnic/religious background were reasons, at one time, for his “confidence in the flesh” (Phil. 3:4).

In the last fifty years, many biblical scholars, beginning with Krister Stendahl,\footnote{475} have attempted to provide a reading of the Remembered Paul that places him within his first-century Jewish-Mediterranean context. Despite their sound intentions, many of these

\footnote{474} John Reumann, *Philippians: A new translation*, The Anchor Bible Vol. 33B (New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 2008), 485: “Pharisaios shows Paul’s loyalty to the law and rigor in observance” and “3:5 boasts about confidence re: Jew law, not a claim to have been a Pharisee.” Such an interpretation fits with the context of reasons for Paul’s “confidence in the flesh.”

studies have often been fraught with methodological difficulties. For instance, the scholarly
distinction between Diaspora and Palestinian Judaism was problematic because such a
binary (and the presumed uniformity) did not actually exist. Palestinian Judaism is a
category term that inaccurately implies there was a kernel of Judaism that had escaped the
process of Hellenization. Sometimes scholars who applied sect theory to questions of
Judean identity made sweeping sociological statements, such as that the Judeans “thought
of themselves as a single people united by a common history and a shared culture…and set
apart from their neighbours by the physical mark of circumcision”. More recently,
scholars have begun to challenge this overly schematic picture of early Judaism. According
to Wayne Meeks, Jews lived in “virtually every town of any size in the lands bordering the
Mediterranean,” and Jonathan Z. Smith has argued that we cannot create a normative
Judaism, but rather, to be true to history, we must construct “a variety of early Judaisms,
clustered in varying configurations”. A.F. Segal notes that there was a wide variety of

19, no. 3 (April, 1973): 271-287; Daniel R. Schwartz, “Studies in the Jewish Background of
Christianity” WUNT 60, no. 12 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992), J.M.G. Barclay, Jews in the
Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE-117 CE) (Edinburgh: T&T Clark,
1996).

477 Bernard O. Ukwuegbu, The Emergence of Christian Identity in Paul’s Letter to the Galatians: A
Social-Scientific Investigation into the Root Causes for the Parting of the Way between Christianity
and Judaism. (Bonn, Germany: Borengässer, 2003); 100.

478 Wayne Meeks, First Urban Christians, 34.

479 Jonathon Z. Smith, “Fences and Judaism in the Greco-Roman Period,” in Imagining Religion:
Jewish groups that adapted to a plethora of economic, social and political environments.\footnote{A.F. Segal, \textit{Rebecca’s Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World} (Cambridge, 1986), 12.}

It is into this diversity of Judaisms that we must place the Remembered Paul, using the data of the ancient manuscripts, making him a Jew, but not just any Jew.\footnote{I am aware of the debate as to whether Judean or Jew is the proper term to translate \textit{Ioudaios}, and chose ‘Jew’, recognizing how it is loaded in the history of Christian anti-Semitic interpretations of Judaism, and also endeavouring to retain the continuity between ancient Judaism and modern Judaism.}

In line with the method, the second step is to situate each of these elements by means of social-historical research.

\textit{Ioudaios}

RP names himself \textit{Ioudaios}. While earlier scholars easily translated Paul as a “Jew”, recent scholars recognize that ethnic/religious terms are more complex. Shaye D. Cohen names this complexity:

\begin{quote}
In particular, the use of the plural \textit{hoi Ioudaioi} must be distinguished from the use of the singular \textit{Ioudaios}; self-designation must be distinguished from designations imposed by others; official public designations must be distinguished from unofficial private ones; the relationship between the term \textit{Ioudaios/oi} and the terms \textit{Hebraios} and \textit{Israel} must be determined; and the occurrences of the terms must be catalogued by chronology, geography, and language.\footnote{Shaye. D. Cohen, \textit{The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties} (Hellenistic Culture and Society, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999): 71}
\end{quote}
Buell has furthered the discussion by noting that “ideas about what constitutes a Ioudaios shift over time and need to be evaluated in context,” and David Miller cautions us to remember that “ethnicity is always malleable,” so “appeals to a fixed quality of ethnicity must be examined in terms of their rhetorical function.” Scholars are still in discussion concerning how Ioudaios represents ethnic and/or ‘religious’ elements, and when ‘religion’ emerged geographic elements, and the role of political events.

Denise Buell counters the dichotomous understanding of ethnicity and religion and argues for “an interrelationship between ethnicity and religion.” Miller, affirming the notion of an emerging ‘religion’, argues that translating Ioudaios as Judean retains the ethnic, but not the religious aspect of the term, though recognizing that ‘Jew’ is loaded with a history of anti-Semitic readings and minimizes geography and place. In light of the scholarly


487 Miller, 2014.


489 Miller, 2014: 258-259.
discussion, I will attempt to understand the uses of the various words by placing them first within the context stated. RP refers to himself and Cephas as *Ioudiaōn* by birth in contrast to “gentile sinners.” (Gal. 2:15). Given RP’s use of *Ioudaios* as an ethnic self-designation (Jew in contrast to Greek and Gentile or Sythian, Gal. 3:28), and his ‘religious’ use (Jews are those who rely on the law, are instructed in the law, have the covenant, and the ritual worship (Rom. 2:17-18, Rom. 9:3-4), I conclude that RP both identifies himself as a member of an ethnic group (a Jew by birth) and delineates two sub-groups: the *Ioudaios* who lives like a Gentile (*ethvikōs*) and the *Ioudaios* who lives like as a Jew (*Ioudaikōs*, Gal. 2:14). In the context of Galatians 2, the ‘Gentile-like’ Jew eats with Gentiles (as Cephas and Barnabas have done, and RP continues to do). The ‘Jew-like Jew’, according to RP, doesn’t eat with Gentiles (Cephas after ‘the ones of the circumcision arrived). Therefore, RP stands inside *Ioudaios*, but does not align himself with the circumcision faction.

490 See Miller 2010 for discussion of M.Smith’s description of the inter-ethnic struggles under Hasmonean rule which resulted in Ituraeans, Idumaeans and Galileans regarded as Gentiles/pagans.

491 See Miller, 2010 and 2014.

492 David M. Miller, 2010: 113. See also uses of *louais* as ethnic category in contrast to Greek/Gentile/barbarian: Rom. 1:16, Rom. 2:9-10, Rom. 3:1, Rom. 3:9, Rom. 3:29-30, Rom. 9:24, Rom. 10:12, 1 Cor. 1:24, Gal. 2:15, Col. 3:11; uses of *louais* as ‘religious’: Rom. 2:17, Rom. 2:28-29, 1 Cor. 9:20, Gal. 2:14; use of *louaoi* as persons with power to impose capital punishment: 2 Cor. 11:24; the Thessalonians suffered the same treatment from other Thessalonians, as did the Judean Christ followers by *louaoi*, whom killed Jesus, and persecuted Paul, Silvanus and Timothy, hindering them from speaking to the Gentiles: 1 Thess. 2:14-16.
Remembered Paul has demonstrated the possibility for a variety of approaches to ‘works of the law” amongst people who name themselves Ioudaios, and he has named other Ioudaios as people with power over other Ioudaios: “the ones of the circumcision” who regulate the freedom of other Jews (Gal. 2); who have the power to impose the capital punishment of flogging (2 Cor. 11:24), and the ones who tried to prevent RP, Silvanus and Timothy from preaching to the Gentiles (1 Thess. 2:14-16), the ones he characterizes as murderers of Jesus and the prophets. Therefore, Paul is a Jew, but not any Jew. He locates himself as a member of the ethnic group of Jews, as a religious Jew amongst a plurality of possibilities for ethnic/religious practice, and refers to both his ‘former’ and his ‘present’ Jewish understandings and practices (Gal. 1:13-15, Phil. 3), characterizing his ‘former’ life as ‘acceptable’ to the “ones of the circumcision” and his present one as ‘punishable.”

Tribe of Benjamin and Descendant of Abraham

Regarding further particularization, Joseph Geiger has noted that being from the tribe of Benjamin is “a fact devoid of any practical consequences in this period [in which the Remembered Paul lived].” Furthermore, the fact that Paul was an Israelite, according to Shaye J. D. Cohen, would have meant very little to other people on the streets of the Roman Empire. Finally, being from the seed of Abraham, objectively tells us very little about


494 Shaye J. D. Cohen, 25-68.
possibilities and limitations resulting from this biographical fact. Erich S. Gruen, for instance, describes the fictive communication between Spartan king Aretus and Judean High Priest Onias in which the Spartan king asserts that he had found a written text that recorded “an ancient kinship between Spartans and Jews: both stemmed from the stock of Abraham”\textsuperscript{495} The text presents an image of Israelite identity in which a Spartan can also imagine himself a descendant of Abraham. Gruen also notes that the story of Ishmael that is found later in the book of Jubilees identifies Ishmael, the son of Abraham, as an Arab.\textsuperscript{496} He concludes that by “the second century BCE, in short, Jews (or some at least) associated Arabs with the descendants of Ishmael and thus with the house of Abraham,” and also notes a text by Apollonius Molon and Josephus who affirm this connection.\textsuperscript{497}

\textbf{Pharisaical Attitude towards law}

The Remembered Paul also describes his relationship with \textit{nomos} as befitting a Pharisee (Phil. 3:5). Although scholars often portray Paul as a Pharisee, the manuscript data is not definitive independent of the elaboration of biography found in Historian Acts (Acts 23:6

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[496]{I Eph’al, “Ishmael and ‘Arab(s)’: A Transformation of Ethnological Terms”, \textit{JNES} 35 (1976), 225-31.}
\end{footnotes}
However, RP did indicate that his attitude or practice of *nomos* was Pharisaical, and he claimed, in relationship to righteousness, to be blameless according to the Law (Phil. 3:6), a biographical fact included in his list of reasons for his “confidence in the flesh” (Phil. 3:5-6) that he now regarded as “loss” (zēmian) and “rubbish” (skubala). There are various scholarly opinions on Pharisaical views concerning *nomos*, their political activities or apolitical stance, and their place in society. However, I am persuaded that his use of *Pharisaios* performs the same function as *Ioudaismos* does in his communication with the Galatians because each are connected with former zeal and persecuting activities.

**Maccabean-style Zealot**

Paul also speaks of his former life in *Ioudaismō*, claiming to have advanced beyond many of his peers because he was a greater *zealot* (or more zealous) of the ancestral traditions (Gal. 1:14). Mason states that the “ismos noun represents in nominal form the ongoing action of the cognate verb in *izw*,” thus linking *Ioudaismos* with *Ioudaizō*. The verb

---


501 Mason, 461.
ioúdaizein is used, for instance, in LXX Esther 8:17 referring to Persians who were being circumcised and on account of the fear of the Ioudaioi. It is also used by Remembered Paul in his description of Cephas’ supposed commitment to request Gentiles to ‘live like Jews’ (Gal. 2). In later Christian texts (e.g. 1Mg 1:8; 10:3; 1Phld 6:1), Ignatius and other Christian writers contrast ioúdaismos with Xristianismos. In these translations, the term simply means ‘Judaism’. The authors of BAGD also translate ioúdaísmo as “the Jewish way of belief and life.”

Pauline biographers, on the whole, have accepted the translation of “Judaism” and portrayed Paul as turning away from Judaism to Christ. Frank Thielman, for example, states that “most interpreters, at least in the last decade, [1980s] have concluded that Paul’s view of the law can only be explained if we assume that he had abandoned Judaism and looked back on his ‘former way of life’, including his devotion to the law…” Steve Mason has argued, however, that the Greek word is not a “general term for “Judaism”, but rather [the representative of] a certain kind of activity over against a pull in another foreign direction.”

502 Arndt and Gingrich, 379.


Mason observed that the “term [Ioudaismos] does not appear at all in the large Greek-language corpora of Philo and Josephus, who both wrote extensively about Ioudaioi and their ways, or in literature by any of their compatriots”. Furthermore, where “Greek and Latin authors mention the Ioudaioi and their laws or customs dozens of times,” they do not “invoke Ioudaismos/Ioudaismus.”

Mason believes, therefore, that the term has a more particular meaning, and he concluded that “Ioudaismos appears to rather be the Maccabean…programme of Judaizing: of striving to restore Judean law and customs.”

James Pasto is in agreement with Mason, and points out that this Greek word only occurs in 2 Macc. 2:21; 8:1; 14:38; 4 Macc. 4:26; and Galatians 1:13-14, the “total presence of the term in the literary and archaeological data Jewish and non-Jewish of the Second Temple period”. He notes that “the Greek is used four times by one Jewish author in the unique situation of the 160s BCE or by his epitomiser some years later in 2 Maccabees, and once by an author inspired by this work (4 Maccabees)”.

Mason asserts that it is a

---

505 Steve Mason, 460-461.

506 Mason, 468.


508 Mason, 460.

508 Mason, 466.

508 Mason, 467.
“slogan for the Maccabean counter-movement” because this definition is consistent with its usage in 2 Macc. 2:21; 8:1; 14:38; and 4 Macc. 4:26.

Given that scholars such as John Collins see the Maccabean revolt as a civil war between ‘traditionalist’ and ‘liberal’ Jews caused by the “persecution of people who observed the Torah by having their children circumcised and refusing to eat pork,” a broad definition, it seems would eliminate the specifics of the violence, and the different stances within the community. Remembered Paul was not, in his reference to Ioudaismos, abandoning Judaism. He was linking Ioudaismos with his ‘former life’ (Gal. 1:13) when he proclaimed the need for circumcision. He notes: “It is not as though the Judaizers are doing something he has neglected, for the same mindset was part of his background.” Cummins also names Paul an “ironic Maccabean figure” who “stands in the tradition of zeal as represented in the Maccabean revolt, but with a zeal which is now dramatically deployed in service of his commitment to the martyred and risen Messiah Jesus.”

508 Mason, 460
509 Mason, 467.
512 Mason, 469.
513 Cummins, 94.
514 Cummins, 95.
Though Josephus used the term *zelōtēs* most frequently when referring to the “rebels who entered Jerusalem around AD 67”, one of his earliest uses was in reference to Maccabean Matthathias who he described as willing to kill on behalf of his zeal for Torah and sacred traditions.\(^\text{515}\) Fairchild also noted that “it was this radical and violent understanding of obedience to the Torah that accounted for the persistence of the [Zealot] movement.”\(^\text{516}\)

**A Socially Degraded and Vulnerable Man**

There are five elements of this biographical cluster that are commonly agreed upon in the ancient manuscripts:

1. Humiliated Bodily Presence
2. Rudimentary Level of Literacy
3. Unskilled in Speech
4. Degraded Forms of Work (Manual labour, apostle, slave of Christ)
5. Corporal Punishment (including imprisonment)

Each of these elements have been examined by Pauline scholars, and the majority of the interpretations are not persuasive, I would argue, because: a) they begin with the untested assumption that ‘Paul’ embodies ancient norms or intentionally adopts a counter-normative stance to challenge norms; b) they search for the ‘context’ of the meaning of words within the set of RP’s ideas rather than material existence; c) the data they present about the ancient social world focuses on the meanings of various words and ideas, rather than the

\(^{515}\) Fairchild, 521.

\(^{516}\) Fairchild, 523.
material realities faced by people who describe themselves or who are described by means of these words; and d) one biographical fact is explored, often, apart from its relationship to the others. In contrast, I will begin with the assumption that meanings arise from material existence and be proven wrong as needed; b) that meanings are uttered in contexts of material existence, and therefore best understood by connecting to the local context of each letter first and then in comparison with other letters before searching for parallels in the writings of ancient people who do not share the same social situation; and c) that the best interpretation is one which makes sense of each element in relationship to the whole.

**Humiliated Bodily Presence**

References to RP’s bodily presence are found in the first and second communications with the Corinthians, and in his communication with the Galatians. The Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements indicate that he came to the Corinthians in *astheneia*, and with *phobos* (1 Cor. 2:3), that, according to his second communication, others viewed the *parousia tou sōmatos asthenēs* (his bodily presence as socially humiliated) in contrast to ‘his’ letters that were *bareiai*<sup>517</sup> *kai ischarai*<sup>518</sup>.

---

<sup>517</sup> Arndt and Gingrich, 134: difficult, burdensome, troublesome, weighty, and important.

<sup>518</sup> Arndt and Gingrich, 383: with *bareiai* effective when referring to things, and opposite of *astheneia* when referring to persons.
(strong/oppressive and effective) (2 Cor. 10:10) and his face-to-face presence as *tapeinos*\(^{519}\) (lowly, pliant, abject) compared to the *tharrō* (confidence/courage)\(^{520}\) of his communication in his absence (2 Cor. 10:1). He reminds the Galatians that he first proclaimed the message to them with *asetheneian tēs sarkos* (Gal. 4:13), and though his condition was a test of their loyalty, they did not hold in contempt/despise him (*exouthenēsate*)\(^{521}\) or disdainfully spit him out.\(^{522}\) That is, his physical presence stands in contrast to their positive welcome.

*Astheneia* is used somewhat differently in each of these contexts. In the first, his socially-humiliated presence and pathetic speech is contrasted with his strong, perhaps overbearing letters. In the second context, his *astheneia* stands in contrast to their warm welcome, to their loyalty. Many scholars, including Raymond Pickett, argue that “Paul intentionally adopted the posture of someone who was weak and deliberately failed to measure up”\(^{523}\) when addressing his critics in Corinth. E.A. Judge supports this notion, and argues: “In assuming the position of a disadvantage person Paul is exemplifying the disposition.”\(^{524}\)

\(^{519}\) Arndt & Gingrich, 804: In terms of position: poor, lowly, of no account, undistinguished. In terms of emotional state: pliant, subservient, and abject. Otherwise, lowly, humble.

\(^{520}\) Arndt and Gingrich, 352.

\(^{521}\) Arndt and Gingrich, 277: Indicative Aorist Active, 2 person plural, *exoutheneō*, to reject, despise, hold in contempt.

\(^{522}\) Arndt and Gingrich, 244: *ekptuō*, Indicative Aorist Active, 2 personal plural, also disdain.

\(^{523}\) Raymond Pickett, 75.

Neither scholar, and, in fact, most scholars, fail to explore the possibility that Remembered Paul may have, in fact, had an abject, socially humiliated physical presence. Where scholars do concede the possibility that his critics were ‘on target’, the critics are usually found wanting (e.g. expecting a ‘flamboyant’ rhetoric known as Asianism” in contrast to unadorned speech)\textsuperscript{525} Troy W. Martin, similarly counters the dominant interpretation that Paul’s weakness of the flesh (which the Galatians rightly could have been contemptible towards according to dominant norms) was a physical illness. He argues that illness has simply been taken for granted, and basing his interpretation on his analysis of the occurrences of “weakness of flesh,” suggests instead that it was RP’s circumcised flesh that provided a temptation for the Galatians.\textsuperscript{526} It is not possible for me to evaluate the various arguments. Suffice it to say that each interpretation mentioned is based on one of the above-stated weaknesses.

In contrast to these approaches, I will begin with the most material explanation first, and to regard each communication (letter) as a representative of a different context. Therefore, to understand the use of \textit{astheneia} in RP’s first or second communication to the Corinthians, and his letter to the Galatians, it is necessary to look within these letters first for the context of his self-description by examining how he uses the term in description of persons.

\textsuperscript{525} Victor Furnish, \textit{2 Corinthians} (New Jersey, Yale University Press, 2007), 490.

The ‘weaknesses’ that he experiences (the sources of physical and social harm) make him weak, and others see the effects of that weakness in his physical demeanour. RP does not counteract their view by denying his weakness, but contrasts weaknesses with the power of God (even God’s weakness by means of Christ’s crucifixion), and the power of Christ within him. There is nothing within each of these letters that disconfirm the interpretation that Remembered Paul is referring to illness and a disdainful physical presence, and the contrast he constructs relies on both the reality of the power of Christ and God, and the weaknesses of human beings, namely himself and most of the Corinthians (1 Cor. 1:26).

Ronald Hock links his disdainful physical appearance with another biographical fact – that RP was a manual labourer:

Paul’s weak appearance was due in part to his plying a trade. In the social world of a city like Corinth, Paul would have been a weak figure, without power, prestige and privilege. We recall the shoemaker Micyllus, depicted by Lucian as penniless and powerless – poor, hungry, wearing an unsightly cloak, granted no status, and victimized. To those of wealth and power, the appearance of the artisan was that befitting a slave.527

Such a description makes more sense of the ensemble of biographical facts.

Unskilled in Speech

In the Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements, Remembered Paul claims that he was sent to proclaim the message, but not *ev sophia logou* (1 Cor. 1:17), not *kat uperoxēn* \(^{528}\) *logou* (1 Cor. 2:1), and both his *logos* and his *kerugma* were not *en peithois sophias [logois]* (1 Cor. 2:3-4). In his second communication to the Corinthians, he also claims that people are saying that his speech is *exsouthenēmenos*, that is ‘despicable’ or ‘disdainful’ (2 Cor. 10:10), and he responds with the concession that he is an *idiōtēs tō logō* (2 Cor. 11:6).

His explanation is as follows: a proclamation made by *sophia logou* \(^{529}\) might *kenōthē* (render void) \(^{530}\) the cross of Christ (1 Cor. 1:17). RP states that they “proclaim Christ crucified”, and the “foolishness of this proclamation” is both God’s foolishness and God’s weakness, both of which are stronger than human wisdom and human strength. He states that *peithois sophias* (persuasive wisdom) \(^{531}\) stands in contrast to knowing nothing except Jesus Christ having been crucified (1 Cor. 2:2). Therefore, well-reasoned speech, human

\(^{528}\) BAGD, 841: could be translated “I have not come as a prominent/speaker.

\(^{529}\) Well-reasoned speech or eloquent speech

\(^{530}\) BAGD, 428

\(^{531}\) *p*\(^{46}\) does not contain the world *logois*. 
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wisdom and the speech of prominent elites stands in contrast to *pneumatos* and *dunamis* (1 Cor. 2:4).

Joy Connolly has argued that rhetoric in the ancient Roman world sought “to discipline language and behavior according to standards imagined to embody elite norms” and to limit “rhetorical training [to] the elite domain.”⁵³³ Although she concedes that rhetoric leaves a space for resistance, she notes that the agenda of the elite largely succeeds, and though “many teachers were slaves or freedmen … the enslaved and otherwise disadvantaged people were excluded from the student ranks.”⁵³⁴ Catherine Hezser also limits educational opportunities to children of the ‘middle strata’, and only rarely to lower class children (including slaves):

[They] were generally despised and had a very low social status, would set themselves up and establish informal ‘schools’, (the term may not even be appropriate for the ancient world) in towns, cities, and some villages, charging a small fee for the instruction of pupils in their private homes, makeshift structures, or public places, in locations which were not specifically designated for that purpose. These schools would teach varying levels of literacy and arithmetics to the (probably relatively few) sons and daughters of the middle strata, and in exceptional cases also of the lower strata, of society (e.g. slaves sent to these schools by their masters) who attended them.”⁵³⁵

---


Hezser also notes that there “is no supporting evidence from any other sources concerning the organization of a Jewish elementary school system before the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E.”

Some Jewish children attended Roman schools. However, John Kirby has noted that most families could only afford primary school, so only the “children [of the wealthiest families] progressed to the instruction of the Grammaticus” which, according to Quintilian taught “the art of speaking correctly and the interpretation of poetry.”

Therefore, Remembered Paul’s statement that he is ‘unskilled in speech’ would hardly be considered unusual, except to those who could measure him according to minority elite norms. The dominant scholarly view, surprisingly, is that RP’s autobiographical statement is not an accurate reflection of his speaking ability, but, according to A.T. Lincoln, is simply a skilled rhetorical ploy (and thus evidence of his true rhetorical skill) to “do battle against sophistic rhetoric.” Since he is a priori pictured as a “higher status person,” biographical statements such as these are seen as proof, according to Ben Witherington, not of “his social location and inclinations,” but rather his rhetorical skill. Once he has

536 Hezser, Private and Public Education, 471.


be found competent in rhetorical skill, scholars then search for the social location that provided such education. Christopher Forbes, for instance, claims that “an understanding of the conventions of comparison, self-praise, [and] irony…provides a convincing background against which to interpret the ‘boasting’ of Paul.” Without any argumentation, he states that “Paul picked up his rhetorical skills during his career as an itinerant preacher and disputant, in debate and possibly by self-tuition [or] he may have had a full education in formal Greek rhetoric.”

The problem with these interpretations is they do not take seriously the contrast that RP makes between the crucifixion of Christ/God’s weakness and foolishness/God’s choice of things low and despised and persuasive human wisdom and eloquent/rhetorically skilled speech. Because too little attention is paid to RP’s biographical ensemble, these interpretations also too quickly rely on an uncritical use of Acts for evidence of a social location which could include rhetorical education. However, there is no data Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon or Contemporary data to support claims that RP was educated by Gamaliel, or that he came from the wealthiest families who were able to send their children to school. Nor does he display the elite attitude towards rhetoric found in the words of Dio Chrysostom:

That a man…who possesses great wealth and has every opportunity to live in luxury by day and night, should in spite of all this reach out for education also and be eager to acquire training in eloquent speaking (tō logō)…seems

to me to give proof of an extraordinarily noble soul and not only ambitious, but in very truth devoted to wisdom (sophia). You, as it seems to me, are altogether wise in believing that a statesman needs experience and training in public speaking and in eloquence (logos). For it is true that this will prove of very great help toward making him beloved and influential and esteemed instead of being looked down upon...The man who intends to have a public career...should increase...the effectiveness of his oratory...541

The simplest interpretation is that when Remembered Paul concedes that he is unskilled in speaking, that his statement is a reflection of a social situation which did not afford the opportunity for rhetorical education. The paradoxical explanation he provides to explain his lack of skill, depends, in fact, on the astheneia of crucifixion and his socially humiliated speech and physical presence.

Rudimentary Literacy

Manuscripts also provide biographical facts about RP’s level of literacy. According to the Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements, Remembered Paul used secretaries for writing letters (Tertius is named in Rom. 16:22), and sometimes signed a letter, or added a few words, or a final greeting (Gal. 6:11, Col. 4:18, 2 Thess. 3:17; 1 Cor.16:21, Heb. 13:22). The references to his own writing, according to Gordon J. Bahr and Deissmann, “implicitly highlights his use of an amanuensis for the rest of the writing task.”542 A Contemporary statement also gives evidence that RP wrote his promise to pay his debt to Philemon (Phlm 19), supporting the agreed-upon statements. Though the Contemporary testimony of RP’s

541 Dio Chrysostom, Discourse: On Training for Public speaking, 18.1, 2, 9, 10.
542 Chris Keith, “In My Own Hand: Grapho-Literacy and the Apostle Paul”, 41.
letter to Timothy includes a claim that he was writing the letter (implicitly the whole letter, 1 Tim. 3:14), this statement is not supported by a Historian.

Chris Keith has relied on the scholarship of Raffaella Cribiore to demonstrate that RP’s contributions to the writing of the letters represents “signature literacy”, which was “the ability to write one’s name” and “was actually a nascent stage of grapho-literacy”.

Students with this level of literacy were only able to copy letters, but “did not have the ability to understand those letters as constituent parts of larger language units of syllables, words or sentences.”

Gordon J. Bahr also noted that illiteracy is the usual reason for subscriptions written by the sender of the letters, and indicates that the rest of the letter was written by a secretary.

Unlearned and learned ancients (e.g. Quintilian, a first century elite) recommended using copyists to avoid the ‘sluggish pen’ (writing slower than one’s thoughts), but this option, he warned, brought with it the danger of the “unformed and illiterate hand [which] cannot be deciphered.” Quintilian gives us evidence that it was possible for someone to be an elite and educated man, and hire a secretary. Unlike Quintilian, however, RP needs a secretary and his hand is an illiterate hand.

543 Keith, 50.
544 Keith, 50.
546 Quintilian, Inst. 1.1.28-29 (BUTLER, LCL)
Deissmann argued that “Paul preferred to dictate his letters; writing [at least in Greek] was not particularly easy for him.” Keith, on the other hand, argued that Paul signed his letters in order to demonstrate his high degree of literacy (at least he could write), but also admits that: “one need posit little beyond the initial stages of literate education in order to account for the level of grapho-literate competency in Greek that Paul displays.” In a society where only 10% of people were literate, and perhaps even less than 10% in Roman Judea, any writing ability was significant. Cribiore states:

There can be no doubt that inhabitants of Greco-Roman Egypt preferred to sign documents and letters in their clumsy, belaboured characters than be considered among illiterates. It was better to possess and exhibit the skill in limited and imperfect degree, however difficult and unpleasant to the eye their efforts were.

Remembered Paul’s reference to his ‘big letters’ (Gal. 6:11), and “writing in my own hand” both suggest that RP was situated in the group of people with limited literacy skills. Therefore, as Bahr has stated, “there is no way of knowing how much of the material in the body of a given letter represents either the thought or the diction of Paul.” Although

547 Deissmann, Paul, 49.
548 Keith, 58.
550 Catherine Hezser, Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 496.
551 Raffaella Cribiore, Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996), 4-5, 7, 10.
the Historian 2 Peter states that there are things in the ‘Pauline’ letters that are hard to understand, the writer also places them amongst *loipas graphas* (“other writings” 2 Peter 3:16). RP’s level of literacy, with the support of secretaries, allowed him to communicate with the assemblies. This rudimentary level of literacy is consistent with the other biographical facts.

**Degraded Forms of Work**

**Manual Labour**

Deissmann declared that “Paul was a craftsman whose wages were the basis of his existence.” 553 The Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon evidence repeatedly identifies RP as a manual labourer (1 Thess. 2:9; 1 Cor. 4:12; 1 Cor. 9:6; 2 Cor. 11:27; 2 Thess. 3:8-9). Many scholars accept this designation, while others embellish (making him a tentmaker) by reading with Historian Acts 18:3. In the Greek and Roman world of the first century, a manual labourer, an artisan was despised by people with higher economic status. 554 Cicero, the wealthy Roman orator wrote the following in 44 BCE:

> Now in regard to trade and other means of livelihood, which ones are to be considered becoming to a gentleman and which ones are vulgar, we have

553 Deissmann, 4.

been taught: Vulgar are the means of livelihood of all hired workmen whom 
we pay for mere manual labor...\(^{555}\)

Manual labourers were not only despised by those more wealthy, they also endured long 
hours in unsafe conditions with poor pay. Helmut Koester notes that when the RP states 
that he works with “toil and sweat” day and night (1 Thess. 2:9), “he is describing the daily 
life of every ancient artisan.”\(^{556}\) I am aware, of course, of the view that RP voluntarily 
became a manual labourer as part of his ‘missionary work’,\(^{557}\) and that Hock knows this 
because RP’s seeming ‘aristocratic’ views about labour. However, I am persuaded by 
Todd. D. Still’s conclusion: “Put succinctly, Hock’s long-standing, if largely unexamined, 
argument that Paul, the one-time aristocrat, evinces in his letters a markedly negative 
attitude toward work positively will not work.”\(^{558}\) Justin J. Meggitt had also noted that 
Hock’s notion that a disdain for labour was an aristocratic attitude was not supported by 
the primary sources. Here one finds instead such “attitudes towards physical labour 
amongst all elements in first-century society.”\(^{559}\) Remembered Paul mentioned his manual 
labour in several of his communications (1 Thess. 2:9; 1 Cor. 4:12; 9:6; 2 Cor. 11:27; 2 
Thess. 3:8), and lamented his hard work, that other apostles were able to avoid.

\(^{555}\) Cicero, On Duties, 1:150-151.


\(^{557}\) Ronald Hock, Social Context of Paul’s Ministry

\(^{558}\) Todd D. Still, “Did Paul Loathes Manual Labour?: Revisiting the Work of Ronald F. Hock on the 
Apostle’s Tentmaking and Social Class” JBL 124, no. 4 (2006), 795.

Commissioned Messenger

Paul’s other form of labour was his work as an *apostolos* (Rom. 1:1, 1 Cor. 1:1, 1 Cor. 9:1; Gal. 1:1; Eph. 1:1; Col. 1:1), amongst a group of other apostles (Acts 14:4; Acts 15:22; Rom. 16:7; 1 Cor. 9:5; 1 Cor. 12:28; 2 Cor. 8:23; Gal. 1:19; Eph. 3:5; Eph. 4:11). That work included delivering the message of Christ (e.g. 1 Cor. 9:11; Rom. 15:16), and administering the *diakonion* (e.g. Rom. 15:25-28; 1 Cor. 16: 1-4, 15; 2 Cor. 8-9). RP expected wages and material support for his labour (e.g. Rom. 4:4; 1 Cor. 3:8).

To understand what apostleship meant in the life of the Remembered Paul, *apostolos* must be socially located. Donald T. Dent states “*apostolos* rarely appeared in Greek literature until its use in the New Testament”\(^{560}\). Francis H. Agnew notes, however, that the word was used in secular Greek, in non-literary Greek, in the writings of Josephus, and twice in the LXX.\(^{561}\) In each of these cases, the term simply means “messenger” or “sent men”: Herodotus employed the word twice, his intended meaning could best be interpreted as “sent messenger”; and Josephus likewise uses the word in the sense of sending emissaries (Ant. 1, 146; 17, 30). Agnew also reports that H.F. von Campenhausen found a Delphic inscription, and “a series of second century Christian texts which suggest that the term


would have been basically understandable for non-Christians.” 562 F. Presigke-E. Kiessling, in his book *Worterbuch der griechischen Papyrussurkunden*, also “provides a considerable number of references to a secular use of the term in the non-literary Greek of Christian times”. 563 In summary, the word *apostolos*, in a non-religious sense, would indicate that Paul or another was a messenger, or “commissioned agent.” 564 In Roman society, Joseph Vogt notes that “slaves were generally central to the transmission of news in ancient society being the messengers of both public and private.” 565

Apostleship is not generally characterized as a form of labour, but rather a ‘calling’ or a religious activity. It is true that Remembered Paul speaks of his apostleship as ‘sacred’ work in the same way that Epaphroditus, his co-worker provides service to him while he is in prison (Folio 88r Phil 2:25). However, as stated earlier, RP described apostles as a degraded group of people who were often hungry, subject to violence, and considered the scum of the earth. The language of ‘calling’ therefore takes a degraded form of labour and transforms it into a cause for boasting, and work that will bring its reward.


563 Agnew, p. 75 n. 1.

564 Agnew, 51.

Slave of Christ

The Remembered Paul claims that he is a *doulos* of Christ (Rom. 1:1, Gal. 1:10, Phil. 1:1, Eph. 1:1, 1 Cor. 1:1, 2 Cor. 1:1, and Colossians 1:7). Contemporaries Titus 1:1 and 2 Timothy 1:1 concur with the Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements. Remembered Paul also claims that he has the *stigmata tou Iēsou* (Gal. 6:17) on his body, that is a tattoo, a form of capital punishment in which a mark was etched or branded on criminals, war captives and slaves, often on their foreheads. RP was a slave, but not just any slave, he was a stigmatized slave, and a slave of Christ.

An examination of ancient uses of *stigmata* reveals that its use in the earliest ancient documents is substantive or material and not metaphorical. Virginia Hunter has identified it as a punishment in Athens that was “used in extreme circumstances” and consisted of “branding, or more accurately, tattooing”, using “needles and ink” to “write on the slave’s forehead or hands.” It is a practice that can be traced back to the Persians by Herodotus (5 BCE) who reported that King Xerxes “tattooed his slaves and Greek prisoners of war.” Slaves were also tattooed “in cases of severe insubordination,” and ancient texts provide evidence that the brows of runaway slaves were often inscribed with

http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/morph?l=stigmata&la=greek

Virginia Hunter, 281.

the words, “Stop me, I am a runaway.” Glancy has noted that such “tattooed slaves were especially vulnerable to additional forms of physical and verbal assault. Tattoos were not easily removed, and had long term consequences. Two Roman juridical sources, for instance, indicate that “slaves who have been tattooed and are later manumitted into freedmen [have only] the status of *peregrine dediticii* (that is, freedmen with no political rights).

There is evidence that temples had slaves, and slaves were often tattooed with the name of the deity in whose temple they served. There were also runaway slaves who were tattooed after seeking sanctuary in the temple of a god. Before concluding that RP’s use of the term “slave of Christ” or “*stigmata*” is simply metaphorical, it is necessary to explore these material possibilities, and avoid transplanting our modern notions of *stigmata* onto the ancient world. Margo DeMello has noted, for instance, that “cases of Christians reporting to bear the wounds of Christ did not develop until the thirteenth century.” A stigmatized slave could be an apostle, a manual labour, unskilled in speech, with a

569 Hunter, 282.

570 Glancy, 132 note 125.

571 Mark Gustafson, “*Inscripta in fronte*: Penal Tattooing in Late Antiquity” *Classical Antiquity* 16(1) April [1997] 86.


rudimentary level of literacy. Such a slave would also be more vulnerable to the other forms of capital punishment that RP experienced.

**Subject to Capital Punishment**

Paul’s despicable social status is also found in the biographical facts concerning his ‘whippable body’. Jennifer Glancy has noted that flogging “was the most commonly practiced species of corporal punishment. The ability to order a whipping signaled a person’s dominance over another; the inability to resist a whipping, the dishonor of the person whipped”.\(^\text{574}\) Josephus notes that such a punishment was suitable only for slaves, and even if the person whipped was a free man, the punishment warranted a description of servile.\(^\text{575}\) Paul received the ‘forty’ minus one from the Ioudaiön (Jewish leaders) on five different occasions. However, whipping was not a punishment that was only meted out by Jewish disciplinarians. Virginia Hunter contrasted the treatment of free persons in Athens with that of slaves (male and female) and noted that the free persons were often fined, while the slaves were administered 50 lashes.\(^\text{576}\) According to Callistratus, this capital punishment extended to lower class free men: “not every free person is beaten with rods, but only those of the lower orders (*tenuiores homines*); imperial rescripts lay down that


\(^{575}\) Glancy, 125.

honestiores should not be beaten (D.48.19.28.2).” Furthermore, Glancy has noted that when Roman officials were accused of misusing their power, they were often charged with flogging a Roman citizen. Capital punishment, though experienced most by slaves and lower class free men, could be inflicted even on citizens.

Many scholars interpret RP’s statements about capital punishment as part of his ironic, boastful rant, and his statements about violence endured are seen as simply a rhetorical strategy. Glancy argues, however, that this interpretation is based on an uncritical application of ancient methods of boasting. Plutarch, Glancy notes that anything that is aischpros (that is dishonorable, degrading or humiliating) had no place in “a litany of self-praise Mor. 544B.” She concludes, therefore, that Paul’s ‘catalogue of hardships’ is simply further proof of the status of his servile body. Richard Saller has also noted that “conventional wisdom…persisted in seeing beating and other corporal punishment as


578 Glancy, 112.


580 Glancy, 120.
inherently degrading.” Whether the person being beaten is able to find some way to reframe the beating as something that demonstrate honor rather than dishonor, Jennifer Glancy has argued persuasively that it was still an action of dominance over a whippable/beatable body, and “Paul’s whippability – for his announcement that he has been repeatedly…beaten with rods defined him as eminently beatable – marked him as dishonorable, even contemptible.”

**Placing Paul within Groups**

**Workers for Christ**

RP was a member of a group of people who had been “baptized into Christ” (Rom. 6:3). Within that group, he named himself an apostle to the Gentiles (Rom. 11:3). His co-workers included: Prisca and Aquilla (Rom. 16:3); Timothy, Sosthenes, Titus, and Adronicus and Junian who were his kinsmen, also imprisoned at the same time, and “in Christ” before Paul (Rom. 16:7). RP and Apollos were also known as *diakonoi* (1 Cor. 3:5), and according to the manuscript evidence, they were each assigned different roles, and expected to receive *misthon* for their particular work (1 Cor. 3:8). According to 1 Cor. 4:13, the apostles suffered in terms of food and shelter and clothing, and were considered the ‘dregs’ of society. Timothy was also a slave (Phil 1:1) as was Epaphroditus, one of his

---


582 Glancy, 111.
co-workers took care of his needs while he was in prison (Phil. 1:25). In addition, Epaphras was a “fellow slave” with Paul and Timothy, also a “slave of Christ” (Col. 4:12). Aristarchus, Mark and Justus were Paul’s only co-workers who were “of the circumcision” (Col. 4:10). Within this group, he considered himself an _ektroma_ (1 Cor. 15:8). Matthew W. Mitchell has persuasively argued that, when Paul uses the word _ektrōma_ (“the abortion”) to describe himself in 1 Corinthians 15, “he portrays himself as something that is cast aside (hidden away) or rejected in the manner of an aborted/miscarried fetus, most likely with respect to his claims to equal authority with the other apostles.” Thus, while the history of Christian interpretation has named Paul an ‘eminent apostle’, the earliest witnesses testify to his marginal and contested place in the group of apostles.

_Zealots_

Given that RP named himself “zealot”, it is important to determine his place within a zealot group. Mark Fairchild has argued that “interpreters and commentators have always interpreted the term as an adjective, meaning “zealous”. By understanding Paul’s statement as an adjective, he argues, “[they]…have dissociated Paul from the Zealot movement”. Although one might dialogue about the shape of such a movement, or even the use of the

---


term ‘movement’, it is clear from the writings of Josephus that it was possible to group people into the term zēlōtai, as into sikario or lēstai.  Although he used the term zēlōtēs most frequently when referring to the “rebels who entered Jerusalem around AD 67,” one of his earliest uses of the term was in reference to Maccabean Matthathias who he described as willing to kill on behalf of his zeal for Torah and sacred traditions. This same link between zeal and Ioudaismos is found in Galatians 1:13-14. Fairchild also noted that “it was this radical and violent understanding of obedience to the Torah that accounted for the persistence of the [Zealot] movement” that had its “origin among the peasants.” Morton Smith has suggested that, although there is no evidence for a Zealot party prior to the 60s, there were individual zealots especially amongst the ‘peasants’ who were joined in their hatred of the elite Judean leaders and the Roman oppressors.

Fairchild and Richard Horsley provide a cautionary note: “we cannot continue to look upon the Zealots as a unified sect of Judaism with a distinctive theology and continuous leadership extending from the Maccabean period to the end of the second revolt against

585 Fairchild, 520.
586 Fairchild, 521.
587 Fairchild, 523.
588 Fairchild, 514-532.
Though the collective memory of the Maccabean zeal lived on, John J. Collins argues that, while the civil war between Jewish leaders led to the king’s new policies, it is wrong to see the revolt as simply a conflict between Hellenism and Judaism. He notes: “The revolt was not provoked by the introduction of Greek customs (typified by the building of a gymnasium) but by the persecution of people who observed the Torah by having their children circumcised and refusing to eat pork.”

It was also formed and reformed in response to different events in history over a couple of centuries. While I do not wish to argue that Paul was a member of formal group of zealots, an examination of their history of this group provides a historical context/memory in which to place zeal, Ioudaismos, ancestral traditions, and violent persecution.

**Pharisees?**

Although there is insufficient manuscript proof that RP considered himself a member of a group of Pharisees, many scholars name him a Pharisee. However, such a designation has no real meaning unless one can reconstruct their history, and describe their first century social situation and activities. Hillel Newman has noted that a groups’ proximity to power depended on who was in power. He suggests that “the Hasmonean regime at its inception, up to the reign of John Hyrcanus, was close to the Pharisees [but] [f]ollowing a particular

---

590 Fairchild, 526.

event, John Hyrcanus transferred the regime’s proximity to the Sadducees.” He also believed here were ongoing struggles for power between the Pharisees and the Sadducees “in the political arena throughout the Hasmonean period, and even into the Herodian period.” According to the literature of the Sages, Newman notes, the Pharisees and their descendants (if Paul even was a descendent), “could come from any social class (rich and poor)….” However, there is much discussion about the Pharisees amongst scholars, and to concede to such a characterization would require wading through sometimes opposing accounts and uses of historical evidence. Therefore, there is nothing gained to placing RP within a first century group of Pharisees, even if one should concede this is a biographical fact.

Waves of History

According to Sartre, the “group bestows its power and its efficacy upon the individuals whom it has made and who have made it in turn, whose irreducible particularity is one way


593 Newmann, 66.

594 Newman, 73.

595 See Jacob Neusner and Bruce Chilton, Quest of the Historical Pharisees (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007) for a discussion of various portrayals of the Pharisees.
of living universality.” I have demonstrated that Paul is an Israelite who identified himself as a zealot in a Maccabean manner in his former life, and he is a socially depraved and vulnerable man, a tattooed “slave of Christ”. This is not enough. How can both of these realities exist in one man? How have each of these parts of his biography changed over time and intersected with one another?

In this section, I will describe how a Zealous/Zealot/Israelite Slave/Servile Body could have been formed within the waves of history of Israelite slavery and Maccabean-Israelite political/religious responses to colonization. How, in short, could the Israelite be a socially humiliated man, a zealot, and a slave? And how, more pressingly, could a socially humiliated zealot slave become a socially humiliated apostle to Gentiles? The following paragraphs provide a temporal framework for these possibilities and limitations in his life.

**Israelite Zeal in History**

During the rule of Nebuchadnezzar II, the Chaldeans destroyed Jerusalem and burned the Temple (587 or 586 BCE). Israelite elites and skilled craftsmen were deported to Babylonia. Cyrus the Great of Persia conquered Babylonia in 536 BCE and permitted the exiles to return to Judah and rebuild the Temple. These returning elites provided leadership to revive the Judean centre, and Judea became a “chartered state” – subject to priestly rule.

---

596 Sartre, 130.
under Persian rule. When the Greeks conquered Persia in 478 BCE, the rise of the Athenian Empire led to the influence of Greek gods in Palestinian Judea.

Alexander the Great conquered Judaea, then a Persian province, in 322 BCE\textsuperscript{597}. His Macedonian successors, the Macedonian rulers of Egypt (the Ptolemies), and the Seleucids, the rulers in Syria, vied for control of the region and Israel was buffeted between these two imperial powers.\textsuperscript{598} Eventually the Seleucids were victorious in 200 BCE and Antiochus III conquered Jerusalem, and ruled over Syro-Palestine. During this time the Israelites cooperated with their jurisdiction, and Antiochus, according to Josephus, allowed them to follow their ancestral laws.\textsuperscript{599}

In the 176/5 BCE Antiochus IV Epiphanies ascended to the throne. The high priest Onias was deposed and Jason became high priest (1 Macc. 1:10). Then Jason was deposed and Menelaus became high priest, and Onias was murdered. In 169 BCE Antiochus Epiphanes plundered the Jerusalem temple. Although many Israelites had been assimilated into Greek culture, Hellenization was still an ongoing source of tension amongst various groups.\textsuperscript{600}

\textsuperscript{597} Elias Bickerman, \textit{The Maccabees: an account of their history from the beginnings to the fall of the house of the Hasmoneans}, Translated by Moses Hadas (New York: Schocken Books, 1947), 32.


\textsuperscript{599} Cummins, 20 cites Josephus, Ant. 12.138-46.

the memory of the Jewish texts that refer to these events (1 and 2 Maccabees, Daniel), Antiochus IV ‘polluted the temple’ and disallowed the observance of Torah.

The desecrations of the temple (1 Macc. 1:54, 59) led to the Maccabean Revolt of 167-164 BCE. Historians often portray this revolt as the Maccabean attempt to save traditional religion. Although the author of 2 Maccabees presents Judas Maccabee as a leader engaged in a battle with Hellenism, more recent Jewish historians have argued that the Hellenizing pressures came not just from without but from within Judea as well, and that Hellenization often served the Israeliite aristocratic interests. Elias Bickerman, for instance, has argued:

> It was not a national fight, but a struggle within the nation itself, i.e. a religious war between two groups of Jews: between the polytheists who sacrificed God in order to save their people through assimilation to the surrounding world, and the monotheists, who were ready to give up their lives and that of the people in order to preserve the law of Moses.\(^{601}\)

In 164 BCE Antiochus IV decreed amnesty for all those who had rebelled, and ended his persecution. However, Judas Maccabees’ attacks continued. An attempt was apparently made by Antiochus to negotiate with the ‘rebels’, but the negotiations were unsuccessful (2 Macc. 11:16-20; 34-38). In 163 BCE Antiochus V ended the ‘hellenization’ of Jerusalem and gave the temple back to the Jews (2 Macc. 11:22-26). However, the

---

Maccabees (or Hasmoneans) didn’t end their rebellion. They managed to dispose of the
Oniad dynasty, and “install themselves as high priests of Judea”.

The Maccabean Revolt linked revolutionary action with an attempt to overthrow leaders
(both external and internal to the ‘Jewish” community) with zeal for the law. 1 Maccabees
2:21-28, speaks of “zeal for the law” and identifies Judas Maccabeus and Onias as zealots
(see also 2 Macc. 4:2). Israel Shatzman has argued that this event in history profoundly
affected Jewish identity. He asserted: “Indeed Antiochus’ persecution and the Hasmonean
uprising started off the formation of conscious, aggressive Jewish identity, characterized
by segregation and strict demarcation of the lines between Jews and Gentiles.”

The author of II Maccabees, for instance, is indignant about any attempt made to Hellenize the
Jewish people, whether by Israelites themselves or by foreigners. The abolition of the Law
and of all the traditional religious and cultural practices of the Jews, on the one hand, and
the forcible, atrocious imposition of Greek cults, sacrificial practices and social behaviour


602 Benedikt Eckhardt, “Introduction” in Jewish Identity and Politics between the Maccabees and Bar

603 Israel Shatzman, “Jews and Gentiles from Judas Maccabaeus to John Hyrcanus according to
Contemporary Jewish Sources” in Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism: Louis
H. Feldman Jubilee Volume, Edited by Shaye J.D. Cohen and Joshua J. Schwartz, Ancient Judaism &
Early Christianity 67 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 240.
was the essence of the persecution (6:1-10).\textsuperscript{604} Israelite zeal, however, did not stop Judas Maccabee from establishing ties between Israel and Rome.\textsuperscript{605}

The Hasmoneans began to expand their territory near the end of the reign of John Hyrcanus I (135-104 BCE), and this expansion was furthered by successor ruler Alexander Jannaeus (104-76 BCE). In 130 BCE, the boundaries of Judean Palestine contained only the district of Judea, but by 100 BCE, the Hasmoneans ruled all of the Palestinian hinterland from Upper Galilee in the north to Negev Desert in the south. The conquered peoples: a mixture of Edomites, Samaritan Israelites, and in Galilee, a patchwork of Arabs, Greeks and Syrians were forced by the Hasmoneans to covert to Judaism, and circumcision was also coerced. According to Shaye D. Cohen, it was during this period that circumcision became the mark of Judean identity.\textsuperscript{606} The Hasmonean conquest also led to economic expansion (through an expanded tax base) for the Judean priesthood and the Temple. This increased the power of the representatives of the Judean institutions – the priests and scholars of Torah, and intensified the gap between the minority of Judean aristocrats and the majority of ‘common’ poor people. Josephus and 4Qnah1 report that many Jews rebelled against

\textsuperscript{604} Shatzman, 257.

\textsuperscript{605} David Flusser, \textit{Judaism of the Second Temple Period} vol. 1, Translated by Azzan Yadin (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2007), 177.

the actions of Jannaeus, and he had “some 800 of his opponents crucified, and slaughtered their wives and children before their eyes.”\(^{607}\)

In 63 BCE, Pompey Rome captured Palestine, and the Jewish territories became subject to Rome. According to Josephus, he also violated the Temple when he captured Jerusalem. The Romans then took over the areas of Palestine that had been ruled and Judaized by the Maccabees (Hasmoneans). During this time the Romans were brutal. As in earlier Roman campaigns in Asia Minor, “Jews [were] captured and enslaved.”\(^{608}\) Cassius, who conquered Taricheae in Galilee, according to Josephus, “made slaves of some thirty thousand men”\(^{609}\) People who rebelled against the imposed unjust taxation were also crucified. Assuming a lifespan of about 60 years, it would be during that time that Paul’s parents may have been born.

Antipater (or Antipas), the first of the Herodian dynasty, was appointed governor of Idumaea. His son Herod the Great became king, by proclamation of the Roman Senate, of the Jewish territories in late 40 BCE. From 37 BCE–4 BCE, as the Roman client king, he was an oppressive ruler. Josephus reports that, on two occasions, the Pharisees refused to


\(^{609}\) Horsley, 31.
“take a loyalty oath to the king, whom they considered illegitimate, because he was a “half-Jew” (Idumean father, Arab mother), a Hellenizer, and a creature of Rome (Ant 15.368-71; 17.41-45).\footnote{Horsley, 32.} Herod gradually conquered the Palestinian hinterland – the districts of Galilee, Samaria, Judea and his native Idumaea, with the help of both Roman and Jewish (non-Judeans like himself) troops. Jerusalem was the last to fall in 37 BCE, and when it did the non-Judean Jewish troops “slaughtered their co-religionists” and Herod attempted to restrain them. According to Seth Schwartz, “resentment against the Judeans may never have been far from the surface.”\footnote{Seth Schwartz, \textit{Imperialism and Jewish Society: 200 BCE. to 640 CE 44} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 44. \url{http://books.google.ca/books?id=K13JHSSyH1gC&dq=Herod+Jewish+troops+slaughtered+their+co-religionists&source=gbs_navlinks_s}}

Herod died in 4 BCE, and several small-scale uprisings promptly took place. According to Robert Eisenman who summarizes the evidence from Josephus and other primary sources, at the time of the death of Herod, there appeared:

a series of “Messianic pretenders from 4. B.C. to 55 C.E. from Judas the Galilean to “the magician” Theudas, “the Egyptian” mistaken for Paul, and Menachem son or grandson of Judas, most of whom attempted to lead their followers out to the wilderness for a reaffirmation of the Deuteronomic Covenant of “Damascus”, or purify the temple in the manner of Judas Maccabee (and Ezra).\footnote{Robert Eisenman, \textit{Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians, and Qumran: A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins} (Leiden: Brill, 1983), 37. \url{http://books.google.ca/books?id=CowRLf9AvAoC&dq=reaffirmation+of+the+Deuteronomic+Covenant+of+%E2%80%9CDamascus%E2%80%9D,+or+purify+the+temple+in+the+manner+of+Judas+Maccabee+(and+Ezra)&source=gbs_navlinks_s}}
It seems that Maccabean zeal was still alive and well in first century Judaisms during the lifetime of Paul. In fact, S.G.F. Brandon has even argued that, despite the tendentious presentation of the Gospels and Josephus’ bias against revolutionary movements, the disciples of Jesus:

saw in the Roman execution of Jesus, martyrdom for Israel, which many other Jewish leaders had suffered from the glorious days of the Maccabees to the recent deaths of Judas of Galilee and many of his Zealot followers. Scriptural warrant being found for such sufferings of the Messiah, they looked forward to the imminent return of Jesus, with supernatural power, to complete his Messianic role. The achievement of this role meant the restoration of sovereignty to Israel, which necessarily involved the overthrow of the Roman government which then ruled in the Holy Land.\(^{613}\)

Whether Jesus was a zealot or not, and whether Jesus was actually killed by the Romans for political reasons\(^{614}\) is beyond the scope of this dissertation. Yet, it is reasonable to claim that, after the death of Jesus, the retrospective accounts of Jesus’ life had certain characteristics of earlier Maccabean zeal. For instance, Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem on an ass, as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels (Mark 11:1-7; Matt. 21:1-7; Luke 19:29-35), presents a brash revolutionary leader challenging Jerusalem power. The Gospel of Matthew links Jerusalem to Herod and Rome as “the city of the great King” (Mt. 5:35). Matthew’s Jesus is also linked to the memory of John the Baptist and the call to repentance embraced

---


\(^{614}\) See Justin J. Meggitt, “The Madness of King Jesus: Why was Jesus put to death, but his followers were not?” *JSNT* 29, no. 4 (2007), 379-413.
by tax collectors and prostitutes (Matt 21:32), but ignored by the elite leaders (Matt. 21:32). A later rabbinic tradition links his entry on an ass (rather than in the clouds), not with his humility, but with Israel’s unworthiness.\textsuperscript{615} When Jesus overturned the tables in the Temple (Mark 11:27-8), Brandon argues that he “was in effect attacking the sacerdotal aristocracy; for the money changers and other traders could have operated there only under licence from the higher clergy who controlled the Temple.”\textsuperscript{616} Although Brandon argues that it was this action of Jesus (with the support of many followers) that caused Judean leaders to seize him,\textsuperscript{617} what is important for the study of Paul’s life is how, after his death, the Messiah narrative developed.

Paul and later Gospel writers share an apocalyptic thinking that was also in line with those zealots who believed that “Israel’s state of servitude to the heathen was due to unfaithfulness, and that repentance of evil and zealous observance of the sacred Torah would prepare the way for God’s deliverance.”\textsuperscript{618} Paul clearly believed that Jesus was the Messiah, and that his heavenly rule would vindicate him and make his followers rulers as well. Matthew’s Jesus retrospectively records Jesus as saying:

\begin{center}
\textsuperscript{615} Brandon, 349 note 2.
\textsuperscript{616} Brandon, 331.
\textsuperscript{617} Brandon, 334.
\textsuperscript{618} Brandon, 337.
\end{center}
Truly I tell you, at the renewal of all things, when the Son of Man is seated on the throne of his glory, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. (Matt. 19:28)

The road to triumph was not without suffering. The Markan Jesus retrospectively declared that following Jesus would lead to crucifixion (Mark 8:34), and that following him would certainly entail suffering. This also placed Jesus in a “long roll of [zealot] martyrs for Israel’s freedom.”

His followers, either by previous association or in association with Jesus were also filled with Maccabean-type zeal. Eisenman, in line with other notable scholars, argues that Judas Iscariot was himself a zealot, and Brandon believes that Simon ton Kavanaion (Kavanaios “is a Greek transliteration of the Aramaic…meaning “Zealot”620) was also a zealous revolutionary (see also Luke 6:15 and Acts 1:13). He argues that Simon’s zealot association was “not explained to the readers of Mark’s Gospel because it was a dangerous time in Roman history (post 70 C.E) to speak of the zealots as they were seen to be the “execrable sects of Jewish fanatics who had been responsible for the Jewish revolt.”

In summary, according to Eisenman:

While the Maccabean movement emerged in response to the destruction and corruption of the previous priesthood in response to the destruction and corruption of the previous priesthood represented by Simeon the Just and his son, Onias, and the forcible imposition of Hellenistic civilization; the events and sentiments culminating in the Messiahship of Jesus came to

619 Brandon, 355.
620 Brandon, 244.
621 Brandon, 244.
fruition as a response to the destruction of the Maccabean priesthood by the “Herodians” and their Roman overlords. So closely do the movements resemble each other that the only observably incontrovertible difference between them is that the Christianity born of Jesus’ death developed a non-Jewish overseas wing because of the general oppression in the Roman Empire at the time.622

During Herod’s reign:

Jews were forced to redefine their political allegiances, cultural proclivities, and religious loyalties in the light this new and complex reality, and they responded in a variety of ways. At the end of one spectrum were Herod and his circles…for whom Rome was the guarantor of a stabilized kingdom…At the other extreme were groups and individuals that refused to make peace with Roman and Herodian rule and, whether by violent measures, messianic expectation, apocalyptic visions, or withdrawal, adopted a variety of tactics to express their resistance. The turmoil and disruption described in many first-century sources – Josephus, the New Testament, and early rabbinic traditions – indicate a sense of instability and the search for a meaningful identity that affected certain segments of Judean society.623

In line with Morton Smith, Terry Donaldson and Richard Horsley,624 I do not wish to place RP within a formal group of zealots. However, taking seriously his self-description as a zealot excelling in Ioudaismō, in light of Maccabean history, rescues his biography from the realm of disembodied theology and places his Israelite status both within the history of colonization of Israelites by Persian, Roman and Hasmonean rulers and within the zeal for

_____________________

622 Eisenmann, 2-3.


Torah and Temple that created the possibility for involvement in a Maccabean-type movement, or continued commitment to zealous attitudes and practises concerning circumcision and food laws amongst a diversity of Israelite approaches.

**Israelite Slaves in a History of Zeal**

Not only does Paul identify himself as a former zealot (zēlōtēs, Gal. 1:13) in Maccabean style, but he also identifies himself as a slave (christou doulos) in Gal. 1:10 – and a slave who carries the ‘*stigmata of Iēsou*’ in his body (Gal. 6:17). Greeks and Romans forced Jewish war captives into slavery. Antiochus III and Antiochus IV, for instance, enslaved Israelites from Jerusalem, and Pompey (63 BCE) and Cassius (52-51 BCE) also subjected captured Jews to slavery. In addition, Hezser has noted that Jews “were not only the victims of capture in war and enslavement but also took war captives themselves during the conquests of the Hasmonean kings and in the Herodian wars.”

Josephus informs us that “John Hyrcanus and his sons captured various cities and towns in Syria, Idumaea, and Samaria (cf. *Bellum Judaicum* 1.2. 6-7, 63-5)” and prisoners of war from Arabia were also enslaved “during the Herodian wars of the second half of the first century BCE…”

Although earlier studies of ancient slavery rarely mentioned Israelite slavery or implied its

---

625 Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity*, 228.

626 Hezser, 227.

627 Hezser, 227.
non-existence, Catherine Hezser has persuasively challenged this notion in her book *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity*, and has studied the relationship between ethnicity and slavery.\(^{628}\)

**Slavery and Ethnicity**

In order to understand how slave and zealous Israelite could co-exist within Remembered Paul’s life, her work on slavery is very informative because she explores the link between slavery and ethnicity. One chapter of her book is devoted to examining the denationalization of slaves, and her opening paragraphs read as follows:

One of the characteristic traits of a slave was his denationalization. Slaves had to be removed from their family, culture, and country of origin ‘to be introduced and reproduced as aliens in the slave-owning society’. Once he was (re)introduced as an alien, the slave’s links to his ancestors and origins were disregarded, and he was not allowed to marry and establish new kinship ties during the period of his enslavement. Orlando Patterson has succinctly described this situation: ‘Not only was the slave denied all claims on, and obligations to, his parents and living blood relations but, by extension, all such claims and obligations on his more remote ancestors and on his descendants. He was truly a genealogical isolate. Formally isolated in his social relations with those who lived, he also was culturally isolated from the social heritage of his ancestors.’\(^{629}\)

\(^{628}\) Catherine Hezser, 7: Dale B. Martin: “Jewishness itself had little if any relevance for the structures of slavery amongst Jews. Jews both had slaves and freedpersons and were slaves and freedpersons. Slavery among Jews of the Greco-Roman period did not differ from the slave structures of those people among whom Jews lived. The relevant factors for slave structures and the existence of slavery itself were geographical and socioeconomicand had little if anything to do with ethnicity or religion” Dale B. Martin, ‘Slavery and the Ancient Jewish Family’, in Shaye J. D. Cohen ed., *The Jewish Family in Antiquity*, Brown Judaic Studies 289 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 113.

\(^{629}\) Hezser, 27.
The Israelite slave was also stripped of religious-cultural community, religious-cultural identity, and religious-cultural status. Heszer notes that:

\[\text{In rabbinic sources, slaves were seen as devoid of relatives and ancestry. Without parents and ancestors their claim to Jewishness could hardly be maintained. While Romans considered slavery incompatible with Roman citizenship, rabbis considered it incompatible with Jewishness: to be the slave of a human master was a reversal of the Exodus experience and a transgression of Jewish monotheistic beliefs.}^{630}\]

She goes on to say that whether Israelite or Gentile, the Mishnah draws the picture that “…slavery [also] cancels out the bondman’s –and therefore the freedman’s previous identity…No clue remains to indicate even his ancestral background, not even to reveal whether he was originally an Israelite or a foreigner.”^{631} What mattered was only the will of the slave’s Master:

\[\text{If their masters were committed Jews, they will have required their gentile slaves to accommodate to their Jewish lifestyle.}^{632}\]

She goes on to say that “[t]he extent to which [a slave] was able to maintain a Jewish identity was not determined by the slave himself but by his master”^{633}

According to these texts, Jewish masters who bought Gentile slaves or exposed infants were required to follow the biblical precepts so that every male would be “circumcised at

\[\text{Hezser, 228.}\]
\[\text{Hezser, 8.}\]
\[\text{Hezser, 53.}\]
\[\text{Hezser, 54.}\]
the age of eight days” (Gen. 17:12-13). The Tosefta also stated: “Unless [slaves] are both circumcised and immersed, male slaves, whether purchased from a slave dealer or born in the Jewish master’s household, are considered gentiles.” Paul Virgil McCracken Flesher, however, has argued that circumcision still did not make these slaves full Israelites. Circumcision is part of a Maccabean history of zeal (making it an ethnic/religious) marker, but that marker also bears an unsettled relationship to ethnicity for slaves.

Hezser also notes that “the children of foreign slave women and Israelite men were considered proper sons and heirs within the Israelite father’s household during the biblical period. In fact, the former Gentile “Abraham is presented as a model with regard to circumcising one’s slaves.” However, “since slave status totally obliterates the slave’s prior identity”, if a slave was originally an Israelite, being enslaved ensured that she or he is no better than a Gentile since being enslaved blots out markers of ethnicity, religion and culture. Claude Meillassoux argues that slaves were removed from their families, culture and country of origin in order “to be introduced and reproduced as aliens in the

634 Hezser, 36.
636 Hezser, 36 note 38.
637 McCraken Flesher, Oxen, 40
slave-owning society.” Slaves were considered socially dead, in the words of Orlando Patterson: alienated “from all ‘rights’ or claims of birth, he ceased to belong in his own right to any legitimate social order.” However, while “the slave is socially a nonperson and exists in a marginal state of social death...he is not an outcaste” and “remained nevertheless an element of society.”

Slaves continued in this ambiguous state even if [when] they were manumitted:

[S]laves did not form a coherent social class or status group: their roles, function, and statuses within society were very varied. Individual slaves would often work side-by-side with free persons, and they could become wealthy after manumission. Their skills and expertise could procure them an elevated status within their master’s household...Once they were manumitted, male slaves could become Roman citizens and/or members of the Jewish community. Since their former enslavement would leave a lasting mark, however, freedmen would nevertheless occupy an intermediate position between slaves and freeborn people, a situation which was loaded with ambiguities.


640 Orlando Patterson, 48.

641 Hezser, 26.
Stigmatized Slaves

*Stigmata* created a permanent and bodily mark of punishment and domination. Slaves of Greeks and Romans who were re-captured after trying to escape, who were accused of disobedience, or simply found wanting in some way could be branded with a red-hot iron. Suetonius (Calig. Xxvii), Pliny (Historia Naturalis (Pliny xviii 3) and Varro (de Rustica, 1.18) describe the process of tattooing a slave, as well as informing us that tattooed slaves were labelled *stigmata* and regarded as socially degraded. Tattooing was also used as a tool of colonization. Ptolemy Philopator, according to 3 Maccabees 2:25-30, “proposed to inflict public disgrace on the Jewish community” (2:27). For this reason, he subjected all Jews to a registration, and “those who [were] registered [were] are all branded on their bodies by fire with the ivy leaf symbol of Dionysus” (2:29). Similarly, the Greek historian Herodotus wrote that the Persian King Xerxes tattooed his slaves and Greek prisoners of war. According to Ps. Solomon 2:6, during the rule of Pompey, Jewish prisoners were also tattooed. And still, after the time of RP, Constantine in 324 declared that criminals


643 Gay and Whittington, 1788.

should be tattooed only on their hands or calves, and not on their face, because they were made in the Divine image.  

In his study of ancient policing in the Roman Empire, Christopher J. Fuhrman notes that “masters, who bore the basic onus of recovering their runaways employed harsh methods to deter the escape of slaves”, and “measures includ[ed] heavy chaining, permanent disfigurements from identifying brands, intentional scars, and most commonly tattooed letters… which our sources call *stigmata.*” Thus, there were multiple paths to bearing *stigmata* on one’s body, though all are “a dynamic process of total domination, an absolute kind of mastery that denies the slave access to autonomous relations outside the master’s sphere… reducing the slave to an alienated outsider, socially ‘dead’ to the free population”.  

One of the possible paths to *stigmata* involved runaway slaves and temples. Herodotus recounts the story of the temple of the Egyptian god Heracles which abided by the following command: “If a slave, whoever his master be, flees here and applies the sacred *stigmata*, giving himself to the god… it is forbidden to lay hold of him (Hdt II, 113, 2).” Jones also

---

645 Gay and Whittington, 1788.  
648 Jones, 144.
identifies a papyrus dated to the middle of the second century that gives the description “of a runaway slave from Bambyke (Hierapolis), where the ‘Syrian goddess’ Atargatis had her great sanctuary,” who was tattooed (estigmenos) on the wrist.” He defines both of these as a form of religious tattooing, failing to note that, in each case, the tattooed slaves were runaways. Jones also named the tattooed bodies of Thracian women found on vases as examples of ‘decorative’ tattooing. He does not note, however, that the philosopher Clearchus provided a different interpretation: the Thracians were defeated by the Scythians, the Thracian women were tattooed with pins by the Scythians, and the Thracian women tattooed the rest of their body in order to transform “the stamp of violence and shame” into bodily ornamentation. Although Jones describes this as ‘ornamental’ tattooing, he also indicates that the tattooed women were usually slaves or coerced by their husbands. He then refers to the fact that Plato, Callimachus and Suetonius all give accounts of the word stigmata being used as invective to hurl at an opponent, and finally concludes that all of these examples of “such metaphorical use of stigma was to have a very profound effect” in “St Paul’s claim to have ‘the marks of Jesus’ (stigmata tou Iēsou) on his body.” The

649 Jones, 144.
650 Jones, 145.
651 Jones, 145.
652 Jones, 145.
653 Jones, 150.
evidence that he provides, however, does not provide a strong basis on which to base his conclusion.

**The Challenge to Scholarship**

While a history of Maccabean zeal provides a social-historical context in which to place Israelite zeal, *Ioudaismos* and circumcision practices attached to political-ethnic-religious struggles, the history of Israelite slavery cautions us to remember that circumcision and “Israelite” status is also experienced differently by slaves than by free persons. Furthermore, statements such as “neither Jew nor Greek” and “slave of Christ,” and *stigmata tou Iēsou* are not made apart from the social-historical realities of Israelite slavery. Meanings carry political-religious-ethnic histories from ‘the past’ into ‘the present’. The interpretive task is to determine not if, but *how* their present use relates to this history.

The biographical ensemble, elaborated and situated within the ‘waves of history’ stands in sharp contrast to the dominant scholar-constructed life of RP. That biographical picture of RP is created, argued Justin J. Meggitt, by the overarching “myth of Paul’s affluent background,” evidenced by statements made by scholars such as: he was “born with a silver spoon in his mouth”\(^{654}\) or his “letters show him to be a man of what we would now call middle-class upbringing.”\(^{655}\) Daniel Boyarin calls Paul a radical Jewish “cultural

\(^{654}\) Meggitt, 80 n. 26.

\(^{655}\) Meggitt, 80 n. 27.
Michael Grant thinks: “Paul was an intellectual of the most imposing caliber, capable of soaring flights that have earned him comparison with Plato”. Theissen claims that being a citizen of Tarsus ensured him noble birth. E.A. Judge places him in “the privileged group of Hellenistic families… [with] an unusually well balanced set of social qualifications.” Stanley Stowers compares Paul to ancient itinerant philosophers who preached in the private homes, thus implying he was amongst a “privileged class of people”. Neil Elliott, after surveying the scholarly literature, assures us that Paul was born into the upper strata of society which requires us to ask the question: “To what extent, and in what ways, did his higher-status origins shape his perceptions and attitudes as an apostle?”

However, I have demonstrated, having followed a well-reasoned methodology, that the extant manuscript evidence does not support this “affluent” and “respectable”

__________________________
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representation of Remembered Paul. Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements are attested in multiple manuscripts, and supported by the witnesses of Contemporary and Historian documents. Except for the Historian account of Acts of the Apostles, the ancient manuscripts present RP as a socially degraded and vulnerable man, and an Israelite

To be fair, there are now a number group of scholars who are challenging this rosy biographical picture. Justin J. Meggitt, for instance in his book, *Paul, Poverty and Survival* declares:

> [t]here are no good grounds for qualifying...[the] estimation of Paul as a man who shared fully in the destitute life of the non-elite in the Roman Empire, an existence dominated by work and the struggle to subsist; someone who….repeatedly experienced toil and hardship, hunger and thirst, exposure, and homelessness.662

The elaboration of the biographical elements (by means of social-historical research); the synthesis of these elements into Remembered Paul the Zealous Israelite (formerly a zealot of *Ioudaismos* loyal to a Maccabean-style emphasis on circumcision) and Remembered Paul the Socially Degraded and Vulnerable man (the punishable, mostly illiterate, physically disdainful messenger and manual labourer, stigmatized slave of Christ), the placement of RP amongst the apostles and co-workers (marginal and but served by other co-workers), and the construction of the history of Maccabean zeal and Israelite slavery has nuanced and particularized the biographical ensemble, and identified both possibilities

662 Meggitt, 80.
and limitations in the biographically-particularized social-historical contexts of first century ethnic/religious Judaism.

Now that the biographical ensemble has been reconstructed, it is now possible to examine *RP: The Work*, in line with Sartrean thinking, as the *objectification of the project* – the movement of Remembered Paul through action, from the scarcity of his ‘present’ social situation (represented by the biographical ensemble) towards his envisioned future. That is, *the work* is not comprehensible apart from *the life*. Just as I have examined *the work* to discover clues (biographical evidence) about *the life*, now I will use *the life* to interpret *the work*, and by doing so, will further understand *the life*. To apply the Sartrean method fully would mean applying it to the entire collection of agreed-upon letters. However, to ensure the manageability of this project, I will apply the method only to RP’s communication with the Galatians, as one instance, one moment of the larger movement of *the project* as objectified in *RP: The Work*. There is no reason other than personal preference that I have chosen Galatians rather than Hebrews or Ephesians, but given that it is considered by many scholars as one of the most important letters, if the method is not applicable to Galatians, it would fail to be persuasive.
CHAPTER SIX

A Biographical Reading of Remembered Paul’s Letter to the Galatians

Any review of the methodologies employed to interpret a single verse, pericope, or the entire letter of Paul to the Galatians will reveal that a detailed biographical description of the life of the Remembered Paul -- in whose name this letter is written -- is never the privileged key to interpretation. Rhetorical critics assume, for instance, that the primary purpose of the letter is argumentation, and accordingly seek to interpret the Pauline narrative by invoking or referring to ancient rhetorical practice. They determine that Paul uses antithesis,\(^{663}\) astonishment-rebuke formulas,\(^{664}\) and ironic rebukes\(^{665}\) or Aristotelian rhetoric to “establish [his] ethos and thus to support his claim of the truth of his gospel.”\(^ {666}\)

Other scholars downplay the use of rhetoric, and rely instead on epistolary analysis - identifying the various literary devices that provide the key to meaning. The literary Paul becomes the skilled letter writer, his authorial intentions known through his skillful use of


linguistic devices, such as allegory, in a fashion seen to be strikingly similar to “rabbinic practises in first century Judaism.”

Pauline theologians rely on identifying a theme or central text in Galatians to interpret Paul’s theology. J. Louis Martyn, for instance, argues that the key to the letter “contains nearly all the letter’s major motifs, and it relates them to one another in such a way as to state what we may call the good news of Paul.” Whether that ‘key’ is identified by means of an examination of the text or arises from the particular investments of the scholar, the social-historical realities of the ancient life of Paul are made peripheral to an interpretation of the texts.

More recently, some scholars have been turning to newer perspectives—postcolonialism, postmodernism, and feminist or queer theory—in their efforts to comprehend the Pauline Corpus. Brigitte Kahl, for instance, interprets Galatians by means of a “critical re-imagination,” using a detailed description of the Roman subjugation of Galatia as her hermeneutical lens. Against this imperial backdrop, Paul becomes the radical who is resists Empire - calling the Galatians to reject the Roman strategy of power over others and
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“justification by works” behind.\textsuperscript{669} Again, a thorough examination of the material realities of his ancient life are absent.

A few scholars do place autobiography at the centre of their interpretation. George Lyons, to correct earlier inattention to autobiography in Paul, compared autobiographical statements from Galatians and 1 Thessalonians to examples of Hellenistic autobiography and concluded that Paul \textit{used} autobiographical material “to establish his ethos, his customary moral character and conduct.”\textsuperscript{671} Brian Dodd demonstrated that, by means of autobiography, Paul “weaves together multiple arguments, including his own self-portrayal, to convince the Galatians to reject this ‘other gospel’.”\textsuperscript{672} Beverly Gaventa examined “the place of autobiographical remarks in Greco-Roman letters” in order “to place Paul's self-reference in its context,”\textsuperscript{673} and she concludes that Paul employs autobiographical material to present himself as a paradigmatic example:

The autobiographical remarks of Galatians 1 and 2 implicitly form the basis for Paul's later exhortation. Paul employs events out of his past, events that

\textsuperscript{669} Brigitte Kahl, \textit{Galatians Re-Imagined: Reading with the Eyes of the Vanquished} (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2010).


\textsuperscript{672} Brian Dodd, “Paul's Paradigmatic ‘I’: Personal Example as Literary Strategy” \textit{JSNTsup} 177 (1999): 136.

have to do with the exclusive nature of the gospel’s claim on his own life, to urge that same exclusive claim on Christians in Galatia. Simply, Paul presents himself as an example of the working of the gospel.674

The problem with all of these interpretations is that Remembered Paul’s material life is left to one side. The interpretation of RP’s use of rhetoric places ancient handbooks of rhetoric as an overlay over the text, literary readings do the same with ancient letter-writing styles, and theological readings use theological themes for the same purpose. None of these provide an interpretation in which meaning is seen to arise from the material life or the project of Remembered Paul. Similarly, RP is described as simply using his autobiographical statements to deliver persuasive theological arguments, to establish his authority, and to use himself as a laudable example. In these interpretations, there is no ancient man with needs and purposes that arise from the scarcity that his social situation creates. The life of Remembered Paul is disconnected from the work.

In contrast to these methods, a biographical interpretation locates the interpretive key, not ‘in the text’ (in a theme or key verse), or ‘over the text’ (e.g. using a grid such as honor-shame for explanation) but in the project that is ‘behind the text’ in the dialectical movement of the life of Remembered Paul from scarcity to envisioned future which is objectified in RP: The Work. The biographical ensemble that has been constructed in Chapter Four is used to represent the life of RP, and each letter within RP: The Work is

674 Gaventa, 313.
taken as one particular objectification of his project that spans the entire corpus of agreed-upon letters, which represents the ‘remains’ of the larger movement of his life of apostleship. Therefore, there is no meaning to the text apart from the project as conditioned and made possible by the life of Remembered Paul.

There are limitations to using this method to construct Pauline biography. Only a segment of Remembered Paul’s life is objectified in RP: The Work. There is, for example, no ‘childhood drama’ that we can draw upon (as Sartre did for Flaubert). We have no access to details about his birth, his childhood, the social-material realities of the ‘family’ or ‘home’ in which he spent the early years of his life. We do not even know the details of the earlier part of his adult life. Our historical evidence is limited to an incomplete set of letters in which RP communicates with various addressees as an apostolos of Christ, who administers “the collection” and imagines its imminent completion (Romans 15). The ‘before’ (e.g. persecuting the assembly, Gal. 1:13, pleasing men Gal. 1:10, advanced in a Maccabean-style commitment to Torah, Gal. 1:13-14) and ‘present’ of his life (‘slave of Christ’ and no longer pleasing men Gal. 1:10, Christ in-filled apostle to the Gentiles, Gal. 1:16) is described in very little detail. We also do not even know if RP: The Work represents all or only a slice of the movement of his life as an apostle. The life of the ancient Paul surely exceeded the remains which we can access.

It should also be stated at the beginning of this chapter that I have only addressed some of the important exegetical issues and have not adequately represented the ‘state of the scholarship’ on any of these. There are two reasons for this choice. First, I have chosen to
focus primarily on the construction of a methodology rather than its full application. Secondly, to adequately engage with all the exegetical arguments pertaining to this interpretation of Galatians deserves more sustained attention than is manageable in this dissertation.

**Biographical Interpretation Steps**

In light of these two limitations, the following paragraphs outline the methodology of a biographical interpretation consistent with the methodological framework of this dissertation. There are five steps in this method:

1. Identify the overarching themes that span the entire corpus of *RP: The Work* (the agreed-upon letters). These themes will provide clues as to the overall movement of the project.

2. Identify the issues and themes that appear in RP’s letter to the Galatians which are particular to Galatians. These themes will provide clues about the particularity of that instance of the project in relationship to the larger movement of his apostleship.

3. Identify the particular biographical facts identified in Galatians, and link these with the themes of the letter (e.g. *Ioudaismos*).

4. Re-interpret the letter as a particular instance of RP’s human project.

The following paragraphs provide a description of the method used for each step, and the preliminary results of the application:
Overarching Themes of RP: The Work

A biographical interpretation requires a primary focus on biographically-situated facts (e.g. ethnicity, age, education, labour, and group memberships) that arise from an examination of biographical evidence. Although theological themes could also be included, they should always be biographically-situated. For instance, a study of slavery must take account of the realities of slavery in the first century and determine how the discussion of slavery fits with RP’s own project. It is not appropriate to examine salvation, justification, righteousness or Paul’s apocalyptic thinking without understanding such meaning-statements as objectifications of the life.

Given that RP: The Work is the objectification of Paul’s human project for a period of his adult life, it makes sense that there would be both overarching themes, and themes specific to different contexts. The overarching themes that I have identified include: RP’s description of his envisioned future and his apostleship, including ‘the collection’ of material resources for those who are poor in Jerusalem, statements about material support, and statements about competition between apostles/messengers. These are identified as the themes which are core to understanding the project objectified in RP: The Work.
**Envisioned Future**

According to Sartre, “at the very heart of the particular action, [stands] the presence of the future as that which is lacking and that which, by its very absence reveals reality.” Remembered Paul “by transcending the given” and “by realizing one possibility from among all the others” moves away from scarcity towards his envisioned future. RP’s vision is theological, and in Sartrean terms, it is particularly theological as the objectification of RP’s project. His envisioned future reveals that from which he desires to escape, and that desire is understood as providing the means by which he will go beyond the present limitations of his social situation. Therefore, one cannot understand his theology unless one also examines its relationship to the life.

**Maccabean-style Ruler**

Remembered Paul describes his vision in traditional military form – with the battle cry of command the Lord will “descend from heaven, and the dead in Christ will rise first” (1 Thess. 4:16). Christ the Maccabean-style conqueror “hands over the kingdom to God the Father, after he has destroyed every ruler and every authority and power” (1 Cor. 15:24) and “has put all his enemies under his feet” (1 Cor. 15:25). He gave the same message to the Ephesians: God has “seated [Christ] at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rulers and authority and power and dominion…[a]nd he has put all things under his feet.

---
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and has made him the head over all things for the assembly” (Eph. 1:20-22). In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the enemies are the *upodion* (footstool) upon which the son will put his feet (Hebrews 1:13), and Jesus the high priest is seated “at the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens” (Hebrews 8:2) crowned with glory and honor (Heb. 2:9). The Messiah is in heaven, and has the power to subject everything to himself (Phil. 3:20-21). In 2 Thessalonians, the Lord Jesus is revealed with “his mighty angels in flaming fire” who will inflict vengeance of those who don’t accept the message (2 Thess. 1:8). On that day, God will reveal his judgement with wrath and fury, and repay each according to their deeds (Rom. 2:5-11). The trumpet will sound, and the dead will rise (1 Cor. 15:52). Remembered Paul imagines his lord as the mighty ruler with power to overthrow death, evil, powerful leaders, and all kinds of authorities. He imagines a future free from violence and suffering for those who can boast of being ‘in Christ.’

This vision makes sense of his socially degraded and vulnerable life which has been subjected to those who have had the power to flog, beat and imprison him. It also makes sense of the zeal of RP the Maccabean-style former persecutor that is part of the former life now considered refuse. His Maccabean ruler is a crucified Messiah who died a humiliated death, but will conquer the injustice of death and *astheneia* when he returns.

**Salvation, Suffering and Work**

This salvation is for those who are “in Christ.” Christ will forgive his follower’s trespasses, even as he disarms rulers and authorities and publicly shames them (Col. 2:15). Christ’s followers will be rescued from the “body of death” (Rom. 7:24), and saved from the wrath
that is to come (Rom. 5:9, 1 Thess. 1:10, 2 Thess. 1:7). He is the mediator of a new covenant (Heb. 9:15), and followers will be redeemed and forgiven (Col. 1:13), brought into his presence (2 Cor. 4:14), and freed from lives of slavery to death (Heb. 3:15). He will also reconcile “the uncircumcision” with “the circumcision” through his peace (Eph. 2:14).

However, this salvation has a price. Remembered Paul believes that it is his present suffering that will enable him to attain resurrection (Phil. 3:11). As Jesus was “crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death (Heb. 2:9), RP shares his suffering, thus becoming like him, perhaps even to death (Phil. 3:10). God rewards the work of those who have shared their material resources with “the saints” (Heb. 6:10). Similarly RP is the ‘father’ of some (including the Thessalonians) who are his “hope or joy or crown of boasting” when the Lord Jesus comes (1 Thess. 1:19). Therefore, although the future envisioned provides eternal life, liberation, and freedom from suffering, faithfulness in the work of apostleship (including “the collection”) and the suffering entailed, is linked to obtaining resurrection of the body.

Such a vision makes sense of the suffering inherent in his life and the meanings he attributes to it, and to his apostleship. Remembered Paul tells the Philippians that he wants “to know Christ and the power of his resurrection and the sharing of his sufferings.” If he must become like him in his death, it would all be worthwhile, “if somehow I may attain the resurrection of the dead.” (Phil. 3:10-11).
Liberated Body

RP’s envisioned future also makes sense of his tattooed servile body. The Remembered Paul laments his bodily hardships (1 Cor. 4:9-13; 2 Corinthians 4:8-9; 6:4-10; 11:23-28; 12:10). He has lived the life of a socially degraded man, flogged, imprisoned, and often hungry and without shelter. In his world, slaves were disposable, considered wretched and unclean, and physical illness and a disdainful physical presence was a source of humiliation. His future vision is that God will raise up his body (1 Cor. 6:14). Faith in anything in the present, he argues, is pitiable (1 Cor. 15:20) because earthly bodies are: “sown in dishonor” (1 Cor. 15:43) and “in weakness” (1 Cor. 15:43), in “a physical body” (1 Cor. 15:43). But his socially degraded and wounded earthly body is not his final end. He envisions: “There are both heavenly bodies and earthly bodies…the glory of the heavenly is one thing, and that of the earthly is another” (1 Cor. 15:40). The heavenly body will be made “imperishable” (1 Cor. 15:42, Rom. 6:9), “raised in glory” (1 Cor. 15:43), and “raised in power” (1 Cor. 15:43). The present social humiliation and dishonor of the physical body will be removed upon resurrection. These bodies will “bear the image of the man of heaven” (1 Cor. 15:49). All will be changed (1 Cor. 15:50), and bodily death will be swallowed up in victory (1 Cor. 15:54). The earthly tent is one of groaning under the physical burden (2 Cor. 5:4), but Christ will transform his body of humiliation into a body of glory (Phil. 4:21). This envisioned future makes sense of his present social situation. Not only does resurrection bring a share in power and glory and eternal life, it also brings release from
bodily humiliation and pain. He will enter a place of rest that provides a continual Sabbath from labour (Heb. 4:10).

**Apostleship**

The work of an *apostolos* was multi-faceted. According to the ancient manuscript witnesses, RP received the *charis* of “apostleship” to: bring about the “obedience of faith amongst all the Gentiles” (Rom. 1:5); and to proclaim the good news (1 Cor. 1:17; 2 Cor. 2:12; Col. 1:25; 1 Thess. 1:5). That is, he was a messenger who proclaimed the ‘gospel of Christ.’ Philological and social-historical studies reveal that the word *apostolos* was sparsely used in ancient Greek, but when it was used, it was best translated “messenger”. The Hebrew verb *slh* is translated as *apostellein* about 700 times in the Septuagint, and its “usage is secular in origin… [though also] employed in connection with significant religious phenomena.”

Epaphroditus, for instance, was also an *apostolos* (translated ‘messenger’ in the NRSV) for the Philippian church (Phil. 2:25). There were also other *apostoloi* who were messengers for the assemblies (2 Cor. 8:23), and associated with administering the collection for the saints (2 Cor. 8).

Remembered Paul met and/or simply communicated with various addressees in Corinth (1 Cor. 1:1), Galatia (Gal. 1:1), Thessalonica (1 Thess. 2:7; 2 Thess. 1:1), Colossae (Col. 1:1), Ephesus (Eph. 1:1), Philippi and Rome (1:1), and in the undefined geographical location of

---
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“The Hebrews” (Hebrews 1:1). He was not the first messenger of Christ (Gal. 1:17; Rom. 16:7), but one of many (e.g. 2 Cor. 8:23; Phil. 2:25, Rom. 16:7, 1 Cor. 4:9; 1 Cor. 12:28-29; 2 Cor. 11:3; 2 Cor. 12:11-12; Eph. 2:20; Eph. 3:5; Eph. 4:11, Rom. 16:7; 1 Thess. 2:7). Finally, Jesus was also named the messenger (apostle) and high priest (Heb. 3:1) of their omologias (agreement, concession, or admission).

Remembered Paul claims to bring the ‘good news of God’ (e.g. to the Thessalonians, Romans and Corinthians (1 Thess. 2:8; Rom. 1:15-16; 2 Cor. 11:7), also the message which brings salvation for both Ioudaios and Greeks (Rom. 1:16), and the good news of Christ (Rom. 15:19; 2 Cor. 2:12; Gal. 1:7; Phil. 1:27; Col. 1:3-6; 1 Thess. 3:2). Remembered Paul also refers to euaggelion mou (my gospel). It is according to his gospel, he tells the Romans, that the Gentiles will be judged, and they will be strengthened (Rom. 2:16, Rom. 16:25). Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon statements in RP’s communication with the Corinthians and Thessalonians also attest to RP’s use of ‘my gospel’ (2 Cor. 4:3, 1Thess. 1:5, 2 Thess. 2:14). In RP’s letter to the Galatians, he declares that, though there may be different gospels, only his is valid (Gal. 1:6-9). Contemporaries also attest to RP’s use of ‘my gospel’ in 2 Timothy 2:8. The message proclaimed by RP, ‘the gospel’, has more than one messenger, and there is more than one message.

Although I have noted that the work of a messenger was a degraded form of work with unpredictable sources of food and shelter and susceptibility to imprisonment and capital
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punishment, the word *euangelion* presents a different picture. Millar Burrows has informed us that *euangelion* “is rarely found in the sense of ‘good tidings’ outside of early Christian literature”. There are very few instances of *euanggelos* and the verb *euaggelizesthai*, but the neuter singular noun “in classical Greek means a messenger’s reward”. The plural of the noun found in a first century BCE inscription, in praise of Caesar Augustus’ birthday, means “good news”: “The birthday of our God signaled the beginning of good news (*euangelia*)”. Similarly, Philo of Alexandria of the first century C.E. reports that the “Jews of Alexandria were the first “to announce the good news” (*euaggelizesthai*) that Gaius Caligula had become emperor.

The Septuagint rarely uses the neuter or feminine noun, but the verb is used more often. In 1-2 Samuel and 1 Kings, it refers to military successes or defeats. The ‘good news’ of Psalms, Joel, Nahum and Deutero-Isaiah is “God’s saving deeds on behalf of Israel.” Therefore, Remembered Paul declares himself a messenger with a ‘royal’ message in line with his envisioned future Maccabean-style King.

Apostleship is also connected to Remembered Paul’s envisioned future as it allows Paul, Silvanus and Timothy to present the Thessalonians as their “hope, joy or crown of boasting


before [the] Lord Jesus at his coming” (1 Thess. 2:19). RP also tells the Philippians that “it is by your holding fast to the word of life that I can boast on the day of Christ that I did not run in vain or labor in vain. (Phil. 2:16). He tells the same to the Corinthians – on the day of the Lord: “you are our boast” (2 Cor. 1:14). Apostleship is connected intimately to the life of RP because it is the means by which he will be able to present himself worthy at the return of the Lord.

**Statements Concerning ‘The Collection’**

One of the aspects of apostleship is ‘the collection’ of material resources. Remembered Paul as well as other apostles and assemblies were involved in ἔ διακονία τῆς λειτουργίας (2 Cor. 9:12) which consisted of collecting material resources to be shared with “the saints” in Jerusalem (Rom. 15; 1 Cor. 8-9; Heb. 6:10). RP applauded those assemblies who served and continued to serve the saints (διακονέσαντες τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ διακονούντες, Heb. 6:10). He noted that the assemblies of Macedonia, though they were poor, made a generous contribution (2 Cor. 8:1-3). Achaia was also a participant (2 Cor. 9:2). RP also hopes that Titus will receive a generous gift from the Corinthians (2 Cor. 8-9) given their greater wealth (2 Cor. 8:14). Though there is no direct mention instructions in his communication with the Galatians, he tells the Corinthians that the directions he gives to them, he already gave to the churches of Galatia (1 Cor. 16:1). Finally, RP tells the Romans that he is on his way to Jerusalem to take the contribution from Macedonia and Achaia (1 Thess. 1:7) to the poor amongst the saints in Jerusalem (Rom. 15:25-29). He was also concerned about a
threat from the ones who are disobeying in Judea (Rom. 16:31), and hopes that his service that he brings to Jerusalem will be acceptable (Rom. 16:31).

Remembered Paul is one member of a group of other collectors. In his first letter to the Corinthians, he informs them that he will send people they have approved, along with letters, to take their gift to Jerusalem, or they could accompany him if he is the one to go (1 Cor. 16:3-5). Titus and Paul are named the administrators of the collection in the second letter to the Corinthians, and they are joined by “the brother” who was appointed by the churches to travel with them (2 Cor. 8:19), and another brother they have chosen (2 Cor. 8:22). The household of Stephanus is also involved in the work of the collection (1 Cor. 16:5). While in prison, RP instructs the Colossians to instruct Archippus to put his attention on tēn diakonian, term has used for the collection (Col. 4:17), and names equipping the saints for the ergon diakonias (Eph. 4:12), possibly an indirect reference to the same work.

Remembered Paul describes the work of the collection in theological language. It is linked to obedience to the euaggelion tou Christou which RP delivers (2 Cor. 9:13). He tells the addressees in Rome that the Gentiles, though they were eager to share with the saints in Jerusalem, are also obliged because “they have come to share in their spiritual blessings.” (Rom. 15:27). The contribution made by the Hebrews is linked to their salvation, and proof of tēs agapes they shared (Heb. 6:10). In Romans 15 Remembered Paul declares that the charis given to him by God was so that he could be a leitourgon (performing sacred temple service) to the Gentiles, administering in sacred service (ierourgounta Rom. 15:16) the “good news” of God, so that the Gentiles will become obedient, and their offering will be
acceptable (Rom. 15:16). This is his reason for boasting in his work (Rom 15:17). This characterization of his work demonstrates a very close link between the work of ‘the collection’ and the work of apostleship.

**Statements about Material Support**

Although the predominant belief concerning Remembered Paul’s labour is that he did not need to work, but chose to work, the agreed-upon letters attest to concerns about material support as an issue of apostleship that spans the entire *RP: The Work*. All these sources attested to the fact that the Corinthians were his ‘work’ and the seal of his status as a messenger. RP and Apollos, according to RP, were both “servants through whom [the Corinthians] came to believe as the Lord assigned to each” (1 Cor. 3:5). They were each assigned different roles in the work, and Paul believed that “each [would] receive *mishhon* [wages]” for the work they performed (1 Cor. 3:8). Similarly, he and Barnabas, he argued, were entitled to material support from the Corinthians (1 Cor. 9), just like the other apostles, the brothers of Jesus and Cephas received. This support would allow RP and Barnabas to reduce their manual labour (1 Cor. 9:6). He argued that this is the case for soldiers in military service, for planters of vineyards, for shepherds of a flock, temple employees, and altar servers (1 Cor. 9). Like these workers, Paul asserts that, if the Corinthians are indeed ‘their labour’, they deserved a share of their material benefits (1 Cor. 9:11, 2 Cor. 3:2).681

681Hock has failed to make the link between Paul’s labour as an apostle and his argument about material support. As a result, he has mistakenly argued that Paul voluntarily gave up a more
He states that “the Lord commanded that those who proclaim the gospel should get their living by the gospel.” (1 Cor. 9:17; 1 Thess. 2:7). He tells the Hebrews to share what they have (Heb. 13:16), notes that they shared with those who were in prison (Heb. 10:34) and reminds the Galatians to share good things with their teacher (Gal. 6:6). When in prison, he makes sure to note that Tychius takes care of his needs (Eph. 6:21; Colossians 4:7), and that Epaphroditus brought the Philippians’ gift to him (Phil 4:18). Phoebe, a minister from the assembly in Cenchrea, has also provided material support to RP and others (Rom. 16:1).

The issue of material support was sometimes a contentious issue for RP. In the second letter to the Corinthians, RP states that he delivered the good news of God free of charge, but his needs were also taken care of by friends from Macedonia (2 Cor. 11:9). He thanks the Philippians profusely for the material support they sent (Phil 4:10-19), while he was in Thessalonica (Phil. 4:16), after he left Macedonia when no other assemblies were assisting him (Phil. 4:15), and then while he was in prison (Phil 4:18). He tells the Thessalonians that he was working with his hands, so as not to burden them (1 Thess. 2:9), but not because they did not have the right to support (2 Thess. 3:8-9). His apostleship is his labour, a labour he prefers over the manual labour he is sometimes forced to do, only in the absence of material support. Remembered Paul counted on the material support he received from various assemblies, and believed he had the right to such support.

_____________________

aristocratic status to become an apostle and gave up material support so he could boast for it. It is just as easy to argue that Paul was declaring that they had refused it to boast to take a bad situation and make it honorable. Given Paul’s dishonorable status, even in the Corinthian correspondence, the latter is more arguable.
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Statements Concerning Competition between apostles

It is not surprising, then, that RP’s third biographical theme is his concern that each messenger should deliver the message only in their own territory. He declares that he only delivers the message of Christ where it has not already been named, so he does “not build on someone else’s foundation.” (Rom. 15:20-22). This is the same language he uses with the addressees in Corinth – that he “like a skilled master builder laid the foundation” (1 Cor. 3:10). Other people may build upon it, but they will only receive a reward if they do not destroy it (1 Cor. 3:10-17). Unlike other messengers, he and his co-workers keep “within the field that God has assigned.” (2 Cor. 10:13). They will not boast “of work already done in someone else’s sphere of action.” (2 Cor. 10:16), though they hope that their “sphere of action” can be enlarged because of their work with the Corinthians (2 Cor. 10:15). When there are no more regions for RP to take his message (Rom. 15:23), he informs the addressees in Rome that will take the material contributions from Macedonia and Achaia to Jerusalem (Rom. 15:26) and then come to Spain.

RP is also concerned when someone proclaims another ‘gospel’ (another Jesus), and he informs the Corinthians that he will not burden them with his material needs, so that he can “deny an opportunity to those who want to be recognized as our equals in what they boast about” (2 Cor. 11:9-13). The other messengers are “false apostles, disguising themselves as apostles of Christ” (2 Cor. 11:13). They “proclaim another Jesus” (2 Cor. 11:4), and this is a threat to RP who desired to present the Corinthians as a “chaste virgin to Christ”, the wife of “one husband” (2 Cor. 11:2). The mere fact that the Corinthians are persuaded by
this different message is evidence to RP that they consider these “super-apostles” superior messengers (2 Cor. 11:5-6). The Thessalonians, he fears, are being duped by others, and reminds them they had received the message from him, and should follow his instructions (2 Thess. 2:2, 14-15). In his first communication with the Thessalonians, he speaks of himself as their ‘father’ (1 Thess. 2:11) and he is fearful that ‘the tempter’ may have caused his labour amongst them to be in vain (1 Thess. 3:5), but he is reassured when Timothy reassures him that they still speak kindly of him (1 Thess. 3:6). His communication suggests that he is anxious that they remain ‘in his fold.’

The Galatians are also persuaded by a different message (Gal. 1:6-7) which again requires RP to challenge their ‘turning away.’ Others create dissension and obstacles against the teaching the addressees in Rome have learned, and RP portrays them as smooth-talking deceivers (Rom. 16:17-18). The Philippians must watch out for the “evil workers” who put confidence in circumcised flesh (Phil. 3:2-6). Given that this work provides RP with food and shelter, it is not surprising that he shows concern about the division of work territory. Because RP is not present in Colossae, and Epaphras is the sundoulou (“fellow slave”) who brought the message and is also their faithful diakonos (Col. 1:7-8), it is possible that he is confident that, even in his absence (Col. 2:1, 5) ‘his’ or ‘their’ work is being done. Similarly, while in prison, RP has heard of the faith of the Ephesians (Eph. 1:15), and he has sent Tychius who is also a pistos diakonos (Eph. 6:21).

In summary, an examination of RP: The Work has revealed that Remembered Paul is one messenger among many who are proclaiming a message and participating in the collection
of material resources. There are many gospels rather than ‘one gospel’ and the work involves competition for ‘territory’ and material support. His work does not provide him secure access to food and shelter, and he claims that he has been imprisoned and punished for proclaiming the message. However, he imagines that each assembly that he claims ‘his own’ gives him a reason for boasting on the day of judgement. In addition, in his present suffering, he carries the death of Jesus in his body, a death that will be transformed into eternal life, power, joy, and liberation. Finally, although he is a messenger, he views his work as a sacred calling, as his priestly service, and his door to connection with those he considers his ‘children’. This overall movement of the project must now be contextualized to the particular communication with the Galatians, as one instance of this overall movement.

Themes Emphasized in Galatians

The themes that span the life of apostleship across RP: The Works take different shapes in different contexts. For instance, Remembered Paul’s focus on questions concerning his rhetorical skill is unique to his communication with the Corinthians. Circumcision is emphasized more in Romans, Galatians and Philippians than in 1 or 2 Thessalonians, and proportionally most in Galatians. Although there are references to slavery in all of the letters, it is emphasized more in Philippians and Galatians, and especially Galatians. In this section, I have identified two themes which are predominant in his communication with the Galatians. A full application of this method would require a more in-depth examination of each of these themes:
Slavery

According to Clarence Reyneveld, the “Christian life is a journey from spiritual slavery to spiritual freedom. ... St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians teaches us how to travel from slavery to freedom.”⁶⁸² P. Bella claims that the slavery imagery used in Galatians is meant to convey theological messages about the nature of belonging to God’s people in the new covenant.⁶⁸³ These interpretations do not connect biography with ‘theology.’ Remembered Paul uses the noun *doulos* (Gal. 1:10; 3:28; 4:1; 4:7), the corresponding verb *doulos* (Gal. 4:3), *douleo* (Gal. 4:8, 4:9, 4:25, 5:13), and *douleia* (Gal. 4:24, 5:1). He also names himself a “slave of Christ” because he no longer pleases men, but God (Gal. 1:10). In Christ, there is no longer *doulos* or *eleutheros*, only ‘oneness’ in Christ (Gal. 3:23). God has redeemed and adopted and ‘made children’ those who were slaves (Gal. 4:1-7). Those who are in Christ are children, not of a slave woman, but the free woman (Gal. 5:31). Christ represents freedom in contrast to the yoke of slavery (Gal. 5:1).

Although it is beyond the scope of this dissertation, this step of the method requires an examination of the theme of slavery to determine how his articulation of slavery fits with identified social practises: adoption in the Jewish-Greco-Roman world, inheritance, slave redemption and manumission in his social world; with his biographical facts (social degradation, slave of Christ), and how this ‘use’ of slavery fits with his *project*.

---


Works of the Law

Philip F. Esler has stated that “Paul’s principal concern with the law in Galatians is to state repeatedly that righteousness is not produced by law (nomos) or by works of law (erga nomou) but by faith in Christ.”$^{684}$ It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to wade into the extensive discussion of ‘law’ and ‘works of law’ for an interpretation of Galatians. However, these ‘theological’ meanings, using a biographical lens, must be embedded in the project of RP’s life that is objectified in his apostleship, and particularized in his communication with the Galatians.

Biographical Facts Particular to Galatians

Remembered Paul portrays himself as a messenger, in his communication with the Galatians, in ways that are consistent with the larger movement of apostleship in RP: The Work. As in other letters, the ministry to the poor in Jerusalem is an important facet of being a messenger of Christ. RP reports that James, Cephas and John agreed that he and Barnabas should go to the Gentiles while the others went to “the circumcised” (Gal. 2:9), and the only direction given was that Barnabas should “remember the poor” (see also 1 Cor. 16:1-4). There is also evidence of competition amongst messengers. RP is deeply upset that the Galatians are turning to a different gospel (1:6), and turning away from RP,
the one who had called them to the gospel. As in other texts, RP speaks of other teachers/ministers/apostles in derogatory ways: as those who confuse the Galatians and pervert the gospel of Christ” (1:7), who should be cursed. (1:9), and who will pay for their crime (Gal. 5:9). He states to the Galatians: “I am afraid that my work for you may have been wasted” (Gal. 4:10-11).

However, there are two biographical facts that are specific to this communication:

**Galatians 1:13-14**

Paul indicates that he is sure that the Galatians have heard of his former life in a Maccabean-influenced approach to Torah (*anastrophēn en tō Iousaidmō*), in which he was a zealot (*zēlōtēs*) for the ancestral traditions (*patrikōn mou paradosēn*), excelling in the activities associated with a Maccabean-type zeal (*en tō Ioudaismō*) more than many of his peers. He had excessively persecuted (*kath uperbolēn diwkōn*) the assembly of God (*ekklēsian tou theou*), a statement which is also reiterated in his communication with the Philippians: *kata zēlos diōkōn tēn ekklēsian* (according to zeal persecuting the assembly, Phil 3:6). RP links his former zeal and persecuting activities with his excellence in *Ioudaismos* only in this letter to the Galatians.686 This biographical fact must be linked with “works of the law,”


686 RP does link zeal with his persecuting activities and law in Philippians, but does not make the connection with *Ioudaismos* explicitly.
and also with the overall themes of apostleship: “the collection”, “material support”, “competition amongst messengers” and his envisioned future, and only then particularized to his communication with the Galatians.

**Gal. 6:17**

Paul also indicates that he bears *ta stigmata tou Iēsou* in his body. Though he has named himself ‘slave of Christ’ on numerous occasions, only in this communication does he state that he has been tattooed, that he bears the physical mark of a severely punished, criminal or runaway slave. Although I have elaborated on slavery and *stigmata* in Chapter Five, it is necessary to note that there is evidence that some zealous Israelite ‘faith communities’ had slaves. Hezser notes, for instance, that there were slaves in the Qumran community:

> Instructions concerning slaves are included in the Damascus Document from Qumran, a phenomenon which suggests that the Qumran community or some of its external affiliates possessed slaves, despite Philo’s and Josephus’ allegations to the contrary. The possession of slaves by the Qumran community is also indicated by the so-called Khirbet Qumran ostracon.\(^{687}\)

There were also Jerusalem temple slaves. Josephus describes the historical situation in time of Felix, Agrippa and Nero, when “such was the shamelessness and effrontery which possessed the high priests that they actually were so brazen as to send slaves to the threshing floors to receive the tithes that were due to the priests, with the result that the poorer priests

\(^{687}\) Hezser, 291 note 21.
starved to death” (Ant. 20.181.). Thus an apostle who names himself a ‘slave of Christ,’ brings his master’s message, and participates in ‘the collection’ similar to the work of temple slaves. This is the same man who is also accountable to others concerning his collection of material resources (Rom. 16:31), and the one who may have the marks of discipline on his body (Gal. 6:17).

There is also some similarity between the accountability and freedom of slaves to the work of apostleship. Hezser notes:

The employment of slaves in business was fraught with ambiguities. On the one hand, slaves were not free agents but under the authority of their masters in all respects. On the other hand, in order to do business for their masters, slaves had to be granted a certain amount of power and autonomy.688

In addition, Remembered Paul’s work as administrator of the collection, his travel amongst various cities, and his argument about material support could also fit with the life of slave in which, Hezser notes, slaves “could also be leased out by their masters to work as craftsmen for others who had to pay them a wage. At least part of that wage would then be given to their owners.” 689 As stated also in Chapter Five, RP belonged to a group of workers, some who were identified as ‘slave of Christ’ and others as ‘fellow slaves’ and others as slaves of an assembly.

688 Hezser, 275.

689 Hezser, 252.
For the purpose of this dissertation, I am leaving ‘slave’ in tension between ‘metaphorical’ usage (which creates no material limitations to the life) and ‘material’ usage which refers to the actual life of an ancient slave (a category subsuming considerable internal differentiation). I have done this intentionally to privilege the most material interpretation before asserting a metaphorical interpretation, and to acknowledge the ambiguity in the text. RP states that he is an *eleutheros* (1 Cor. 9:1) who has a right to material support, and he claims that he has enslaved himself to all men (1 Cor. 9:19). These statements must also take into consideration alongside his ‘whippable’ body, his imprisonments, his dependence on others for material support, and his disciplinary lashings by the *Ioudaios*. His social degradation and his vulnerability to different forms of capital punishment suggest more limitations to his freedom than he proclaims to the Corinthians, but they do not exclude the possibility of freedom. The predominance of the theme of slavery in the text of Galatians would also prompt Sartre to search for the roots of these meanings in the life of Remembered Paul – another possible clue to biography. However, for the purpose of this dissertation, I am leaving this question in abeyance.

**A Biographical Re-interpretation of Galatians**

At this point, it is necessary to turn to the text of Galatians. The particular biographical facts have been defined: Gal. 1:13-14 and Gal. 6:17. The first fact links with Zealous Israelite, and further defines RP as formerly zealous for Torah in a Maccabean style. The second fact links with RP as a socially depraved and vulnerable man, and further describes him as bearing the same marks of slave discipline and capital punishment that Jesus
suffered. The socially degraded and vulnerable Israelite that is constant across *RP: The Work*, is also particularized in his communication with the Galatians. Apostleship, with concerns about material support, ongoing work of “the collection”, competition between messengers has been described. RP’s envisioned future is linked both with the material realities of apostleship, and his socially degraded body. We now have the basis for an interpretation of the larger movement of apostleship against which *Ioudaismos* (‘works of the law’ specifically circumcision) and *stigmatized* slave (proof of capital punishment) are specifically at play in Paul’s *Letter to the Galatians*.

In the following paragraphs, I will offer a biographical interpretation in which the various pericopes of Galatians fit together to create a particular instance of the objectification of RP’s project. This interpretation contains three elements: a) The Problem; b) The Misunderstanding; and c) Proofs for the Misunderstanding.

**Gal. 1:6-9 – The Problem**

Immediately after greeting the Galatians, RP departs from his usual practice of giving thanks, and tells them he is amazed that they are deserting him and are switching their allegiance to “another gospel” (Gal. 1:6). Since scholars often assume that RP’s gospel is *the* “the gospel of Christ”, if the Galatians are turning away, it is proof that “they were

__________________________

690 Fung, 43.
betraying their calling as Christians.⁶⁹¹ James D.G. Dunn, for instance, states that it is not “that they were abandoning Paul, or the message Paul brought them. They were being unfaithful to God.”⁶⁹² In these interpretations, the significance of delivering the message is divorced from the material realities of the life of Remembered Paul.

Remembered Paul accuses the other messengers who offer a different gospel of distorting the “gospel of Christ,” (Gal. 1:7) and because RP’s words are too easily taken as ‘Word of God’, his protest becomes proof, in Dunn’s eyes, of the Galatians’ “apostasy.”⁶⁹³ However, if we place Remembered Paul’s protest within the theme of competition between messengers found in the larger movement of his apostleship portrayed in in RP: The Work, we remember that he has often portrayed other messengers as troublemakers, liars, and deceivers. Anyone, human or angel, who presents a different gospel than the one they received from him, Paul declares, is cursed (Gal. 1:8-9). Fung believes that this statement implies “that the gospel embodies a core of fixed tradition which is normative so that no preaching deviating from it can be called “gospel” in the proper sense of the word.”⁶⁹⁴ Paul’s gospel is considered the gospel, and at the same time divorced from the life of its messenger because “that the authority of the gospel resides primarily in the message itself and only secondarily in the messenger.”⁶⁹⁴ Because the project which is objectified in these

⁶⁹² Dunn, 40.
⁶⁹³ Dunn, 39.
⁶⁹⁴ Fung, 46.
statements is left unconsidered, RP’s statements are seen only as examples of ‘persuasive artistry’ which he uses for polemical reasons,⁶⁹⁵ to defend the truth of the ‘Christian gospel,’⁶⁹⁶ and therefore the justifiable “supremacy of his message.”⁶⁹⁷ Even the notion that the letter “supposes the situation of “a court of law with jury, accuser, and defendant”⁶⁹⁸ is reliant on removing the possibility that RP’s anger arises from his perception that the work of his apostleship is being threatened, and such a threat might have an impact on his material life.

In contrast to these interpretations, a biographical interpretation grounds the texts in the life of RP and his project. One does not begin with the assumption that RP’s primary concern is the objective truth of his ‘good news’, but rather that there is an interplay between the threats concerning the ‘truth of his gospel’ and the relationship between those threats and his project. The question of why he is upset that the Galatians are ‘turning away’ must be grounded within the framework of his biographical ensemble, his envisioned future, the overarching themes of apostleship, and finally, his project. The following reading is an

---


⁶⁹⁶ Dunn, 44.

⁶⁹⁷ Dodd, 138.

attempt to weaves the life, and the work, with the project with special attention to Ioudaismos and stigmata.

The Misunderstanding (Gal. 1:13-14)

Remembered Paul believes the Galatians have undoubtedly heard about his former life in Ioudaismos. As described in Chapter Five, Ioudaismos is best translated, not as Judaism, but as a set of practices dependent on a Maccabean-style zeal concerning the laws (including circumcisions and food laws). In that life, he advanced beyond many of his peers because he was excessively zealous for the ‘traditions of [his] ancestors.’


700 See Cummins, 54-90 for a description of first century Maccabean-type zeal as described earlier in this chapter and in Chapter 4. See also p. 121 wherein Cummin links Ioudaismos with Maccabean history. This contrasts with the earlier, more common translation, for instance that of F.F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982), 91: “Here Ioudaismos means simply 'Judaism', Jewish faith and life.”


702 See Benjamin J. Lappenga. "Misdirected Emulation and Paradoxical Zeal: Paul's Redefinition of "The Good" as Object of ζηλος in Galatians 4:12-20." Journal of Biblical Literature 131, no. 4 (2012): 775-796. http://muse.jhu.edu/ (accessed February 19, 2014): “Here it is enough to note (1) the language of zeal was highly evocative for first-century Jews (see L.A.B. 47.7; Josephus, Ant. 12.271; Philo, Post. 183; 1QS IX, 23; 4Q372 frg. 1, line 12; Acts 21:20; 22:3) as a defining characteristic of great figures in the tradition of zeal for the Jewish people and the Torah, including Elijah (1 Kgs 19:10, 14; Sir 48:1-2), Phinehas (Num 25:11-13), and Mattathias (1 Macc 2:23-26); and (2) Paul clearly identified himself within this tradition (Gal 1:14; Phil 3:6).” Robert Jewett,
because he links his persecuting activities here with *Ioudaismos*, RP had persecuted ‘the assembly’ because its members had not adhered to Torah in an ‘appropriate’ fashion. Terry Donaldson has noted:

The heart of the phenomenon was the willingness to use force to defend Torah and Temple against any perceived infraction or threat. Philo, for example, defines *zēloītai* as those who are “strictest guardians of the ancestral traditions, merciless to those who do anything to subvert them (*Spec. Leg.* 2.253). As often as not, zeal is directed against fellow Jews (as in the example from Philo: also the example of Phineas (Num. 25; 1 Macc. 2:26, 54, 58; Sir. 45:23-24; 4 Macc. 18:12) and Elijah (1 Macc. 2:54, 58; Sir 48:1-2); 2 Bar. 66:1-8; m. Sanh. 9:6), though zeal can be directed as well at non-Jews (Simeon and Levi) [Jub. 30:18; T. Levi 6:3; Judith 9:2-4]; 1 Macc. 2:25.703

Because scholars traditionally translated *Ioudaismos* as ‘Judaism’, Dunn, for example, imagines that RP’s use of this word “indicates a certain distancing of himself from the characteristic self-understanding of most of his fellow Jews.”704 That is, he is leaving dominant Jewish thinking behind. Other scholars imagine that he is speaking of his “non-Christian past.”705 Too quickly, commentators have suggested that “Paul reflects here on his former life in Judaism before he met Christ on the Damascus road.”706 Other scholars

704 Dunn, 57.
705 Fung, 55.
also want to link his preaching of circumcision to ‘before his conversion’. The passage becomes permeated with Christian theological investments, and the link between Remembered Paul’s material social situation, the life ‘behind the text’ and his project is ignored.

A biographical reading, in contrast, takes seriously that the Galatians, according to Paul, have heard how, in his former life, he had excelled in the activities associated with a zealous Maccabean-style Ioudaismos. The biographical facts: zealot and Ioudaismos, when temporalized in ‘waves of history’ have revealed that Maccabean-style Israelite zeal was political and religious and exemplified in a variety of forms, but at its core, it was a defense of Torah and Temple. How does these waves of history funnel into the life of RP, and how are they significant in this communication with the Galatians?

Remembered Paul believes, I would argue, that the Galatians rightly link his Ioudaismos-style zeal with a zealous adherence to Torah (specifically circumcision) and with his persecuting activities, and have presumed that he still proclaims the same message about the need for circumcision. This is the misunderstanding: he used to proclaim the need for circumcision, but he does no longer. Such an interpretation takes seriously Ioudaismos as a biographical fact of his former life.

707 Gaventa, 314.
The Proofs of the Misunderstanding

Based on the argument that RP believes that the Galatians have heard that he used to proclaim a radical adherence to Torah in line with Maccabean zeal, I am hypothesizing that the remaining pericopes of Galatians 1-2 provide a list of the proofs he offers to show they are mistaken.

Proof #1

The first proof that RP offers is stated at the beginning of the letter. He was not commissioned/sent as a messenger by human beings or human authorities, but through Jesus Christ. (Gal. 1:1). Beverly Gaventa has noted rightly that it is “only in Galatians” that RP states his “apostleship did not originate with and through other human beings.”

The Galatians may believe that he is still a messenger on behalf of those with whom he used to associate, in line with his Ioudaismos past, but he is not guilty by association with any other human beings or authorities because he is commissioned as a messenger though an extra-human source.

Proof #2

The second proof he offers is that he would not be a slave of Christ if he were still pleasing people, still seeking human approval (Gal. 1:10).\textsuperscript{709} He implies that he formerly sought human approval, formerly pleased people, but his present degraded slave status (a slave of Christ is still a slave) is proof that he does not longer. If we link this with Ioudaismos, it would suggest that he is no longer proclaiming the need for circumcision, and for that reason, he has been downgraded to the status of a slave. The verb, areskō, creates the possibility of a stronger interpretation of RP’s contrary to fact statement: “If I were still striving to serve/ accommodate people, I would not be a slave of Christ.”\textsuperscript{710} Richard N. Longenecker claims that most “recent translators and commentators treat” this verse as “an emotional outburst that is to be related in some manner to the curses of verses 8-9, yet to be set off as a separate paragraph.”\textsuperscript{711} Fung, however, finds purpose in this ‘outburst’ and argues that Paul was being accused of “jettisoning the demand for circumcision and other legal requirements – in order to make conversion easy for Gentiles.”\textsuperscript{712} The first interpretation fails to connect the verse with the larger purpose of the letter, and the second interpretation does not account for RP’s denial that he is still proclaiming circumcision.

\textsuperscript{709} Peter Richardson, “Pauline Inconsistency: I Corinthians 9: 19–23 and Galatians 2: 11–14”.\textit{NTS}, 26, no. 3 (1980): 24: “The collection of materials in Galatians 1 and 2 is shaped by the need to demonstrate that Paul does not please men.”

\textsuperscript{710} Arndt and Gingrich, 105.


\textsuperscript{712} Fung, 48.
(Gal. 5:11; Gal. 6:12-15). I do agree with Fung, however, that the issue here is circumcision, and that he is a ‘slave of Christ’ because he is no longer ‘pleasing men.’ That is, Paul has stopped pleasing them because he no longer preaches circumcision (Gal. 5:11). This is the second proof to the Galatians. If he were still preaching circumcision, he would still be pleasing men, and he would not be a slave of Christ.

**Proof #3**

Gal. 1:11-17 provides the third proof: not only was he not sent or commissioned as a messenger by human beings, but his message also does not have a human origin (Gal. 1:11). He didn’t receive it from a human source, and he wasn’t taught it. He received it, instead, though a revelation of Jesus Christ (Gal. 1:12). It is here that he concedes his former life in Ioudaismos, a life that entailed persecuting the assembly and trying to destroy it, advancing beyond his peers because he was perissotereōs zēlōtēs (more abundantly being a zealot) for his patrikōn mou paradosēn (ancestral traditions, traditions of the elders, Gal. 1:13-14). But then he counters this with the proof that they are wrong. When (*ote de* – relative adverb *ote* = “when” and adversative participle indicates opposition to what precedes – their mistaken view), God “was pleased to reveal his son in me,” the infilling which enabled him to proclaim God’s son among the Gentiles (Gal. 1:16), RP counters, he did not consult with flesh and blood, he didn’t go up to Jerusalem to meet the ones who were apostles before him, but went immediately to Arabia and returned again to

---

713 All the extant manuscripts listed on the INTR contain these words except p51 which is damaged.
Damascus. That is, the revelation of Jesus Christ is the source of his message, a message he received to proclaim to the Gentiles, and that message remains untainted by human influences in Jerusalem. Because they have heard of his former life in Ioudaismos, they may be assuming his message is similar to that to certain apostles in Jerusalem (presumably those who proclaim the need for circumcision), but they are wrong in their assumption. He begins with his assertion of his ‘divine’ message (received by a revelation of Jesus Christ), concedes they may be thinking otherwise (that his former life guides his present proclamation and his circle of accountability), but (in contrast to what they are thinking), when God has revealed his son in him to proclaim his son to the Gentiles, he didn’t consult with anyone. This is third proof that RP is not proclaiming the need for circumcision – his message is not tainted by other influences.

Most Pauline scholars describe the ‘before’ and ‘after’ of RP’s life on the basis of Gal. 1:13-16. Reading only this part of the narrative, with the help of Acts, leads to a story of conversion or ‘call’. Terry Donaldson provides one example:

Somewhere in the vicinity of Damascus, Paul had a powerful personal experience that decisively altered his world of understanding and the framework of meaning. While he speaks of the event itself infrequently and intangentially (Gal. 1:15-16; 1 Cor. 15:8-10; and probably 1 Cor. 9:1), the transition it effects, by which he became an apostle of Christ, is present in all his letters both as a fundamental assumption and as a recurring theme.714

K. H. Rengstorf also argues that a complete break has occurred, and this verse marks “the first distinguishing mark of the Pauline apostolate.” Gaventa disagrees: “Between this "former lifestyle" and vv. 15-17 there is no transition sentence. Nor does Paul describe an event of revelation, a Christophany. Indeed, he confines to a temporal clause (οτε δὲ) all that he has to say about the revelation and commission to preach among the Gentiles.” I agree with Gaventa that the temporal clause includes verse 17, but I also believe that RP did describe an event of revelation, the infilling of Christ, which gave him power to proclaim the message to the Gentiles. However, Remembered Paul is recounting that infilling, combined with a description of his subsequent whereabouts, only to underline that his message is divine in origin, and remained untainted by external influences subsequent to the event. Fee argues that “Paul’s meaning here is that he did not consult the apostles about the significance of the revelation he had received.” I would argue that the significance is that RP is an apostle to the Gentiles by means of God’s ‘infilling’, rather than a close connection with Jerusalem’s ‘circumcision faction.’

715 Fung, 63 note 1.
716 Gaventa, 315.
717 Fee, 70.
Proof #4

The fourth proof also concerns the inconsequential influence of Jerusalem. In Gal. 1:18-20 he speaks about his first trip to Jerusalem after three years. He identifies the purpose of his trip: to visit Cephas. He informs them that he was only there fifteen days, and he didn’t see any of the other apostles except James. Ann Jervis states that RP emphasized, by using the word *epeita* (then) (Gal. 1:18), “the length of time, three years, before he went to Jerusalem.” Most scholars agree. What varies are the interpretations concerning the purpose of his visit. Jervis states that Paul emphasized the time interval in order to “make plain that when he went to Jerusalem he was… a person of some Christian maturity.”718 Fee states that “Paul is giving a consecutive account of his career since his conversion.”719 F.F. Bruce believes that Paul is emphasizing the interval between “his conversion and his first subsequent visit to Jerusalem, implying that in this interval he had already begun his apostolic ministry without any authorization.”720 All of these interpretations rest on reading a ‘conversion’ in Gal. 1:15-16 that contrasts with his ‘former life’, and the importance of Jerusalem is interpreted in that light. Cephas then represents RP’s “one-to-one access to Peter, one of the most important apostles.”721 Bruce imagines that Paul went to meet him

718 Ann Jervis, *Galatians* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1999), 47.

719 Gordon Fee, 73.

720 F.F. Bruce, 97.

721 Jervis, 47.
because it would have been important for him “to get to know the leader of the original apostles.” However, if we read these verses as the continuation of the statement begun at Gal. 1:17 (or even placing it within a larger pericope Gal. 1:11-21), RP is indicating that he did eventually go to Jerusalem, but only to see Cephas, only staying 15 days, and seeing none of the other apostles except James. He ends this pericope with an oath which, according to F.F. Bruce, indicates that “the independence of his gospel and of his apostleship was at stake.” I am in agreement with Bruce that RP is defending “himself against the charge that he proclaims a man-made, second-hand gospel and that his commission to proclaim it was derived from men,” but I believe the divine nature of his message is not the central point. The oath is needed to prove his separation from Jerusalem, specifically those who proclaim the importance of circumcision (Gal. 2:12-13).

**Proof #5**

The fifth proof is his separateness from specific persons in Judea. RP states that when he went to Syria and Cilicia, he was still unknown to the churches of Judea that are in Christ – they had only heard of me (Gal. 1:21--24). Bruce links these assemblies with those referred to in 1 Thess. 2:14 (Judean assemblies) who had been persecuted by their

---

722 F.F. Bruce, 98.
723 Bruce, 100.
724 F.F.Bruce, 102.
725 Bruce, 101.
‘countrymen’. Bruce then argues that RP is emphasizing “the fewness of his contacts with the Jerusalem church in particular, and only then with the Judean churches in general.” I would again agree with Bruce but add that the purpose for emphasizing this point is that he contrasts his circumcision-free gospel with a ‘circumcision factor’ from Jerusalem (Gal. 2:12-13) and the Ioudaioi in Judea (Rom. 15:31; 1 Thess. 2:14-16) who persecuted the assembly of Christ followers in Judea.

**Proof #6**

Though RP, Titus and Barnabas went to Jerusalem after fourteen years, according to the sixth proof, he only went in response to a revelation (Gal. 2:2). That is, he was not summoned to appear. He claims that he had a private meeting with the ‘acknowledged leaders’ and described the gospel that he proclaimed amongst the Gentiles to be sure that he was not running in vain. And the result of that meeting, was that Titus was not compelled to be circumcised (Gal. 2:1-5). Therefore, even after a private meeting with the “acknowledged leaders”, they did not oppose his circumcision-free gospel by demanding Titus’ circumcision. Furthermore, Remembered Paul states that they did not submit to the “false believers” who came to “spy on the freedom we have in Christ Jesus” even for a moment, so “the truth of the gospel might always remain with you.” (Gal. 2: 4-6). Even under pressure RP did not abandon his stance on circumcision.

726 Bruce, 103.
727 Bruce, 104.
Proof #7

The seventh proof is that the acknowledged leaders added no further requirements for his message. They listened to his message, but did not ask him to change it. Instead, once they recognized that he had been “entrusted with the gospel for the uncircumcised”, when James, Cephas and John recognized the charis he had been given, they gave Barnabas and RP the “right hand of fellowship” and agreed that he would be a messenger to the uncircumcised and they would proclaim the message to the circumcised (Gal. 2:6-9). In the previous passages, RP has indicated his separation from Jerusalem, and the apostles before him. Now, however, he presents proof that his gospel is a recognized gospel for the uncircumcised, and he has support from the acknowledged leaders in Jerusalem – further proof that he is no longer proclaiming circumcision. Nor is he required to do so.

Proof #8

The only suggestion that the acknowledged leaders made was that RP would remember the poor (Gal. 2:10). Fee links “the poor” of this verse with the “materially poor members of the Jerusalem church.” He then places this verse in light of “the collection” that I have identified as one of the themes that spans RP’s apostleship. Jervis has suggested that the Greek word menemoneuōmen which is translated “remember” “conveys the sense of continuing action”, and therefore that they are asking RP to continue to do what he is

728 Fee, 102.
already doing. She goes on to say that “the collection indicates that there was at this stage a high degree of unity between the churches of Paul and the leadership in Jerusalem.”\textsuperscript{729} Nothing has been added to his message except a request that RP continue to collect material resources for the poor ‘saints’ in Jerusalem.

\textbf{Proof #9}

According to RP, Cephas then came to Antioch and stopped eating with the Gentiles because he was afraid of “the circumcision faction.” The ninth proof that RP is no longer proclaiming circumcision is that he did not join change his own behaviour, and he reprimanded Cephas and the other Jews who joined in this hypocrisy (even Barnabas) because “they were not acting consistently with the “truth of the Gospel.” (Gal. 2:11-14). Peter Richardson has stated that this pericope “is a cogent presentation of the law and justification.”\textsuperscript{730} Michael Grant links this incident to Paul’s desire to “deny that he owed the slightest inspiration to the church [he names it the Jerusalem mother church], since his inspiration had come to him direct from God.\textsuperscript{731} F.F. Bruce claims: “It was Cephas’ volte-face that made Paul speak out so bluntly.”\textsuperscript{732} Fee states that Paul uses this incident to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{729} Jervis, 59.
\item \textsuperscript{731} Grant, 166.
\item \textsuperscript{732} F.F. Bruce, 129.
\end{itemize}
“conclude his sustained defense...of his authentic gospel.” In contrast to each of these readings, I would argue that the RP is again making a distinction between himself and those who submit to the “circumcision faction.” Taking this verse back to his ‘former’ biographical facts, he demonstrates that he, unlike Cephas and Barnabas and many other Jews, is not succumbing to the pressure to uphold strict food laws (not eating with Gentiles). In fact, he is publicly opposing them. Even when his co-workers succumbed to the temptation to live “like a Jew” and require Gentiles to live like Jews, Remembered Paul does not follow in their footsteps. Another proof that he is no longer committed to Ioudaismos, and no longer committed to strict adherence to food laws or circumcision.

Proof #10

RP does not know who is persuading the Galatians to be circumcised, but he declares that it is not him (Gal. 5:7-8), and he is confident that “slowly but surely” they will not think that he is (Gal. 5:9). Furthermore, he predicts, “the one who is troubling you will bear the judgement” (Gal. 5:10). This is the tenth proof. Not only have they blamed the wrong person, but whoever is persuading them of this untruth will be judged.

733 Fee, 104.

734 Paul Nadim Tarazi, Galatians: A Commentary (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1994), 280: “This is a well known proverb in the synoptic tradition (Mt. 13:33//Lk 13:21) and elsewhere by Paul (1 Cor. 5:6). In those contexts, it bears its basic meaning of “slowly but surely”.
Proof #11

Finally he asks them: “why am I still being persecuted if I am still [according to the Galatians] preaching circumcision? (Gal. 5:11). In other words, “if I am [as you claim] still publicly announcing (κηρυσσω) circumcision, why I am still being chased/pursued/accused?” (5:11). If I were still publicly announcing circumcision, then to skavdalou tou staurou would be removed (Gal. 5:11) as it has been for those who are compelling you to be circumcised so they are not chased/pursued/accused because of the [scandal of the] cross (Ga. 6:12). Douglas Campbell agrees that Paul did, at some point, proclaim the need for circumcision. F.F. Bruce argued that preaching circumcision would not have occurred “since he was commissioned to be an apostle of Jesus” and must be an activity associated with his pre-conversion life. However, Campbell has persuasively argued that, if proclaiming circumcision was indeed an activity only of his

735 Douglas A. Campbell, “Galatians 5.11: Evidence of an Early Law-observant Mission by Paul?” NTS 57 (2011): 327: “The NT uses the adverb ἄρτι almost one hundred times, Paul using it fifteen or sixteen times. The most usual sense is one of continuation or extension, whether through time or space, some activity, or by way of analogy….suggesting the translations ‘still’, ‘yet’, ‘further’, ‘even’, and occasionally ‘additionally’. The best translation in all Paul’s material, barring question-begging instances, is ‘still’.”

736 H.D. Betz, Galatians (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 268: ‘[w]hat the Apostle has precisely in mind will in all likelihood always be hidden from our knowledge.’
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pre-apostle life, there would be no need to refute it.\(^{740}\) Although it is not clear what RP intended when he told that Corinthians that he “became to the Jews as a Jew” and “to the ones under law as under law” (1 Cor. 9:20-21), this statement would suggest that even after RP considered himself “not being myself under law” (1 Cor. 9:20), he still acted as though he was. Such a statement would support the Galatians’ belief that he was still proclaiming the need for circumcision. The eleventh proof is that he is being persecuted for not proclaiming the need for circumcision.

**Proof #12**

Paul writes the closing of the letter in his own hand (Gal. 6:11) “to underscore the importance”\(^{741}\) of his final words. Unlike RP, the other messengers, who want to “make a good showing in the flesh”, are compeling the Galatians to be circumcised for only one purpose: “so that they may not be persecuted for the cross of Christ” (Gal. 6:12). Even those who are circumcised, he argues, don’t keep the law, but they want the Galatians to be circumcised so “they may boast about [their] flesh.” (Gal. 6:13). In contrast to those who ask them to “mutilate the flesh”, Paul will boast of nothing except the cross (Gal. 6:14). In other words, he is not the one persuading them to be circumcised (Gal. 5:8). He does not need to boast in their circumcised flesh because “neither circumcision nor

---

\(^{740}\) Campbell, 332.

\(^{741}\) Betz, 314.
uncircumcision is anything” (Gal. 6:15). It is a new creation that is everything (Gal. 5:6; 2 Cor. 5:17).

**Stigmata: The Final Proof**

The final proof is that RP bears *ta stigmata tou Iēsou Christou* on his body (Gal. 6:17), and therefore nobody should give him any *kopous* (troubles, literally translated “beatings”). This is the second biographical fact that comes to bear on our interpretation of Galatians. The majority of scholars either ignore Gal. 6:17 or interpret this reference in one of three ways: as a metaphor (without a tattoo), metaphor (with a tattoo) or as a reference to religious tattooing. Guthrie argues that “Paul is thinking metaphorically of the badge of Jesus upon him, perhaps in contrast to the badge of circumcision carried by the legalists”.

Maccoby claims that: “Even more important for an understanding of Paul’s view of his own status is his claim to have special marks or stigmata on his body, showing the depth of his self-identification with the sufferings of Jesus on the cross…. Thus the *stigmata* of Paul, whether self-inflicted or psychosomatically produced, made him, in his own eyes, and those of his followers, the supreme embodiment of the power of the mystery of God, the Lord Jesus Christ.” In fact, according to John Stott: “Medieval churchmen believed that these


were the scars in the hands, feet, and side of Jesus, and that Paul by sympathetic identification with Him found the same scars appearing on his body.”

John Stott argues “that the stigmata of Jesus which Paul bore on his body were…rather wounds, which he had received while being persecuted for Jesus’ sake”. Deissmann argued earlier that Paul had been speaking of actual “wounds that he had received in his apostolic labours”, and that RP referred to them metaphorically to declare that “anyone who offends [him] lays himself open to the punishment of a stronger power.” Jeremy W. Barrier argues that “Paul envisions himself as a loyal household slave…and has the stigmata to prove such a claim.” Barrier concludes that “it reveals Paul’s suppressed status as a colonized Jew looking for an alternative language to express his deep need for a master worthy of his loyalty.” Although Barrier comes closest to acknowledging the link between social degradation and stigmata, none of these interpretations link this reference to the purpose of the letter: RP is no longer proclaiming circumcision.
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RP identifies the *stigmata* on his body as ‘marks of Jesus’ and not, it needs emphasizing, the ‘marks of Christ’. He bears the *stigmata* of Jesus on his body in the same way that he “bears the death of Jesus in his body” (2 Cor. 4:10). Timothy B. Savage notes that scholars “are quick to point out that Paul is probably not focusing here on the historical Jesus,” but he argues that “the phrase ἐνεκρόσις του Ἰησοῦ would suggest that [Paul] is thinking of the excruciating suffering of just that dying.”753 In the same way, I would argue that he is thinking here of the marks of capital punishment that Jesus bore on his slave body. For either of these statements to be anything more than laughable to the Galatians or Corinthians, Paul’s body would need to bear the marks of serious physical trauma caused by capital punishment. And, indeed, the Corinthians make such a claim (2 Cor. 10:10) that is consistent with RP’s self-description of the capital punishment (floggings, imprisonments, lashings by Ioudaioi, and stoning and beatings he received which made him “often near death”) inflicted on his body.

Whether there was a tattoo on Remembered Paul’s body or not, *stigmata* is proof that he has received severe punishment like that inflicted on a runaway, or severely disciplined or criminal slave. He bears the *stigmata* of Jesus, like the death of Jesus, on his body. In this way, his body is proof that he shares in the punishment that led to Jesus’ death. This, I submit, is RP’s final and decisive proof. He is proclaiming circumcision no longer, and the proof is that his body bears the marks of capital punishment. He uses to please men

(proclaiming circumcision), but he does no longer – and his body wounded by punishment is his proof.

In conclusion, a biographical interpretation of Galatians reveals that the Galatians are turning away to a different gospel (an all too common experience for RP). This is problematic for Remembered Paul’s project for two reasons: it removes a source of material support and a source of ‘boasting’. The first is needed for his present life, the continuance of his apostleship. The second is needed so he has solid ground on which to boast when his Lord returns. Unlike a more traditional reading, this biographical interpretation does not centre the conversation between Remembered Paul and the Galatians in Galatians 1 and 2 around a defense of his ‘call’ or a description of his ‘conversion.’ The only change RP has identified is that he used to proclaim the need for circumcision, but he does no longer. He offers twelve proofs to the Galatians that, though in his ‘former’ life he zealously excelled in Maccabean-style adherence to Torah, his present ‘gospel’ is not influenced by this attitude toward ‘works of the law’: food laws and circumcision. His proofs include his separateness from Jerusalem, his limited exposure to those who were apostles before him, his claim that he received his message directly from Christ, and finally the symbol of his punishment for no longer ‘pleasing men’ by doing so. RP’s Letter to the Galatians is his action upon his material situation of scarce resources, and competition for objects of ‘boasting’. It makes sense of his biographical ensemble, his envisioned future, and the present realities of an apostleship that is contested and precarious.
Impact of Biographical Reading on Interpretation

The difference between a biographical interpretation and many other interpretations is that the ‘key’ to the meaning of the text is found ‘behind the text’ rather than ‘in the text’. The text (the work) asks questions of the life. RP: The Work must lead us back to examine biography. It is not enough to locate the life in the body of thought in the text, or to presume the needs and motivations for that life from the arguments of the text. Instead the meanings of the text, the statements it contains, must make sense of the life objectified in them. A theological reading focuses on ‘the thought’ of Paul, as if thought exists apart from the human life that moves away from scarcity towards an envisioned future. The life objectified in the text becomes an object divorced from the human actor whose purpose was not to create Christian theology.

A biographical reading views human meanings as the outcome of the movement of material life – the project. Galatians is one instance of that movement, and I have identified a misunderstanding about circumcision as the central issue of the letter. However, this misunderstanding must also be placed in the context of the overall movement – in the project which requires us to examine the overall themes previously identified to understand more about why Remembered Paul offered proofs to set right the misunderstanding.

As stated earlier the overall themes of RP: The Work include: apostleship as a form of labour, questions about material support, competition between co-workers, an envisioned future which brings power, eternal life and liberation from a humiliated body, and “the collection.” As I have demonstrated “the collection” and “apostleship” are interrelated.
Similarly material support for the work of apostleship is unpredictable, expected and needed. Finally, there is a religious aspect to apostleship: reason for boasting on the day of judgement, the reward for work done.

Material support provides him with food and shelter for his present life. As in other letters RP refers to the question of material support. He reminds them that all must test their own work, so that their own work, not that of their neighbour’s, is their source of pride (Gal. 6:4). All must carry their own loads (Gal. 6:5). Finally, those who are taught the word (as he has taught them) must share “good things” with the one who has taught them (RP). Here is the crunch. The teacher of ‘the word’ is provided with food and shelter which RP, a depraved and vulnerable man, needs to meet the material needs of his life. The problem is that there are workers preaching a different gospel, and the Galatians are turning away – possibly reducing his material support.

Finally, he declares that he will not boast in their flesh, only in the cross “by which he has been crucified to the world.” (Gal. 6:14). As in other letters, Remembered Paul has referred to assemblies as his ‘work’ and his ‘boast’ or ‘cause for boasting’. Paul’s envisioned future includes a resurrected body, and eternal life with his Maccabean Messiah who will have ultimate power. And when he meets his Messiah, he wants to have ‘cause for boasting’. If the Galatians turn to a different gospel, to those who desire to “make a good showing in the flesh” (Gal. 6:12), he has lost his cause for boasting. The others who want the Galatians to be circumcised are proclaiming this message so they can boast about their flesh (Gal. 6:13),
but Paul will only boast of the cross because circumcision or uncircumcision is nothing (Gal. 6:15).
CONCLUSION

In conclusion, a Sartrean methodology provides a methodological framework and resulting biographical reading that takes seriously the life of a particular ancient man ‘behind the text’ who seeks to act upon a situation of scarcity, by creating material and meaning resources within the material limitations of his biographical ensemble. His contested apostleship connects him with a socially degraded and vulnerable Messiah, creates opportunities for food and shelter and promises him with hope of a liberated body and eternal rule with a Maccabean-style ruler.

As I stated in my opening preface, the purpose of this dissertation was to create a methodological framework by which we might create biographical accounts of the Remembered Paul and biographical interpretations of particular letters that would be based on sound historical methods of data collection and historical-sociological interpretations which did not erase the human being whose life is re-membered in these texts; theologically plucking him out of his social situation (including the domination and pain and unbearable suffering) which impinged upon him and which he acted upon, or reducing him to an object, a product of oppressive structures in which he lived. Sartre’s methodological framework has provided, in contrast, an alternative to re-member the life of Remembered Paul ‘behind the text.’

This task has invited me into many areas of New Testament studies in which I cannot claim to be proficient by any stretch of the imagination. I have relied on transcriptions and translations (and aids to translation) of primary data. My understanding of text criticism is
basic, and I have, no doubt, described the field in a simplistic manner. The philological information that I have provided is minimal for illustrative purposes only. Although somewhat more extensive, the same applies to the social-historical knowledge I have gathered to ‘contextualize’ the biographical facts. The history in which I have placed these facts hardly does justice to everything that was part of Second Temple Jewish history. I am not a philosopher or expert in Sartre, and I have engaged primarily with *Search for a Method*, and I have struggled to understand his philosophical thinking. A Sartrean expert would quickly note the incompleteness of my understanding, and feminist, queer, and postcolonial critiques have not been included.

My reading of Galatians is incomplete. I have not identified all the themes of apostleship that span the Pauline corpus, and I have focused primarily on the material limitations which may have impinged on ‘Paul’s’ action rather than enabling structures. I have left the ‘slave’ status of RP in question rather than taking a more definitive interpretative stand. There are many exegetical issues that, if explored, would refine and nuance or potentially change the reading. I have also only applied the method to a reading of Remembered Paul’s communication to the Galatians, a letter considered ‘authentic’ by most Pauline scholars. An interpretation of the project would require application to all the letters of RP: The Work, and the significance of this method would be more apparent with a biographical reading of Hebrews.

Finally, some aspects of my methodology for the use of primary sources needs further thought. For instance, although I have chosen to leave aside the patristic evidence and focus
on extant primary sources, providing a methodological framework for use of other data sources would enrich the study. I have used the term Remembered Paul to create some distance between the life of the ancient man named Paulos and the life that is represented in the manuscripts, and the life that is re-constructed by scholars, including myself. The words of Walter Benjamin have guided my work: “Only the historian will have the gift of fanning the spark of hope in the past who is firmly convinced that even the dead will not be safe from the enemy if he wins. And this enemy has not ceased to be victorious.”

Because the all too dominant portrayals of Paul are linked, in my mind, with the valuing of educated, unmarked and able-bodied, Western male, heterosexual Christian minds, Paul’s voice has been a tool of oppression for many readers. The Remembered Paul is constructed from primary data by means of a historically sound method of data collection, and also constructed through the lens of my desire for a Paul who embodies and enacts a challenge to these dominant values. If I had simply constructed the Paul I desired, without being accountable to the ancient evidence, in my mind, I also would have participated in the colonizing of the dead. And yet, even as I say “Remembered Paul,” I am more persuaded that the historical Paul fits with this picture from the primary data, than the dominant scholarly interpretations dependent on a muddled methodology.

What I have accomplished is also significant. I have created a methodological framework that provides the basis for an identification of biographical evidence (translated into a

biographical ensemble of ‘facts’) facts of the Remembered Paul that relies on the earliest extant manuscript evidence rather than on the scholar-constructed ‘Pauline Corpus’ from the canonical New Testament. The discussion of the role of Acts as well as 1-2 Timothy, Titus, Hebrews, 2 Thessalonians, Philemon and Colossians-Ephesians for the writing of a “Pauline” biography has been reframed. In addition, other texts (Acts of Paul, 1 Clement) that exist outside the canonical Corpus Paulinum have been differently valued as Historians of equal value to Acts. Hebrews has been recovered as part of the Corpus Paulinum. The authenticity/inauthenticity (or identified interpolations) of texts are no longer issues because the work of Paul is defined on the basis of the extant manuscript evidence.

I have also changed the contours of the debate concerning a number of the biographical facts which are contentious: namely Paul a Roman citizen, Paul educated by Gamaliel, Paul a citizen of Tarsus, and Paul a tent-maker. All the earliest and later evidence of the agreed-upon letters cluster around specific biographical facts. The social-historical knowledge may change the shape somewhat of any particular biographical fact (e.g. RP’s literacy level, his zeal, or the meaning of ‘slave of Christ’), but the biographical evidence is not in question unless the methodological framework is found lacking. Furthermore, the categorization of biographical evidence (Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon, Contemporaries, and Historians) has demonstrated that the witness of Contemporaries strengthen rather than contradicts the witness of the agreed-upon statements.
Sartre’s philosophy has created an opening for scholars to imagine a Paul with needs, feelings, hope and concerns which do not float above the social world in which he lived, but were formed (though not completely defined) by the social situation(s) in which he lived. Sartre’s Marxist-Existentialism avoids the extremes of both psychological and sociological interpretations, and creates a well-reasoned theory of human action that “makes these bones live by clothing them with flesh, and infusing them with a human spirit.”

Finally, this dissertation is not only an ‘academic study’, it is also the objectification of my human project. We live in a world in which certain human bodies are marked as ‘scandalous’, vulnerable to violence, hunger and homelessness, and the unbearable suffering of various forms of punishment and imprisonment. The trauma experienced often goes unnamed and unwitnessed because some things are simply ‘unspeakable’ or ‘inappropriate’ for public spaces. Traumatized bodies are analyzed, diagnosed and labelled in ways that make them ‘less than’ what is supposed to be ‘normal’ human functioning. They are excluded from communities because they are a constant reminder of the physical and emotional human frailty that any of us could suffer. Finally, it is either imagined that these impoverished, beaten and imprisoned human beings should be able, through personal effort and new thinking, to transcend these experiences and emerge a ‘whole’ human being,

---
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or they are assumed to always be the damaged products of the oppressions they experienced.

On the basis of the biographical facts collected from the ancient manuscripts, the Remembered Paul was one of those bodies. Most interpretations, however, have minimized the scandal of Remembered Paul’s body, erased his exclusion from community through the construction of always misguided ‘opponents’, ignored his protests against being considered less than ‘normal’ by translating his laments into ironic performances, and trivializing his search for a different life into discussions of ‘conversion’ and theological discussions of ‘faith without works’. Perhaps it is time to question these interpretations on the basis of the ancient manuscript evidence, and to heed Vincent Wimbush’s call to “see not only how texts are the products of certain material culture, not only how they help invent and shape and determine (sociocultural) texture, but also how sociocultural dynamics in turn again become text-ualized.”\textsuperscript{757}

\textsuperscript{757} Wimbush, 195.
### APPENDIX A

#### TABLE 1: Autobiographical/Core Group Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
<th>Statements About Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age, Marital Status, Freedom</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 45v Cor. 7:8</td>
<td>RP is unmarried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 47r Cor. 9:1</td>
<td>RP is an <em>eleutheros</em>, a free man, and an apostle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlm 9</td>
<td>RP is an old man.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 8v Rom. 9:3</td>
<td>The/My Brothers are kinsmen according to flesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 8v Rom. 9:4</td>
<td>Israelites, adoption, glory, covenant, giving of law, temple service, promises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 13v Rom. 9:24</td>
<td>Ethnically diverse group of <em>loudaioi</em> and ethnōn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 14v Rom. 11:1</td>
<td>Israelite, descendant of Abraham, tribe of Benjamin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3590 2 Cor. 11:32</td>
<td>RP in Nabataean-controlled Damascus, perhaps a member of colony?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3612 Gal. 1:14</td>
<td><em>loudaismos</em>, advanced above peers as greater zealot of ancestral traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3613 Gal. 2:9</td>
<td>Returned to Damascus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3614 Gal. 2:15</td>
<td><em>loudaios</em> by birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 12v Rom. 9:3-4</td>
<td>RP, like his kindred, belongs to the Israelites who have the adoption, the covenant, giving of law, temple service, the glory, and the promises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3619 Gal. 5:11</td>
<td>No longer preaching circumcision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 88v Phil. 3:4-5</td>
<td>Circumcised on 8th day, race of Israel, tribe of Benjamin, Hebrew of Hebrews, attitude toward law is that of a Pharisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 88v Phil 3:6</td>
<td>Zeal, blameless concerning righteousness of law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work/Religious Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 15v Rom. 11:13</td>
<td><em>Apostolos</em>, glories in <em>diakonian</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3557 Rom. 15:16</td>
<td><em>Leitourgon</em> (sacred priestly server) see Epaphroditus Phil 2:25-30 – the collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3557 Rom. 15:17-18</td>
<td>Boasts only in his own work, direct result of Christ working through him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3557 Rom. 15:9</td>
<td>Told Romans proclaimed message Jerusalem to Illyricum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3558 Rom. 15:20</td>
<td>Only proclaims where Christ not preached, not build on another’s foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3558 Rom. 15:22</td>
<td>Didn’t come to Rome before so not to preach where Christ already preached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3558 Rom. 15:23</td>
<td>No more places left to preach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3558 Rom. 15:25</td>
<td>Taking collection to Jerusalem – contribution of Macedonia and Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3558 Rom. 15:28</td>
<td>Will go to Jerusalem, and then Rome by way of Spain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3559 Rom. 15:31</td>
<td><em>Diakonia</em> to Jerusalem with worry about acceptance by ones disobeying in Judea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3612 Gal. 1:13-15</td>
<td>Previous life in <em>loudaismos</em>, zealot of ancestral traditions, persecutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 38r 1 Cor. 1:14</td>
<td>Baptized Crispus and Gaius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Work/Religious Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3584 1 Cor. 3:5</td>
<td>RP and Apollos are diakonoi for Corinthians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 41v 1 Cor. 3:6</td>
<td>RP planted. Apollos watered ‘the field’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 41r 1 Cor. 4:1</td>
<td>He and Apollos - upēretas christou (servants, helpers, assistants), oikonomous musteriwn of mysteries of God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 57v 1 Cor. 15:10</td>
<td>Least of apostles, unworthy to be called apostle, former persecutor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 59v 1 Cor. 16:1</td>
<td>Instructed the Corinthians as he did the Galatians about the collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3612 Gal. 1:10</td>
<td>Slave of Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 86r Phil. 1:1</td>
<td>Timothy and Paul slave of Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaticanus Romans 1:1</td>
<td>Slave of Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:1</td>
<td>Slave of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim. 1:13</td>
<td>Former persecutor and blasphemer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3619 Gal. 5:11</td>
<td>RP used to proclaim circumcision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 88v Phil 3:6</td>
<td>Former persecutor of assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3569 Rom. 16:22</td>
<td>Paul does not write all ‘his’ letters. Tertius is letter-writer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 38v Heb. 13:22</td>
<td>Wrote to Hebrews by means of a few words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 60v 1 Cor. 16:21</td>
<td>Paul wrote with his own hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3602 Eph. 3:3</td>
<td>RP wrote a few words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 86r Gal. 6:11</td>
<td>Large letters when writing with own hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 94r Col. 4:18</td>
<td>Wrote in his own hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking Ability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 39v 1 Cor. 1:17</td>
<td>RP does not proclaim his message with eloquent speech/intellectual reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3583 1 Cor. 2:4</td>
<td>His speech was no with persuasive wisdom, but demonstration of spirit and power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 56r 1 Cor. 14:18</td>
<td>RP speaks the speech of religious ecstasy more than any of the others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3586 2 Cor. 10:10</td>
<td>His speech is despicable, disdainful, amounts to nothing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3612 Gal. 1:12</td>
<td>Obtained message by means of revelation of Jesus Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3588 2 Cor. 11:6</td>
<td>He concedes he is unskilled in speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bodily Presence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3583 1 Cor. 2:3</td>
<td>Came in weakness and fear/anxiety – astheneia and phobos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 42v 1 Cor. 4:10</td>
<td>Unlike Corinthians, he and others are astheneia and atimoi (dishonorable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3585 2 Cor. 10:1</td>
<td>Despicable physical appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3586 2 Cor. 10:10</td>
<td>Humiliated bodily presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3617 Gal. 4:13</td>
<td>Asthenia of the body – illness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Capital Punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3590 2 Cor. 11:23-27</td>
<td>More hardships, imprisonments, beatings, in danger of death, more imprisonments. Forty lashes on five occasions. Beaten with rods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3602 Eph. 3:1</td>
<td>Shackled prisoner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3611 Eph. 6:20</td>
<td>Shackled prisoner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 86v Phil. 1:7, 13</td>
<td>Shackled prisoner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 93v Col. 4:3</td>
<td>Imprisoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 86r Gal. 6:17</td>
<td>RP is tattooed – the physical proof of punishment by slave master or as criminal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food and Shelter</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Folio 41 v 1 Cor. 3:8</td>
<td>He and Apollos will receive wages according to their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 41r 1 Cor. 3:9</td>
<td>He and Apollos are co-workers, he laid the foundation Apollos builds, and the builder will get wages if the house survives the fires of judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 42r 1 Cor. 4:11</td>
<td>Belongs to group who are hungry, thirsty, poorly clothed, physically beaten and homeless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 42r 1 Cor. 4:12</td>
<td>Belongs to group who are constantly tired from work with their hands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 48v 1 Cor. 9:6</td>
<td>RP believes that, like the others, he and Barnabas deserve material support, so they do not have to work for their food and shelter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 88r Phil. 2:25</td>
<td>Epaphroditus, a co-worker provides service to him in prison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaticanus 2 Thess. 3:8-9</td>
<td>They worked not and day for their food, so not to burden the Thessalonians, though RP asserts they have a right not to work for a living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3559 Rom. 16:2</td>
<td>Phoebe is RP’s benefactor as also for others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3585 2 Cor. 4:9</td>
<td>RP and Timothy were persecuted/chased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3588 2 Cor. 11:7-9</td>
<td>Preached gospel free of charge, robbed other assembly for provisions while he was in Corinth, didn’t burden them because Macedonians provided for him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3620 Gal. 6:6</td>
<td>Those who are instructed should share their material goods with their instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 89v Phil. 4:11</td>
<td>Sometimes hungry, sometimes enough to eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 90r Phil 4:15-16</td>
<td>Only Philippians provided support after leaving Macedonia, and Philippians sent support twice when he was in Macedonia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaticanus Folio 95-6 2 Thess. 3:8-9</td>
<td>Worked night and day so not to burden them though he had the right not to work for his support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autobiographical/Agreed-Upon</td>
<td>Statements about Group Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 8v Rom. 6:3</td>
<td>RP member of group of people “baptized into Christ”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 13v Rom. 9:23-24</td>
<td>RP is a member of a group of people called by God – Jews and non-Jews, in order to display the “riches of his glory for the objects of mercy.” (Rom. 9:23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3559 Rom. 16:2</td>
<td>Phoebe is a benefactor to RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3559 Rom. 16:3</td>
<td>Prisca and Aquilla are Paul's co-workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3560 Rom. 16:7</td>
<td>Adronicus and Julia are co-workers and prisoners with him, notable amongst apostles and ‘in Christ' before him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3560 Rom. 16:11</td>
<td>Herodian is RP's kinsman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3560 Rom. 16:13</td>
<td>Rufus' mother is named RP’s mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 3569 Rom. 16:21</td>
<td>Tertius is writer of letter to Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 37r Heb. 13:19</td>
<td>Hopes that he and Timothy will see them soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 42r 1 Cor. 4:13</td>
<td>Group of workers he belongs to are slandered as filth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 57 v 1 Cor. 15:6-10</td>
<td>The Risen Christ appeared last to RP because he is the lesser of the apostles, the one not qualified to be called as a messenger because he persecuted the assembly of God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 90r Col. 1:7</td>
<td>Epaphras is a fellow slave along with RP and Timothy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 93v Col. 4:11</td>
<td>Aristarchus, Mark, Justus are co-workers, also of “the circumcision.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 42v 1 Cor. 4:9-10</td>
<td>The apostles, are a spectacle, and last amongst people, as if sentenced to death. Unlike the Corinthians, the apostles are socially humiliated and dishonorable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 42r 1 Cor. 4:11-13</td>
<td>RP and Sothene are hungry and thirsty, without proper clothing, beaten and homeless, continually weary from working with their hands, slandered as if they were filth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio 64v 2 Cor. 4:9</td>
<td>Timothy and RP were persecuted (same verb as RP uses to describe himself as persecutor).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 2: Statements of Contemporaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographical Source: Codex Sinaiticus</th>
<th>Statements of Contemporaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim. 1:1</td>
<td>Apostle of Christ Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim. 1:12</td>
<td>Appointed by Jesus Christ, our master to diakonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim. 1:13</td>
<td>Previously a persecutor, violent man and blasphemer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim. 2:7</td>
<td>Herald, apostle, didaskalos of Gentiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim. 3:14</td>
<td>He is writing these things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim. 1:15</td>
<td>Co-workers have turned away from him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim. 1:16</td>
<td>Onesiphorus provided hospitality even those he was a chained prisoner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim. 2:9</td>
<td>Chained Prisoner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim. 4:10</td>
<td>Demas deserted him, Crescens went to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim. 4:11</td>
<td>Luke is present, RP wants Mark to come because he is useful for diakonian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim. 4:16</td>
<td>At his first defense, nobody came, and everyone deserted him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:1</td>
<td>Slave of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlm 1</td>
<td>prisoner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlm 9</td>
<td>Old man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlm 13</td>
<td>Hopes to keep Onesimus for diakonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlm 19</td>
<td>Wrote this with my own hand – promise to repay debt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlm 22</td>
<td>Asks Philemon to prepare him a guest room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlm 23</td>
<td>He and Epaphras are imprisoned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlm 24</td>
<td>Mark, Aristarchus, Demas and Luke are co-workers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3: Statements of Historians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Statement of Historian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts 16:37</td>
<td>Paul was beaten and he stated he was a Roman citizen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 23:27</td>
<td>Claudius Lysias has indicated that RP is a Roman citizen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Peter 3:14</td>
<td>RP is their beloved brother who wrote to them according to the wisdom he was given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts of Paul and Thecla</td>
<td>Shackled in prison, pursued and beaten, physical description may concur with Philemon “thin-haired on head”, short, crooked legs, good state of body, joining eyebrows, and hooked nose, full of grace, sometimes appearing as a man and sometimes with the face of an angel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Clement Orient, folio 3065</td>
<td>Apostle, endured despite jealousy and strife.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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