

## Paul within Judaism: Identity and Tensions

### Introduction

His identity card records the following data: Paul (Saul), Hebrew, Israelite (cf. Rom 11,1), son of Abraham (cf. 2Cor 11,22), of the tribe of Benjamin (cf. Rom 11,1; Phil 3,5), a Jew (cf. Gal 2,15) and a Pharisee (cf. Phil 3,5). As far as we can tell, his ID was never torn up nor cancelled, but it received a black mark on five occasions on account of the beating of the forty lashes less one (cf. 2Cor 11,24) for the sake of Jesus Christ. The data seem to be established and have no need of further verification, but one of the issues posed by contemporary scholars is whether Paul was a good or a bad Jew.<sup>1</sup> What, then, is the relationship between Paul and Judaism? The debate is at the heart of lively discussions since Paul is still being fought for between Hellenism and Judaism, in so far as we may refer to a period in which there existed a Judaism that was Hellenistic.<sup>2</sup> Confining our attention to the Jewish background, is it more appropriate to think of Paul and Judaism,<sup>3</sup> of the Judaism of Paul<sup>4</sup> or of Paul within Judaism? And to what form of Judaism are we to re-

<sup>1</sup> M. BARTH, «Der gute Jude Paulus», in A. BAUDIS ET AL. (edd.), *Richte unsere FüÙe auf den Weg des Friedens. FS H. Gollwitzer*, München 1979, 132; S.E. PORTER, «Was Paul a Good Jew? Fundamental Issues in a Current Debate», in S.E. PORTER – B.W.R. PEARSON (edd.), *Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries* (JSNT.S 192), Sheffield 2000, 148-174.

<sup>2</sup> To M. Hengel is chiefly due the overcoming of the dichotomy between Judaism and Hellenism. Cf. M. HENGEL, *The «Hellenization» of Judaea in the First Century after Christ*, London 1989. On the presumed double (for some triple, if one considers his Roman citizenship) identity of Paul between Judaism and Hellenism cf. A. PITTA, «Sistemi argomentativi e topologie ellenistiche nelle lettere paoline», in G. BELLIA – D. GARRIBA (edd.), *L'ellenizzazione del cristianesimo dal I al II secolo* (= *RStB* 23[2011]), Bologna 2011, 43-44.

<sup>3</sup> D.A. HAGNER, «Paul and Judaism. The Jewish Matrix of Early Christianity: Issues in the Current Debate», in *BBR* 3(1993), 111-130.

<sup>4</sup> M. NANOS, «Paul and Judaism: Why Not Paul's Judaism», in M. GIVEN (ed.), *Paul Unbound: Other Perspectives on Paul*, Peabody, MA 2010, 117-160; M.F. BIRD,

late him: Palestinian, Diaspora, or both? Instead of thinking of a *Common Judaism*, as held by E.P. Sanders, would it not be more appropriate to speak of Judaisms or of pluralistic Judaism?

In recent decades, the contributions of scholars of Jewish origin on Paul have shown themselves to be particularly fruitful and have opened up new perspectives.<sup>5</sup> In addition to the classical contributions of W.D. Davies,<sup>6</sup> J.G. Klausner,<sup>7</sup> C.G. Montefiore<sup>8</sup> and H.-J. Schoeps,<sup>9</sup> we note those of S. Ben-Chorin,<sup>10</sup> D. Boyarin,<sup>11</sup> S.J.D. Cohen,<sup>12</sup> P.M. Eisenbaum,<sup>13</sup> D. Flusser,<sup>14</sup> P. Lapide,<sup>15</sup> H. Maccoby,<sup>16</sup> M. Nanos,<sup>17</sup>

---

«Salvation in Paul's Judaism», in R. BIERINGER – D. POLLEFEY (edd.), *Paul and Judaism. Crosscurrents in Pauline Exegesis and the Study of Jewish-Christian Relations* (LNTS 463), London-New York 2012, 15-40.

<sup>5</sup> S. MEISSNER, *Die Heimholung des Ketzers. Studien zur jüdischen Auseinandersetzung mit Paulus* (WUNT 2.87), Tübingen 1996, is a detailed monograph which, after having presented the scholars of Jewish origin on Paul from 1800 to the end of the last century, concentrates its attention on their interpretation of Pauline mysticism, Christology, the Torah and the halakhah for the Gentiles. More recent bibliographical surveys are those of A. SEGAL, «Paul et ses exégètes juifs contemporains», in *RSR* 94(2006), 413-441; M.F. BIRD – P.M. SPRINKLE, «Jewish Interpretation of Paul in the Last Thirty Years», in *CBR* 6(2008), 355-376; D.R. LANGTON, *The Apostle Paul in the Jewish Imagination. A Study in Modern Jewish-Christian Relations*, Cambridge 2010.

<sup>6</sup> W.D. DAVIES, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, Philadelphia, PA 41980 (1948).

<sup>7</sup> J.G. KLAUSNER, *Von Jesus zu Paulus*, Jerusalem 1950.

<sup>8</sup> C.G. MONTEFIORE, *Judaism and St. Paul: Two Essays*, London 1914.

<sup>9</sup> H.-J. SCHOEPS, *Paulus: die Theologie des Apostels im Lichte der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte*, Tübingen 1959.

<sup>10</sup> S. BEN-CHORIN, *Paulus. Der Völkerapostel in jüdischer Sicht*, München 61998 (1970).

<sup>11</sup> D. BOYARIN, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*, Berkeley, CA 1994.

<sup>12</sup> S.J.D. COHEN, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (HCS 31), Berkeley, CA 1999; ID., «From Permission to Prohibition: Paul and the Early Church on Mixed Marriage», in T.G. CASEY – J. TAYLOR (edd.), *Paul's Jewish Matrix*, Rome 2011, 259-291.

<sup>13</sup> P.M. EISENBAUM, «Paul, Polemics, and the Problem of Essentialism», in *BibInt* 13(2005), 224-238.

<sup>14</sup> D. FLUSSER, «Paulus of Tarsus», in *Encyclopedia Judaica*, XV, 696-697; ID., *Judaism and the Origin of Christianity*, Jerusalem 2009, 75-87 («From the Essenes to Romans 9:24-33»).

<sup>15</sup> P. LAPIDE, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Qumran. Fehldeutungen und Übersetzungsfehler*, Gütersloh 1993.

<sup>16</sup> H. MACCOBY, *The Mythmaker: Paul and the Invention of Christianity*, New York 1986.

<sup>17</sup> NANOS, «Paul and Judaism»; ID., «The Myth of the "Law-Free" Paul Standing Between Christians and Jews», in *SCIR* 4(2009), 1-21.

S. Sandmel,<sup>18</sup> D.R. Schwartz,<sup>19</sup> A. Segal,<sup>20</sup> G.G. Stroumsa<sup>21</sup> and J. Taubes.<sup>22</sup> As it is natural, each one presents a different picture of Paul and Judaism, but the growing interest deserves consideration.

Before entering in *medias res*, it is necessary to state two methodological premisses which ought, in our opinion, to orient the research: the structure of the communities to which Paul sends his letters; and the restriction of the analysis to his autobiographical epistles. In fact, the relationship with Judaism changes between the period of the authorial letters (the years 50 CE), that of the early Pauline tradition (between 65 and 70 CE) and that of the later Pauline tradition (between 70 and 80 CE), at least on account of the fast developments of the Christian movement and over the complex vision of the Law. Among the various topics involved, we shall examine closely the relationship between the Pauline churches, «the Church of God» and Judaism, the Pharisaic movement and the adaptability, the nature and the function of Israel, and the nexus between the old covenant, the new covenant and the Mosaic Law.

## The house churches

The relationship between Paul and Judaism is often treated in isolation from his communities, and it is forgotten that this constitutes its inseparable filter and one which conditions it.<sup>23</sup> Let us seek, then, to describe in a schematic way the ethnical and religious shapes of the churches to which the Pauline letters are directed, prescindendo from the domestic community of Philemon, on which the data which have come down to us are too scanty and, in any case, insignificant when it comes to the relationship between Paul and Judaism.

<sup>18</sup> S. SANDMEL, *The Genius of Paul: A Study in History*, Philadelphia, PA 1979 (1958).

<sup>19</sup> D.R. SCHWARTZ, «“Someone who considers something to be impure – for him it is impure” (Rom 14:14): Good Manners or Law?», in CASEY – TAYLOR (edd.), *Paul’s Jewish Matrix*, 293-309.

<sup>20</sup> A.F. SEGAL, *Paul the Convert: The Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*, New Haven, CT 1990.

<sup>21</sup> G.G. STROUMSA, *The end of sacrifice. Religious transformations in late antiquity*, Chicago, IL 2009 (orig. fr. 2005).

<sup>22</sup> J. TAUBES, *The Politische Theologie des Paulus*, München 1993.

<sup>23</sup> See the analogous remark of W.S. CAMPBELL, *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity*, London-New York 2008, 9.

Some dissenting opinions notwithstanding,<sup>24</sup> there is wide agreement that 1 Thessalonians is addressed to a mixed community, with a minority of Jewish origin (cf. Acts 17,1 with the mention of a synagogue of the Jews) and a Gentile majority.<sup>25</sup> The pre-Pauline fragment of 1Thess 1,9-10 which refers to the conversion of the addressees «from idols to serve a living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, Jesus who delivers us from the wrath to come», reflects the typical language of Jewish propaganda against idolatry. The metaphors used in 1Thess 4,16-17 to describe the parousia of Christ are predominantly Jewish and hark back to the apocalyptic tradition. The invective against the Jews who are impeding Paul's preaching to the Gentiles in 1Thess 2,16 (ἔφθασεν δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος) should not be considered as a later gloss, rather it ought to be seen in a relationship, more or less direct, with the *Testament of Levi* 6,11 (ἔφθασεν δὲ ἡ ὀργὴ Κυρίου ἐπ' αὐτοὺς εἰς τέλος).<sup>26</sup> As can be observed, the parallel is substantial and is explained not in the context of antisemitic polemic but rather of inter-Jewish or intra-community dispute.<sup>27</sup>

Mixed too are the domestic communities to which the Corinthian correspondence is addressed, with a Gentile majority and a Jewish minority.<sup>28</sup> Apart from the denotations in Acts 18,1-4, the famous marble inscription found near the market attests the Jewish presence in Corinth and confirms the use of the Semitic language which runs through, mainly, 1 Corinthians: τὸ πάσχα in 1Cor 5,7 in allusion to the paschal sacrifice of Christ; μαράνα θά given without translation in 1Cor 16,22; the mention of the feast of πεντηκοστή in 1Cor 16,8; the allusion to the first (working) day after the sabbath in 1Cor 16,2. Conversely, in 1Cor 12,2, Paul recalls the Gentile origin of a great

<sup>24</sup> C.S. DE VOS, *Church and Community Conflicts: The Relationships of the Thessalonian, Corinthian, and Philippian Churches with their wider Civic Communities* (SBL.DS 168), Atlanta, GA 1999, 130-136 who, because of the lack of archaeological evidence, considers the «church of the Thessalonians» to be solely of Gentile origin.

<sup>25</sup> M. TELLBE, *Paul Between Synagogue and State: Christians, Jews and Civic Authorities in 1 Thessalonians, Romans and Philippians*, Stockholm 2001, 90-93.

<sup>26</sup> A. PITTA, *Sinossi paolina bilingue*, F. FILANNINO – A. LANDI coll., Cinisello Balsamo (MI) 2013, 80.

<sup>27</sup> K. DONFRIED, *Paul, Thessalonians and Early Christianity*, London-New York 2002; J.Y. LAMP, «Is Paul Anti-Jewish? Testament of Levi 6 in the Interpretation of 1 Thessalonians 2:13-16», in *CBQ* 65(2003), 408-427.

<sup>28</sup> For further details, cf. A. PITTA, *La Seconda Lettera ai Corinzi*, Roma 2006, 31-42.

number of the Corinthians when they were drawn towards dumb idols. On the other hand, only where adherents of Gentile origin exist does the question emerge of meat offered to idols as in the section of 1Cor 8,1–11,1.

By contrast, the communities of central Galatia are made up only of Gentiles, given to polytheistic worship (cf. Gal 4,7-11).<sup>29</sup> The case of the Galatian communities is anomalous since it is a question of small domestic churches (cf. ἐκκλησίαις in Gal 1,2), scattered in the Anatolian region around Ankyra, Tavium and Pessinus, who had no contact with the Jewish God before the preaching of Paul. In a substantial way, for the first time, the polemic on circumcision and the Law emerges, since the Galatians are all for submitting themselves to the Law and to circumcision (cf. Gal 1,5-10) at the instigation of some of Paul's adversaries who are of Jewish origin but believers in Christ.

The domestic churches to which the Letter to the Romans is addressed present a further typology: here we have believers of Jewish origin and Gentiles who have adhered to Christ not by separating from but through the mediation of Roman Judaism.<sup>30</sup> On such a framework, it is worth quoting the comment of Ambrosiaster (fourth century CE) who, among other things, originates from the same Roman environment: «It is known, then, that, in the time of the apostles, some Jews were living in Rome since they were subjects of the Roman Empire. And, among these, those who had believed taught the Romans to keep the Law although confessing Christ».<sup>31</sup> Only this letter was sent to domestic communities which had not been founded by Paul but evangelised before his arrival in the imperial capital. However, the list of Romans 16,1-23 shows that Paul knows various members of the Roman communities well and writes, among other things, to defend himself from defamation as an antinomian (cf. Rom 3,8) and to resolve the conflict between the strong and the weak over questions of Jewish dietary laws (cf. Rom 14,1–15,13).<sup>32</sup>

<sup>29</sup> A. PITTA, *Lettera ai Galati. Introduzione, versione e commento* (SOC 9), Bologna 2000, 27-35.

<sup>30</sup> R. PENNA, *Le prime comunità cristiane. Persone, tempi, luoghi, forme, credenze*, Roma 2011, 82-104.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. H.J. VOGELS (ed.), *Ambrosiastri qui dicitur commentarius in epistulas Pauli. Ad Romanos* (CSEL 81), Vienna 1966, 1.

<sup>32</sup> A. PITTA, *Paolo, la Scrittura e la Legge. Antiche e nuove prospettive* (CSB 57), Bologna 2010, 161-169.

Finally, the addressees of the Letter to the Philippians are believers of Gentile origin, most of them Romanised, who had never come into contact with Judaism before the preaching of Paul.<sup>33</sup> In my opinion, Phil 3,2's sharp invective against «the dogs, the evil-workers and the circumcision» takes on more the character of a preventative strategy against some adversaries of Paul who are believers in Christ and of Jewish origin,<sup>34</sup> rather than an apology against those at Philippi who do not share in his preaching.

So then, while all the Pauline communities exhibit domestic structures and appear for the main in the most important urban centres of the empire (except for the villages of Galatia and the colony of Philippi), they enjoy different relations with the Judaism of the Diaspora.

From the social perspective, the hypothesis of W. Meeks remains valid in its broad outlines. He suggests regarding the first Christian communities as analogous to the synagogues, the voluntary cultic associations and philosophical schools like the Stoa.<sup>35</sup> As one can see, we are dealing with a hybrid or interstitial structure, which does not yet make a neat distinction between the Pauline churches and the synagogues of the Diaspora. Thus, it is not necessary, nor appropriate to choose one assembly model compared with another;<sup>36</sup> rather, it is preferable to respect the structures of the first domestic churches in connection with the environments in which they arose. If at Corinth and Rome, the domestic churches continue to entertain relations with

<sup>33</sup> A. PITTA, *Lettera ai Filippesi. Nuova versione, introduzione e commento*, Milano 2010, 21-28.

<sup>34</sup> I disagree with M. NANOS, «Paul's Reversal of Jews Calling Gentile "Dogs"» (Philippians 3:2): 1600 Years of an Ideological Tale Wagging an Exegetical Dogs?», in *BibInt* 17(2009), 448-482, who, in order to correct the anti-Jewish interpretation of Phil 3,2, thinks of Gentile opponents. Those who are called «evil-workers, dogs and circumcision» are not just Jews but believers in Christ of Jewish origin, as the use of «evil-workers» in the rest of the Pauline corpus demonstrates. However, in this case too, the polemic is intramural and not extramural.

<sup>35</sup> W.A. MEEKS, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, New Haven, CT 1983, 75-84. On the balance sheet for the research initiated by Meeks, cf. T.D. STILL – D.G. HORRELL (edd.), *After the First Urban Christians. The Social-Scientific Study of Pauline Christianity Twenty-Five Years Later*, London 2009.

<sup>36</sup> S.K. STOWERS, «Does Pauline Christianity Resemble a Hellenistic Philosophy?», in T. ENGBERG-PEDERSEN (ed.), *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, Louisville, KY 2001, 100: «Even though Christianity did not derive from philosophy in any direct way, but from Judaism, it shared the structural features that made it philosophy-like».

the synagogues,<sup>37</sup> at Thessalonica and Philippi they seem to be closer to the voluntary cultic associations.<sup>38</sup> And, in my opinion, it is for such new phenomena that, Paul prefers to use the substantive ἐκκλησία, one that is certainly marked with a less religious character than συναγωγή, a word which he avoids completely in his letters.<sup>39</sup> In the face of such a hybrid phenomenon, what is the relationship between what Paul calls the «Church of God» and Judaism?

### The Church of God within Judaism

Two thousand years of history weigh, decisively, on the interpretation of some of Paul's statements which seem evident but which are really nothing of the kind! We refer in particular to the statements of Gal 1,13-14 in which he twice employs the term Ἰουδαϊσμός – a unique case among the writings of the NT. At first glance, it seems that, on the one hand, there is Judaism and on the other hand, the ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ which, in the past, he sought to destroy. The step towards the antithesis between Judaism and Christianity is a short one, but one which we hold to be anachronistic from the historical point of view. In fact, precisely the attention addressed to persecution in the relationships of that which he calls *a posteriori* «the Church of God» shows that this was not yet separate from Judaism with a life of its own.

Let us clarify first of all that, in both cases, Paul speaks of «Judaism» in the singular and not in the plural, by contrast with those who today prefer to employ the plural «Judaisms».<sup>40</sup> The substantive Ἰουδαϊσμός is rare in the LXX and in the para-testamental literature: it is found only in the Maccabean *corpus* (cf. 2Mac 2,21; 8,1; 14,38[bis]; 4Mac 4,26), that is to say, in a context where there is a concern to safeguard not the relationship with Hellenism, but rather the political and religious identity of the Jewish people in conditions of captivity under the Syrian dominion. The mention of Paul's own zeal too in Gal 1,12-13

<sup>37</sup> J.M.G. BARCLAY, *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews* (WUNT 275), Tübingen 2011.

<sup>38</sup> R.S. ASCOUGH, *Paul's Macedonian Association: The Social Context of Philippians and 1 Thessalonians* (WUNT 2.161), Tübingen 2003.

<sup>39</sup> P. TREBILCO, «Why Did the Early Christians Call Themselves ἡ ἐκκλησία», in *NTS* 57(2011), 440-460.

<sup>40</sup> J. NEUSNER, *Studying Classical Judaism*, Louisville, KY 1991, 31-35; G. BOCCACCINI, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. – 200 C.E.*, Minneapolis, MN 1991; A. DESTRO – M. PESCE, «Come è nato il cristianesimo», in *ASE* 21(2004), 533-543.

directs us to the politico-religious acceptance of the term «Judaism» providing that we make clear, however, that in the first century there did not exist a religion which did not have civil or political implications.<sup>41</sup> The *hapax legomenon* ἰουδαΐζειν, which is found in Gal 2,14 for the NT, alludes to the Judaizing of the Gentiles on the occasion of table-sharing with the Jews and so refers to the dietary rules which caused the famous Antioch incident and which distinguish Jews from Gentiles. Thus, at least in the first century CE, the term Ἰουδαϊσμός assumes a force that is more politico-religious<sup>42</sup> than ethnic.<sup>43</sup>

An analogous emphasis ought to be true for «the Church of God» (cf. Gal 1,13) which, in practice, is identified with the «Churches of Judaea» (cf. Gal 1,22) subjected to persecution within Palestinian Judaism (cf. Gal 1,23). In such a context, the substantive ἐκκλησία has not only the political meaning borrowed from the Hellenistic environment,<sup>44</sup> but also a religious one;<sup>45</sup> and it is already being used with this force in the LXX.<sup>46</sup>

These clarifications ought to be sufficient to indicate that the Church of God spoken of in Gal 1,13-24 is not opposed, or much less an alternative to Judaism, rather it is internal to it, and that the persecution carried out by Paul is not an invention of the author of Acts,<sup>47</sup> but rather goes back to his autobiography. Perhaps it is necessary to recognise that in the section Acts 7-9 the tones of the contrasts are more exaggerated inasmuch as they reflect the growing conflict between Judaism and the first Christian communities after 70 CE, but

<sup>41</sup> PITTA, «Sistemi argomentativi», 54 with extra-NT parallels on the politico-religious importance of ἐκκλησία.

<sup>42</sup> R. PENNA, *Vangelo e inculturazione. Studi sul rapporto tra rivelazione e cultura nel Nuovo Testamento*, Cinisello Balsamo (MI) 2001, 65 which appropriately distinguishes Judaism (religious acceptance) from Hebraism (ethnic acceptance) («Che cosa significava essere giudeo al tempo e nella terra di Gesù. Problemi e proposte»).

<sup>43</sup> S.C. MIMOUNI, «Les “origines” du mouvement chrétien entre 30 et 135: Des réflexions et des remarques», in *ASE* 21(2004), 463.

<sup>44</sup> But cf. G. BARBAGLIO, *Gesù di Nazaret e Paolo di Tarso. Confronto storico*, Bologna 2006, 214; PENNA, *Le prime comunità cristiane*, 23.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. TUCIDIDE, *Storie* 67,2,2 with regard to the assembly gathered in the sacred precinct of Cologne; and *CIG* 2271 *à propos* of a cultic association.

<sup>46</sup> On the «church of God» in the Pauline corpus, cf. 1Cor 1,2; 10,32; 15,9; 2Cor 1,1. The formula has an Old Testament stamp and refers to the ἐκκλησία κυρίου of Deut 23,2.3 (twice).4.9; Neh 13,1. Cf., moreover, the variant «the Church of the people of God» in Gdc 20,2.

<sup>47</sup> Pace L.J. LIETAERT PEERBOLTE, *Paul the Missionary*, Leuven 2003, 176-178.

were not invented by Luke. Following his adhesion to Christ, Paul himself underwent the forty lashes less one at the hands of a Jewish tribunal (cf. 2Cor 11,24). The persecutions undergone by the «churches of Judaea», mentioned in Gal 1,22 are already evoked indirectly in 1Thess 2,14 with regard to the analogous persecutions which the Thessalonians are undergoing from their compatriots just like «the churches of God which are in Judaea in Christ Jesus».<sup>48</sup> From this point of view, E.P. Sanders puts it well: «*Punishment implies inclusion*. If Paul had considered that he had withdrawn from Judaism, he would not have attended synagogue. If the members of the synagogue had considered him an outsider, they would not have punished him».<sup>49</sup>

The relations between Judaism and the churches of Judaea, idealised as «the Church of God» show that, in the years 60 CE, the parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity had not yet been completed.<sup>50</sup> The process is underway, but it is not yet finished. With the admission of the Gentiles into the «Church of God», without Judaising them but remaining as such, Paul plays a role of the first importance, but the Christian movement does not yet present the features of an independent religion. Among other things, the existence of the churches of Judaea, which Paul seeks to destroy, attests how inappropriate it is to attribute to him the invention of Christianity: before him there was no such thing; rather, there existed the concrete domestic churches which he was seeking to destroy.

It would be anachronistic, therefore to identify «the Church of God» with «Christianity», something which will begin to be spoken of only with the letters of Ignatius and in a contest which requires its own examination: «To profess Jesus Christ while continuing to follow Jewish customs is an absurdity. The Christian faith does not look to Judaism, but Judaism looks to Christianity, in which every other race and tongue that confesses a belief in God has now been comprehended» (*To the Magnesians* 10,3). If we prefer the term «Judaism» instead of Judaisms it is not because we share the idea of a *Common Judaism*,

<sup>48</sup> It is difficult to establish whether the Jews in 1Thess 2,14 are Pharisees, as maintained by B. CHILTON, «Paul and the Pharisees», in J. NEUSNER – B.D. CHILTON (edd.), *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, Waco, TX 2007, 172. The hints are too general to point at the Pharisees.

<sup>49</sup> E.P. SANDERS, *Paul, the Law and the Jewish People*, London 1983, 192.

<sup>50</sup> J.D.G. DUNN, *The Partings of the Ways between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*, London-Philadelphia, PA 1991.

proposed by E.P. Sanders,<sup>51</sup> given that there does not exist in the first-century a normative Judaism, but because the peculiarities assumed by Palestinian, Egyptian, Syrian (Asia Minor) and Italian (not only Roman) Judaism, concern not different political and religious identities, but rather the same Judaism.<sup>52</sup> P. Sacchi is much to the point here: «While there have been many ways of being Jewish, if the Jew always saw himself to be such it seems to me that we should maintain a unitary term; “currents” (plural) of Judaism (singular)». <sup>53</sup> However, we have been freed from an unfortunate conception of Judaism, seen as a sectarian and legalistic religion by contrast with Christianity, understood as a universal religion and one of grace, and for this we must give credit to E.P. Sanders.<sup>54</sup>

### The Pharisaic movement and adaptability

Perhaps M. Hengel is not entirely wrong when, in treating of the Pharisaic origin of Paul, he wrote that very probably, if he had not declared himself to be a Pharisee in Phil 3,5 «historical criticism would dismiss Luke’s “I am a Pharisee, the son of Pharisees” as a typically Lukan invention». <sup>55</sup> In fact the Lukan Paul declares of himself to be a Pharisee (Acts 23,6), and to have been brought up in the movement or current (αἵρεσις), which he describes as the «most accurate» (ἀκριβεστάτην) and not «the most rigid» of his time (cf. Acts 26,5). Thus there is no rational motive to underestimate the Lukan observations. It remains only to describe, not so much whether Paul was a Hillelite<sup>56</sup> or

<sup>51</sup> E.P. SANDERS, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism; A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, London 1977.

<sup>52</sup> J.M.G. BARCLAY, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)*, Edinburgh 1998.

<sup>53</sup> P. SACCHI, *The History of the Second Temple Period*, Sheffield 2000, 307. Also reticent is CAMPBELL, *Paul and the creation of Christian Identity*, 141.

<sup>54</sup> In addition to the works cited, cf. E.P. SANDERS, *Judaism: Practice and Belief (63 B.C. – 66 A.D.)*, London 1992. Cf. the primacy of grace in Judaism demonstrated by C.H. TALBERT, «Paul, Judaism, and Revisionists», in *CBQ* 63(2001), 1-22.

<sup>55</sup> M. HENGEL, «The pre-Christian Paul», in J. LIEU – J. NORTH – T. RAJAK (edd.), *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*, London-New York 1992, 36.

<sup>56</sup> J. JEREMIAS, «Paulus als Hillelit», in E.E. ÉLLIS – E. WILCOX (edd.), *Neotestamentica et Semitica. FS M. Black*, Edinburgh 1969, 88-94. With regard to the halakhic relationships between the Gamaliel of the rabbinic sources and Paul, cf. B.D. CHILTON – J. NEUSNER, «Paul and Gamaliel», in NEUSNER – CHILTON (edd.), *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, 175-223.

a Shammaite,<sup>57</sup> as his historical contribution to the movement since – a fact that is rarely remarked on – he is the only Pharisee whose writings have come down to us.<sup>58</sup>

Now in the sources on the Pharisaic movement which have survived, two contrasting considerations exist: one which presents it as rigid and intransigent and the other which writes it off as a school of easy interpretations. The first opinion emerges in the gospel writings and, in particular, on the occasion of Jesus' polemics against the Pharisees (cf. Mt 23,2-29); the second goes back to the writings of Qumran. This is the description of the Pharisaic movement in the *Nahum Pesher*: «Its interpretation concerns the Angry Lion <sup>7</sup>[who filled his cave with a mass of corpses, carrying out rev]enge against those looking for easy interpretations, who hanged living men <sup>8</sup>[from the tree, committing an atrocity which had not been committed] since ancient times, for it is [hor]rible for the one hanged alive from the tree» (4QpNah fr. 3-4 col I).<sup>59</sup>

The Qumran fragment alludes to Alexander Jannaeus, who, in the first century BCE, caused the crucifixion of eight hundred Pharisees, described as «those looking for easy interpretations».<sup>60</sup> The tendency of the Pharisaic movement to adapt the Law and the Jewish traditions to the multiple situations of the social life of the people is confirmed by Josephus who, in his *Jewish Antiquities* 13,297, informs us: «For the present I wish merely to explain that the Pharisees had passed on to the people certain regulations handed down by former generations and not recorded in the Laws of Moses, for which reason they are rejected by the Sadducean group, who hold that only those regulations should be considered valid which were written down (in Scripture),

<sup>57</sup> H. HÜBNER, *Law in Paul's Thought. A Contribution to the Development of Pauline Theology*, London-New York 1984 (ger. 1978), 19; N.T. WRIGHT, *The New Testament and the People of God*, London-Minneapolis, MN 1992, I, 201-202.

<sup>58</sup> Here, I hope to take up and expand what was written in A. PITTA, «Paul, the Pharisee and the Law», in CASEY – TAYLOR (edd.), *Paul's Jewish Matrix*, 99-122.

<sup>59</sup> F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ – E.J.C. TIGCHELAAR (edd.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls; Study Edition*, Grand Rapids, MI 1997, I, 337.

<sup>60</sup> D. FLUSSER, «Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes in Pesher Nahum», in *Judaism of the Second Temple Period. I, Qumran and Apocalypticism*, Grand Rapids, MI-Cambridge 2007, 214-257; J.J. COLLINS, «Reading for History in the Dead Sea Scrolls», in *DSD* 18(2011), 295-315 (especially 301-314).

and that those which had been handed down by former generations (lit. "by the fathers") need not be observed». <sup>61</sup>

It is no accident that the «traditions of my fathers» mentioned in Gal 1,14, in the context of Paul's past in Judaism, correspond to τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων of Mk 7,3.5, in the context of Pharisaic polemics, and to the «the tradition of the fathers» which Josephus mentions in connection with the Pharisees. We thus arrive at the flexibility with which Paul tackles the situations of his communities, following the pairing between Scripture and the oral traditions which is typical of the Pharisaic movement. As for the method of argument, it seems that Paul's flexibility derives from the influence of Stoicism; <sup>62</sup> and the background is likely. However, it is timely to remember that Josephus, even if in a summary way, compares the Pharisees to the Stoics (cf. *Life* 1,12) <sup>63</sup> and that Paul's flexibility hinges principally on Scripture and the traditions of the fathers.

With regard to the first area, we distinguish the hermeneutic of Scripture, the use of biblical citations, and the chief rules of interpretation. In the area of the hermeneutic of Scripture, Paul opposes the γράμμα to the Spirit (cf. 2Cor 3,6; Rom 2,29; 7,6), in favour of the Spirit. However, he does not equate the γράμμα with the νόμος, on account of the fact that the νόμος too is πνευματικός (cf. Rom 7,14), while between the γράμμα and the πνεῦμα there is total incompatibility. Therefore, his is a typological/allegorical hermeneutic of Scripture which does not neatly distinguish the first process from the second. As far as we can understand it, in 1Cor 10,1-10 there occurs an allegorical typology where, by means of the use of the substantive τύποι in v. 6, Paul re-reads in a typological manner the connections between the events of the Exodus and those of the community of Corinth. However, the correspondence between the rock and Christ in 1Cor 10,4 is allegorical and not typological. Conversely, despite the explicit and rare substantivized participle ἀλληγορούμενα (cf. Gal 4,24) as a result of which Hagar and Sarah are interpreted as two covenants in Gal 4,29, the correspondence by means of the adverbs τότε and οὕτως καὶ

<sup>61</sup> R. MARCUS, *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities* (LCL 365), Cambridge, MA-London 1976, 377.

<sup>62</sup> C.E. GLAD, «Paul and Adaptability», in J.P. SAMPLEY (ed.), *Paul in the Greco-Roman World. A Handbook*, Harrisburg, PA 2003, 17-41.

<sup>63</sup> S. MASON, «The Philosophy of Josephus's Pharisees», in *Josephus, Judea, and Christian Origins. Methods and Categories*, Peabody, MA 2009, 217-238.

vōv is more typological than allegorical. At first sight, we are surprised by the not very literal way in which Paul interprets Scripture, but an analogous, if more complex approach is encountered in Philo before him, and in the targumic literature after him. Thus, similarly to 1Cor 10,4, Philo writes in his *Allegorical Interpretation* 2,86: «For the flinty rock is the wisdom of God, which He marked off highest and chiefest from His powers, and from which He satisfies the thirsty souls that love God». <sup>64</sup>

And in continuity with Gal 4,29, the *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, the *Fragm. Targum* and the *Targum Neofiti I* render the verb «to play» (פִּתְּוּ of the MT; παίζοντα of the LXX) of Gen 21,9 with the verb «to persecute». <sup>65</sup> With these parallels, I do not intend to claim that Paul was dependent on Philo or on the targumic literature, but at least that his mode of interpretation is not quite so extravagant as it could seem to the modern reader.

The use of direct and indirect quotations from the OT in the Pauline corpus is also not literal, as well from the point of view of content as from that of the context, but is free and geared to what it is that Paul wishes to demonstrate. As a result, almost always, the original context of the quotations, drawn predominantly from one of the versions of the LXX, is different from that of the Pauline letters, with all due respect to those who insist on the intertextuality between the Pauline quotations and their scriptural sources. <sup>66</sup> In addition to the adaptation of the sources to their new contexts, a determining role in the textual variations in the Pauline quotations is played by the memorisation of Scripture, particularly as edited in the Pharisaic schools and in the environment of the synagogue. <sup>67</sup>

Finally, the use of *gezerah shewah* or isotopy between two or more passages of Scripture in sections such as 1Cor 1,18–3,20; Gal 3,6–14;

<sup>64</sup> F.H. COLSON – G.H. WHITAKER (edd.), *Philo* (LCL 226), Cambridge, MA-London 1991, 279.

<sup>65</sup> A parallel already identified by R. LE DÉAUT, «Traditions targumiques dans le corpus paulinen? (Hebr 11,4 et 12,24; Gal 4,29–30; II Cor 3,16)», in *Bib* 42(1961), 28–48 (especially 37–43). In addition, cf. M. MCNAMARA's targumic hypothesis for the famous *crux interpretum* of Gal 4,25, «Τὸ δὲ (Ἄγαρ) Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ: Paul and Petra», in *Targum and New Testament* (WUNT 279), Tübingen 2011, 460–479.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. the reservations expressed by, among others, S. HOLTHUIS, *Intertextualität. Aspekte einer rezeptionsorientierten Konzeption* (SCB 28), Tübingen 1993, 92–144.

<sup>67</sup> E.P. SANDERS, «Paul's Jewishness», in CASEY – TAYLOR (edd.), *Paul's Jewish Matrix*, 51–73.

Rom 4,1-8; 11,7-10; 15,8-12 and of *qal wahomer* or argumentation *a fortiori* in pericopes such as 2Cor 3,7-11 and Rom 5,12-21 attest how much weight Paul's Pharisaic upbringing had exercised on his Christological interpretation of Scripture.<sup>68</sup> In conclusion, A.F. Segal is right in maintaining that «Paul's letters may be more important to the history of Judaism than the rabbinic texts are to the interpretation of the Christian Scriptures».<sup>69</sup>

The other area of adaptability concerns the «traditions of the fathers», that is to say, what is called, not quite correctly, the «oral Torah», but should be called oral tradition since it assumes a secondary and functional role with regard to the Mosaic Law. As I have mentioned, the formulae «paternal traditions» or «traditions of the fathers» or «of the elders» are typical, even if not exclusive of the Pharisaic movement, and concern, chiefly, the body of unwritten practices which regulate the social life of the movement. Elsewhere, I have suggested interpreting in the context of the oral tradition the expression ἔργα νόμου of Gal 2,16 (three times); 3,2.5.10; Rom 3,20.28.<sup>70</sup> On the meaning and background of the «works of the Law», it is important to read them again in connection with 4QMMT C 3-4, where the following recommendation is made to the addressee of this *halakhic* letter: «And also we have written to you some of the *works of the Torah* (*ma'āsê hattôrâh*) which we think are good for you and for your people, for we s[a]w<sup>4</sup> that you have intellect and knowledge of the Law».<sup>71</sup> Important is both the correspondence between ἔργα νόμου and *ma'āsê hattôrâh*, and the argumentative system within which the formulae are treated. Before the passage cited, there are about twenty *halakôt* or rules of conduct; and the halakhic Letter closes thus: «And it shall be reckoned to you as justice when you do what is upright and good before him, for your good<sup>8</sup> and that of Israel» (4QMMT C 7-8).<sup>72</sup>

It will be fortuitous, but the same paradigm of the connection between *halakôt*, the works of the Law and justification is encountered

<sup>68</sup> P. BASTA, *Gezerah Shawah. Storia, forme e metodi dell'analogia biblica* (SuBib 26), Roma 2006; D.I. BREWER, *Technique and Assumption in Jewish Exegesis Before 70 CE* (TSAJ 30), Tübingen 1992; M. RASTOIN, *Tarse et Jérusalem. La double culture de l'Apôtre Paul en Galates 3,6-4,7* (AnBib 152), Roma 2003.

<sup>69</sup> SEGAL, *Paul the Convert*, 48.

<sup>70</sup> PITTA, *Paolo, la Scrittura e la Legge*, 149-155.

<sup>71</sup> MARTÍNEZ – TIGCHELAAR, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, II, 803.

<sup>72</sup> MARTÍNEZ – TIGCHELAAR, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, II, 803.

in Gal 2,16–21; 3,1-14 and in Rom 3,20-28, even if through the negative lens of that justification which is realised without the mediation of the works of the Law but rather only through faith in Christ. Concerning the first horizon, the statement of Gal 2,16 is found in the context of the Antioch incident between Paul and Cephas, that is to say, on the occasion of table-sharing between Jews and Gentiles. Now, in no statement of the Torah is it prescribed that Jews and Gentiles cannot share tables. Rather, the prescription enters into the oral or paternal traditions towards which Paul had shown himself zealous from the time of his formation in the Pharisaic movement. However, it is necessary to recognise that there is further allusion to «works of the Law» in Gal 3,1-14 and in Rom 3,20-28 where, perhaps, the more important *halakhah* comes in: that relative to crucifixion, one which we have already encountered in 4QpNah fr. 3-4 col I, that is to say, in the context of the crucifixion of the Pharisees under Alexander Jannaeus. In Gal 3,13, there is a direct allusion to the penalty of crucifixion, founded on the oral tradition around Deut 21,23: ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου.<sup>73</sup> In this case, the passage of Deut 21,23 does not allude to the punishment of crucifixion but rather to the exposing of corpses *post-mortem*. If Paul persecutes «the Church of God» or, concretely, «the Churches of Judaea», it is because the *halakhic* tradition to which he alludes in Gal 3,13-14 categorically excludes the existence of a crucified Messiah. Once he has passed over into the Christian movement, he looks again precisely at this *halakhah* which concerns not only the «identity markers» of the Pharisaic tradition, but also the way to justification: whether through faith in Christ crucified or by means of the works prescribed by the traditions of the fathers, such as the exclusion of crucifixion and the observance of dietary purity. It is thus clear how reductive it is to interpret the «works of the Law» only within the horizon of the identity which separates Jews from Gentiles or equates them with the Law, considered outside

<sup>73</sup> The changing of the verb κρεμάμενος in Deut 21,23 with the synonym ἐπικατάρατος in Gal 3,13 is due not to a different source of the LXX, but to the need to link the passage of Deut 21,23 with that of Deut 27,26 mentioned in Gal 3,11 where the verb ἐπικατάρατος is found. Thus Paul forms a *gezerah shewah* or lexical isotopy between the curse on the one who does not keep the things written in the Torah and that on crucifixion.

the paradigm of the covenant.<sup>74</sup> Against the *New Perspective*, advanced by J.D.G. Dunn,<sup>75</sup> what is in question is, above all, the way to justification and not just the identity markers which separate the Jew from the Gentile.<sup>76</sup>

If, on the one hand, therefore, Paul considers his own *curriculum* in Pharisaic Judaism as garbage because of his knowledge of Christ, on the other hand, he continues to argue and to interpret Scripture according to the education which he received in the Pharisaic movement; and it is natural, since his encounter with the Risen One on the road to Damascus transforms him radically in the content of his reasoning, but not in its mode! His recourse to oral tradition (and not to oral Torah) and his flexibility play decisive roles in interpreting Scripture and in adapting it to the situations of his communities, prescindendo from whether these are «easy interpretations» or rigid ones. By contrast with the negative features against the Pharisees to which we have become accustomed, the only time when Paul mentions his own Pharisaic past (in Phil 3,5), it is to boast of it and certainly not to reproach it.

Some scholars tend to regard primitive «Christianity» as a simple expression of Pharisaic Judaism.<sup>77</sup> My view is that the hypothesis is exaggerated and the reality is more complex. The Pharisaic movement plays a decisive role in the formation of the Christian movement, but it would be prudent to avoid a vague *pan-Pharisaism*, which risks falling into the excess opposite to that of the old kind of anti-Pharisaism.<sup>78</sup> An analogous remark goes for those who place all the Gentile who are in Christ under the so-called «Judean umbrella»;<sup>79</sup> this is valid for some, but not for all the Pauline communities.

<sup>74</sup> But cf. J.P. WARE, «Law, Christ, and Covenant: Paul's Theology of the Law in Romans 3:19-20», in *JTS* 62(2011), 513-540.

<sup>75</sup> J.D.G. DUNN, «The New Perspective on Paul: whence, what, whither?», in *The New Perspective on Paul. Collected Essays* (WUNT 185), Tübingen 2005, 1-88.

<sup>76</sup> Among the most recent critics of the *New Perspective* of J.D.G. Dunn, cf. E. LOHSE, «Christus das Gesetz Ende? Die Theologie des Apostels Paulus in kritischer Perspektive», in *ZNW* 99(2008), 18-32; C. FOCANT, «Paul, le judaïsme et la Torah. Discussion sur une nouvelle perspective», in *RTL* 42(2011), 35-52 (especially 42-43).

<sup>77</sup> CAMPBELL, *Paul and Creation of Christian Identity*, 102.

<sup>78</sup> PITTA, «Paul, the Pharisee and the Law», 99-122.

<sup>79</sup> D.K. BUELL – C.J. HODGE, «The Politics of Interpretation: The Rhetoric of Race and Ethnicity in Paul», in *JBL* 23(2004), 249.

## New Israel or elect Israel?

While Paul mentions Judaism only twice, he often dwells on Israel, above all in the section Rom 9,1–11,36.<sup>80</sup> However, on the identity of Israel too there emerge various questions and tensions. What does he understand by the expression Ἰσραήλ τοῦ θεοῦ of Gal 6,16? And how is the statement that «not all who are descended from Israel belong to Israel» of Rom 9,6b to be reconciled with Rom 11,26's «all Israel will be saved»?

In the first case, some scholars interpret the closing syntagma of the Letter to the Galatians through the ecclesiological lens, so that the Israel of God would be the new entity of the Church which would include both Jews and Gentiles who have believed in Christ.<sup>81</sup> For the interpretation of this passage, I maintain that it is important to follow a methodological criterion that is perhaps too often disregarded. In order to support a proposed solution for a *crux intepretum*, like that of Gal 6,16, it is necessary to find at least an analogous comparison in the same letter or in the rest of the Pauline corpus. Now, Paul never employs the term Ἰσραήλ in order to speak of the Church, or of Gentiles who have been converted to the gospel such as the Galatians.<sup>82</sup> Much less does he have recourse to formulae such as «new Israel» or «true Israel» which leave room for a supersessionary perspective.<sup>83</sup> In 1Cor 10,18, he goes so far as to speak of «Israel according to the flesh», but, on the other side of the balance, we do not find any «Israel according to the Spirit», or a spiritual Israel.

Rather, in Gal 6,16, he seeks the divine blessing both for those who follow the rule by which «neither circumcision counts for anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation» (cf. Gal 6,15), and upon the Israel of God. Very probably the blessing of Gal 6,16 reflects an anal-

<sup>80</sup> Keeping the attention to the authorial letters, cf. the use of Ἰσραήλ in 1Cor 10,18; 2Cor 3,7.13; Gal 6,15; Rom 9,6[bis].27[bis].31; 10,19.21; 11,2.7.25.26; Phil 3,5; cf., additionally, the less frequent Ἰσραηλίτης in 2Cor 11,22; Rom 9,4; 11,1.

<sup>81</sup> For the bibliography, cf. PITTA, *Galati*, 405.

<sup>82</sup> Pace BARCLAY, *Diaspora*, 389 who applies the expression «Israel of God» *tout-court* to the believers of Gentile origin in Galatia.

<sup>83</sup> I do not know on what basis can be sustained what HAGNER, «Paul and Judaism», 123 writes: «Christianity, for Paul, is nothing other than the faith of his ancestors come to an eschatological phase of fulfillment before the final consummation. The Christian community is the true Israel, if not the new Israel».

ogous background to that of the XIXth Benediction recorded in the *Shemoneh esreh*: «Let there be peace, salvation and blessing upon us and upon all Israel, your people». In my opinion, therefore, the conjunction *καί*, which joins those who follow the Pauline rule with the Israel of God, does not have attributive or exegetical force but is rather simply copulative.<sup>84</sup> Attention is directed, on the one hand, to those among the Galatians who follow the «rule» or canon of the new creation, and on the other hand, to the Israel which is elect and eschatological at the same time but which is not yet identified with the Church. Consequently, it would be prudent not to create a correspondence between «the Israel of God» in Gal 6,16 and the Jerusalem which is above, spoken of in Gal 4,26 which includes all the believers in Christ (Jews and Gentiles). Moreover, «the Jerusalem which is above» (ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ) is not placed in antithesis with that which is below,<sup>85</sup> but with that which is present (τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλήμ in Gal 4,25), so that we find the superposition of two categories – one chronological and the other spatial – which prevents any kind of supersessionary perspective of the one in relation to the other.

More complex is the tension between Rom 9,6b and Rom 11,26 which some do not hesitate to regard as contradictory or think that when Paul dictates Rom 9,6-29 he does not yet have the solution of Rom 11,1-36 or, finally, that the all Israel to be saved is different from the historical Israel.<sup>86</sup> The solutions advanced do not seem to be convincing for the identity of Israel in Rom 9–11. Let us make clear, first, that in Rom 9,6b-29, the focus is on protology or the original fidelity of the Word of God, while, in Rom 11,1-36, it has shifted to eschatology or the final salvation of Israel. While, from the protological point of view, Israel is identified by her election or the ἐκλογή, which is the

<sup>84</sup> S.L. JOHNSON, «Paul and “the Israel of God”: An exegetical and eschatological Case-Study», in *TMSJ* 20(2009), 41-55 (especially 52-54).

<sup>85</sup> But cf. J.-N. ALETTI, *Essai sur l'écclésiologie des lettres de Saint-Paul* (EtB 60), Pendé 2009, 97 who, with regard to the expression «Israel of God» in Gal 6,16 comments: «Qu'elle ne puisse designer l'Israël historique et concret, les expressions parallèles de Ga 4,21-31 le montrent, qui distinguent entre deux Jérusalem, celle d'en bas et celle d'en haut. L'Israël de Dieu doit être parallèle à la Jérusalem d'en haut, qui est notre mère».

<sup>86</sup> D. KIM, «Reading Paul's *καὶ οὕτως πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται* (Rom. 11:26a) in the Context of Romans», in *CTJ* 45(2010), 317-334 considers the Gentiles and the elect Jews as parts of the all Israel that is saved.

dominating theme of Rom 9,6-29, from the eschatological point of view there is a transference to the ethnic theme which is precisely that of Rom 11,1-36. However, this shift of emphasis does not imply that ethnic Israel is not also elect: Paul never comes to conclusions such as these either in the section of Rom 9–11 or in any of his other letters.

To understand the unsustainability of those hypotheses which identify «Israel» solely with the remnant or with those who have believed in Christ, it is useful to linger for a moment on the category of λαός in Rom 9–11 and in the rest of the letter.<sup>87</sup> It is significant that, before the section of Rom 9–11, Paul rarely speaks of λαός and, what is more, he does in direct quotations from the OT: 1Cor 10,7 with the quotation of Ex 32,6b; 14,21 with that of Is 28,11-12; and 2Cor 6,16 with that of Lev 26,12. In Rom 9–11 too, there is a predominance of scriptural quotations with the term λαός: Rom 9,25 (twice) with the quotation of Hos 2,25; Rom 9,26 with that of Hos 2,1b; and Rom 10,21 with that of Is 65,2. Only in Rom 11,1-2 does λαός appear in Paul's own words, but in order to allude clearly to Israel or to the people whom God has not rejected, so much so that in v. 2 there is an echo of Ps 93,14<sup>LXX</sup>: «For the Lord will not forsake his people; He will not abandon his heritage».<sup>88</sup>

That Paul prefers to employ the substantive λαός to refer to Israel and not to the Gentiles is indicated in the *florilegium* of four quotations drawn from the OT in Rom 15,9-11 where he distinguishes His (God's) λαός from the ἔθνη. In each quotation from Scripture, the term ἔθνη is found in the plural, which forms the principal *gezerah shewah*,<sup>89</sup> so that the emphasis falls on the universalism of salvation announced by the prophetic oracle of the shoot of Jesse. In their turn, the two intervening quotations of Deut 32,43 and Ps 116,1<sup>LXX</sup> also understand the term λαός referring to the people of the Lord and to πάντες οἱ λαοί to allude to all the nations. The need to have recourse to Scripture to describe the relations between the people of the Lord and the Gentiles or the nations, avoiding in practice the use of the substantive λαός in his own writing, is too consistent to be by chance.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. λαός in Rom 9,25.26; 10,21; 11,1.2; 15,10.11. For the remaining authorial letters, cf. 1Cor 10,7; 14,21; 2Cor 6,16.

<sup>88</sup> P.T. GADENZ, *Called from the Jews and from the Gentiles. Pauline Ecclesiology in Romans 9–11* (WUNT 2.267), Tübingen 2009, 226-229.

<sup>89</sup> The quotation of Ps 17,50<sup>LXX</sup> in Rom 15,9; of Deut 32,43 in Rom 15,10; of Ps 116,1<sup>LXX</sup> in Rom 15,11; and of Is 11,10 in Rom 15,12.

However, this procedure can be understood in two ways: that the concept of «people» was not so decisive, as is often supposed; or that, on the contrary, it is so central that it occurs where the authority of Scripture is cited. Because of the importance of Scripture in the Pauline letters, I maintain that the second opinion is to be preferred, but that the allusion is not to the Church,<sup>90</sup> but rather to Israel which has remained the people of the Lord. It is necessary to wait for the Pastoral Letters and, in particular, the passage of Tit 2,14, for the term λαός finally to be attributed by the later Pauline tradition to the people which Jesus Christ has redeemed and which has come into being.

Not even the model of the *Sonderweg* or of the way to salvation alternative to that which comes through Christ finds echoes in the section Rom 9,1–11,36.<sup>91</sup> On several occasions, in the intermediate subsection of Rom 9,30–10,21, Paul emphasises that salvation passes through «the narrow road of Christ» (cf. Rom 10,9). Thus, even if it is unknown, the way by which all Israel will be saved forms part of the inscrutable ways of the Lord which belong to his mystery (cf. Rom 11,33). Unfortunately, the inclusive language of Paul is often understood in an exclusive way, above all when it is a matter of soteriology; and there is a risk in ignoring the role that Israel plays in the salvation of the Gentiles.

So then, against more or less implicit forms of *supersessionism* or of substitution, for Paul, it is inappropriate to transfer the term «Israel» to the Church.<sup>92</sup> The Israel of God is not the Church, which is never described as such, but rather only and always ethnic Israel considered from the point of view of election.<sup>93</sup> To deal with the Church and to avoid any kind of ambiguity, Paul prefers to have recourse to the category of «body», which does not come from an Old Testament or Jewish matrix,

<sup>90</sup> But cf. R.W. KRAUS, *Das Volk Gottes: zur Grundlegung der Ekklesiologie bei Paulus* (WUNT 85), Tübingen 1996. For criticism of Kraus's ecclesiology, cf. ALETTI, *Essai sur l'ecclésiologie*.

<sup>91</sup> Among the critics, cf. T.L. DONALDSON, «Jewish Christianity, Israel's Stumbling and the *Sonderweg* Reading of Paul», in *JSNT* 29(2006), 27–54 who, instead of a *Sonderweg* based on the two covenants, suggests a *Sonderplatz* that is peculiar to Israel.

<sup>92</sup> J.A. STAPLES, «What the Gentiles have to do with "All Israel"? A Fresh Look at Romans 11:25–27», in *JBL* 130(2011), 389.

<sup>93</sup> But cf. B. WITHERINGTON III, *Jesus, Paul and the End of the World. A Comparative Study in New Testament Eschatology*, Downers Grove, IL 1992, 124 who *à propos* of Rom 9–11 writes: «This means that what he calls the *ekklēsia* (Jew and Gentile united in Christ) is a development of Israel, not a replacement of Israel. It may rightly be called the "true Israel" in the present age though he chooses to call it "the Israel of God"».

but originates in popular Hellenistic philosophy and, in particular, in Stoicism.<sup>94</sup> The last area in his relationship with Judaism concerns the covenant and the Law which continue to generate lively debates.

### Abrogations of the covenant and of the Law?

It is difficult to be free from the abrogatory language applied to the relations between Paul, the covenant and the Law. Such language is employed in particular in two sections of the Pauline corpus, namely in 2Cor 3,1–18 and in Rom 9,30–10,21. In the first case, the abrogatory perspective concerns the old covenant in relation to the new covenant<sup>95</sup> and, for some scholars, the Law in relation to the Spirit; in the second case, it explicitly involves the Mosaic Law.

Let us make clear, first of all, that the substantive νόμος does not appear throughout 2 Corinthians, while in 2Cor 3,6 we encounter the term γράμμα. Now, what kills is not the Mosaic Law, but rather the letter; and it kills because life comes only from the Spirit. The section of 2Cor 3,1–17 contains four times the verb καταργέω (cf. vv. 7.11.13.14) which, however, is never employed for the old covenant, but only for the glory and for the veil on Moses' face. This fundamental datum implies that the relationship between the old and the new covenant is not understood in terms of abrogation or of substitution between the one and the other. The only difference between the old and the new covenants which is maintained in 2Cor 3,1–17 concerns the veil which covers the first, while it has been completely removed through the second. Only in Christ is the veil which covers the face of Moses and distinguishes the old covenant from the new removed.

There is, therefore, no abrogatory, still less substitutionary relationship between the old and new covenants, but rather one of reciprocal concealment and revelation. And despite his declaration that the min-

<sup>94</sup> M.V. LEE, *Paul, the Stoics and the Body of Christ* (SNTSMS 157), Cambridge 2006; R. PENNA, «La chiesa come corpo di Cristo secondo S. Paolo», in *Lateranum* 68(2002), 243–257 (= R. PENNA, *Paolo e la Chiesa di Roma* [BCR 67], Brescia 2009, 209–224); A. PITTA, «Eclesiologia paulina y el cuerpo de Cristo», in FACULTAD DE TEOLOGÍA SAN DÁMASO, *Pablo y Cristo. La centralidad de Cristo en el pensamiento de San Pablo* (Collectanea Matritensia 5), Madrid 2009, 87–106; M. WALTER, *Gemeinde als Lieb Christi: Untersuchungen zum Corpus Paulinum und zu den «apostolischen Vätern»* (NTOA 49), Freiburg-Göttingen 2001.

<sup>95</sup> WITHERINGTON III, *Jesus, Paul and the end of the World*, 119.

istry of the new covenant advances with unveiled face, in 2Cor 4,3 Paul is forced to recognise that the same gospel remains veiled or hidden from those who are lost. If a metaphor can be applied to the relationship between the old covenant and the new in 2Cor 3,1-17, it is that chosen by W.D. Davies, but underestimated: «And the adjective *hadasah* in Jer. 31:33, translated *kainē* by Paul, can be applied to the new moon, which is simply the old moon in a new light».<sup>96</sup> So it is opportune to make clear that the expression *καινή διαθήκη* of 2Cor 3,6 does not refer only to the prophetic oracle of Jer 31,33, but also to the words of Jesus during the Last Supper (cf. 1Cor 11,25; Lk 22,20) so that the new covenant makes the old new by means of the blood of Christ and not by a new way of looking at the old covenant.<sup>97</sup> So the viewpoint of 2Cor 3,1-18 is not so much of a hermeneutical type, as of a salvation-historical type between the old and the new covenants.<sup>98</sup>

Concerning the relationship between Paul and the Law, while I refer to *Paul, the Scripture and the Law*, I limit my attention to Rom 10,4 and its context to establish whether the Law is to be considered abrogated or confirmed in its relationship with Christ. Depending on the meaning which is conferred on the substantive *τέλος*, three hypotheses are marked out for this famous *crux interpretum*: goal,<sup>99</sup> abrogation<sup>100</sup> or both.<sup>101</sup> Against the abrogation hypothesis, unless the

<sup>96</sup> W.D. DAVIES, «Paul from the Jewish point of view», in W. HORBURY – W.D. DAVIES – J. STURDY (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism. The early Roman Period*, Cambridge 1999, III, 722.

<sup>97</sup> T.R. BLANTON IV, «Spirit and Covenant Renewal: a Theologoumenon of Paul's Opponents in 2 Corinthians», in *JBL* 129(2010), 129-151 has sought to demonstrate that the expression «new covenant» in 2Cor 3,6 derives from Paul's adversaries and not from the words of Jesus at the Last Supper. However, while the first hypothesis is not verifiable, since Paul does not give room to the preaching of his opponents in 2 Corinthians (apart from in 2Cor 10,10 which does not concern the relationship between the two covenants), the second finds a resonance in 1Cor 11,25.

<sup>98</sup> S.J. HAFEMANN, *Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel: The Letter/Spirit Contrast and the Argument from Scripture in 2 Corinthians 3* (WUNT 81), Tübingen 1995.

<sup>99</sup> Beside R. BADENAS, *Christ the End of the Law: Romans 10.4 in Pauline Perspective* (JSNT.S 10), Sheffield 1985, 38-80; see S.R. BECHTLER, «Christ, the τέλος of the Law: The Goal of Romans 10:4», in *CBQ* 56(1994), 288-308.

<sup>100</sup> T.R. SCHREINER, «Paul's View of the Law in Romans 10:4-5», in *WTJ* 55(1993), 113-135; J.P. HEIL, «Christ, the Termination of the Law (Romans 9:30-10:8)», in *CBQ* 63(2001), 484-498.

<sup>101</sup> Among the most recent upholders of the ambiguous hypothesis, cf. I. JOLIVET, «Christ the ΤΕΛΟΣ in Romans 10:4 as both fulfillment and termination of the Law», in *RdQ* 51(2009), 13-30 (especially 16).

Pauline vision of the Law is to be considered contradictory within the same letter, the relationship with Rom 3,31 is useful. There Paul himself asks whether the Law has been abrogated (νόμον οὖν καταργούμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως;) and replies with a peremptory μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ νόμον ἱσχύνομεν. As for the ambiguous hypothesis which considers the Law in relation to Christ as, at one and the same time, fulfilled and abrogated, at first sight, it seems the most viable: confirmed in its revelatory value, the law would be abrogated in its soteriological function. As regards the first, the revelatory standpoint would be found in Rom 9,30–10,3, while the second perspective would be demonstrated in Rom 10,5-21. In fact, precisely in the developments of the latter demonstration, there appears the question of the way to salvation or justification – whether by means of faith or the Law – and not the relationship between Christ and the Law as such. Rather, in Rom 9,4-5, both the Law (νομοθεσία) and «the Christ according to the flesh» belong to the gifts of God which in Rom 11,29 will be described as «irrevocable» for his people. Moreover, the ambiguous hypothesis (confirmation and abrogation) does not answer to the style of Paul, in the sense that, as far as I know, he never uses a single term, such as τέλος, with a double value that is both confirmatory or abrogatory at one and the same time.<sup>102</sup> Thus, the confirmatory hypothesis seems to be the only viable one: the goal and not the end of the Law is Christ for the justification of those who believe.

It remains to establish whether, since it is confirmed, the Mosaic Law ought to be observed or not by those who believe in Christ; and, in the first case, whether it is to be observed as a whole or only in part. In the same direction there arises the question whether, on the personal level, Paul continued to observe the Law or transgressed it following his adhesion to Christ.

I maintain that, in this direction, little attention has been paid to the apocalyptic dimension within which Paul assessed the question.<sup>103</sup> In this connection, the way in which he emphasises that the Law has

<sup>102</sup> This is not a question of antanaclasis or the reverberation of two or more meanings of a term that is repeated two or more times in the same context (cf. νόμος in Rom 7,25–8,2) but of the ambiguity contained in a single term.

<sup>103</sup> Among the contributions alert to the apocalyptic dimension for the Pauline conception of the Law, cf. D. HARINK, «Paul and Israel: An Apocalyptic Reading», in *Pro Ecclesia* 16(2007), 359-380; B. ROSNER, «Paul and the Law: What he does not say», in *JSNT* 32(2010), 418-419.

power over a man as long as he is living is important (cf. Rom 7,1). Then, to illustrate the temporal power of the Law, he adduces the example of a married woman: she is bound to the marriage law as long as her husband is living. If, however, the husband dies, the wife is free to pass to a new relationship without being taxed with adultery on account of this (cf. Rom 7,2-3). In applying this juridical example, Paul asserts that, in an analogous way, believers must be considered dead to the Law in order to belong to another man: Jesus Christ (cf. Rom 7,5). Thus, they have been «loosed» or «released»<sup>104</sup> from the Law, being dead to what held them prisoners in order to serve in the newness of the Spirit and not in the dusty old letter (vv. 4-6). It is easy to observe that between the example and the application there is a certain macroscopic dystonia, namely that, in the example, it is the life or death of the husband which causes the validity or not of the matrimonial law; in the application, it is the believers who correspond to the woman of the example who have to consider themselves dead to the Law so as to be with Christ. However, the dystonia is deliberate because it places in relief the apocalyptic dimension with which the believers must consider themselves to be dead to the Law though continuing to live in the world.

The apocalyptic dimension brings in the criterion of *diaphorology* or of what makes the difference with regard to the observance or the non-observance of the Mosaic Law. First of all, rather than relativisation or indifference (*adiaphorology*), properly from Stoic territory,<sup>105</sup> we regard it as appropriate to speak of *diaphorology*.<sup>106</sup> What is in question is not what is indifferent but rather what makes the difference and allows the discerning of what is important (cf. the use of τὰ διαφέροντα in Rom 2,18; Phil 1,10). At first sight, it seems that in expressions such as 1Cor 9,20-21, where Paul claims to subject himself to the Law in order to gain those who are under the Law and to be without the Law for those who do not have the Law, he is renouncing

<sup>104</sup> In Rom 7,6 the verb *κατηργήθημεν* returns and assumes theological force, making it clear that God or Jesus Christ has released the believers from the Law and not the opposite.

<sup>105</sup> J. JAQUETTE, *Discerning what Counts: The Function of the Adiaphora Topos in Paul's Letters* (SBL.DS 146), Atlanta, GA 1995; W. DEMING, «Paul and Indifferent Things», in SAMPLEY (ed.), *Paul in the Greco-Roman World*, 384-403.

<sup>106</sup> PITTA, «Sistemi argomentativi», 70-71.

his Jewish identity.<sup>107</sup> In reality, the decisive criterion which allows him to assess the one situation and the other is what he calls ἔννομος Χριστοῦ (v. 21), which is identified with doing everything for the gospel (cf. 1Cor 9,23). Consequently, the passage of 1Cor 9,20-21 has nothing to do with the Jewish identity of Paul, but only with the criterion of what makes the difference in the strategy of the preaching of Christ.<sup>108</sup>

The same criterion of what creates the difference returns, among other places, in Gal 3,27-28 in connection with the so-called *tertium genus* and in Rom 14,7-8.17 in order to resolve the conflict between the strong and the weak over the question of dietary purity. Being in Christ or the Lord and the identification of the kingdom of God with righteousness and not with dietary questions constitutes the criterion of difference which does not abrogate the differences but rather views them in a different way and in a different context. So much so that the ethnic differences denied (but not abrogated) in Gal 3,27-28 are affirmed in 1Cor 12,13 where Jews and Greeks, slaves and free have been baptised with a single Spirit to form a single body.<sup>109</sup>

The criterion of *diaphorology* should be pointed out from the personal level of Paul, both against those who maintain that, following the Damascus event, he no longer observed the Law, and those who claim that he continued to practice it.<sup>110</sup> Where the Law enters into conflict with Christ on account of the way to justification, as in Galatia, Paul maintains without equivocation that he is dead to the Law by means of the Law (cf. Gal 2,19) in order to convince the Gentile of Galatia not to have themselves circumcised. On the other hand, in Rom 14,1-15,6, he requests the strong to observe the rules of (Jewish) dietary pu-

<sup>107</sup> For example, this is the interpretation of J.D.G. DUNN, *Jesus, Paul, and the Gospels*, Grand Rapids, MI-Cambridge, UK 2011, 126 who comments: «In other words, Paul speaks here as one who did not acknowledge “Jew” as his own identity; or as an identity inalienable from his person as an ethnic Jew».

<sup>108</sup> Correctly D.J. RUDOLPH, *A Jew to the Jews. Jewish Contours of Pauline Flexibility in 1 Corinthians 9:19-23* (WUNT 2.304), Tübingen 2011, 173-208 who relates Paul's adaptability to the example of Jesus in his relations with sinners during his public life.

<sup>109</sup> C.H. COSGROVE, «Did Paul Value Ethnicity» in *CBQ* 68(2006), 281 considers the term *adiaphoron* inadequate since it designates what is not important, while «Paul has strong opinion about how ethnic differences should be maintained». However, Cosgrove does not transform *adiaphorology* into *diaphorology* or into the positive dimension of what is important and makes the difference.

<sup>110</sup> NANOS, «The Myth of the “Law-Free” Paul», 4-7.

rity so as not to lose the weak, since, for both the one and the other, what counts is the soteriological import of the death of Christ which is what makes the difference for both the Roman groups.<sup>111</sup>

The objection, that if the Law was not abrogated as normative it would have had to have been observed in its entirety, is, in my opinion, a false objection which does not take into proper account both the apocalyptic dimension of the one who has to consider himself dead to the Law and the criterion of what makes the difference. If the commandment of love has to be observed by believers in Christ, it is because it comes under the criterion of difference made explicit in the expression «faith working in love» (cf. Gal 5,6; also Rom 14,17), while this is not the case with circumcision and uncircumcision, much less the rules of dietary purity, without either of these being abrogated.

The apocalyptic «new creation» (cf. Gal 6,15), therefore, is the origin of the criterion of what makes the difference with which Paul does not abrogate, much less level the differences but rather denies them at the level of existence in Christ and of faith in him.

## Conclusion

Not Paul and Judaism, since on the other side of the scales we do not have Hellenism. Much less the Judaism of Paul which risks reconstructing an isolated and arbitrary form of Judaism. Rather, Paul within Judaism from which he originated and to which he remains anchored, although passing from the Pharisaic movement to that which he calls «the Church of God». We began with the question whether he was a good Jew or bad one. On this, every scholar has his own opinion. For C.G. Montefiore, he is a rabbinic Jew who knows of the Law only its chains.<sup>112</sup> According to J.M.G. Barclay, he is an anomalous Jew because he redefines the Jewish identity and that of Israel.<sup>113</sup> For M. Barth, he is a good Jew who spent himself for the rights of his neighbour.<sup>114</sup>

<sup>111</sup> A. PITTA, «The Strong, the Weak and the Mosaic Law in the Christian Communities of Rome (Rom. 14,1–15,13)», in J. ZANGENBERG – M. LABAHN (edd.), *Christians as a Religious Minority* (JSNT.S 243), London-New York 2004, 90-102.

<sup>112</sup> MONTEFIORE, *Judaism and St. Paul: Two Essays*, 115.

<sup>113</sup> BARCLAY, *Diaspora*, 393-395.

<sup>114</sup> BARTH, «Der gute Jude Paulus», 132.

It is sufficient only to maintain that he remained such right to the end of his existence without adding any value judgements. Like all Jews, Paul professes the oneness of God and, like all believers in Christ, he confesses the oneness of the Lord Jesus Christ (according to the pre-Pauline fragment of 1Cor 8,6). He does not claim that the Law has been abrogated (cf. Rom 3,30), but, on the one hand, it is not able to offer salvation and, on the other, it is fulfilled in the commandment of love (cf. Gal 5,13-15; Rom 13,8-10). «Israel according to the flesh» has not been replaced by an Israel according to the Spirit because God has not rejected his people (cf. Rom 11,1-2). The old covenant has not been replaced by the new, but becomes new when, in Christ, the veil which covers it is taken away. His Pharisaic education continues to regulate his way of arguing and of demonstrating his convictions by means of a marked interpretative capacity for Scripture.<sup>115</sup> Rather than a fanatic, he seems one who, like the Pharisees of his time, puts forward easy or populist interpretations of Scripture. Moreover, the first apology of 2Cor 3,1-7,4 must be an accusation directed against his adversaries of trafficking in or diluting the Word of God (cf. 2Cor 2,17).

Paul, thus, originates from the Pharisaic movement which is the most influential at least in Palestinian Judaism, but he also demonstrates relations with other Jewish movements: from Qumran to Alexandrine Judaism, from the apocalyptic movement to that which will flow into the targumic tradition. In his authentic letters, there is no form of substitution or of *supersessionism* by Christianity over Judaism, since, when he deals with Judaism, there does not yet exist a Christianity, and the «Church of God» belongs to Judaism itself. The separation of the ways between Judaism and the Christian movement was not yet completed, but in process of realisation. Paul's principal contribution towards the separation of the ways concerns the preaching of the crucified Messiah from which he derives justification by faith without any work of the Law. As a result, for the Gentiles who adhere to his gospel, without passing through the Law, no legal conditions must be required, while those who have become believers by means of the Law can continue to observe the Law and the rules of dietary purity.

<sup>115</sup> A.J. SALDARINI, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society. A Sociological Approach*, Grand Rapids, MI-Cambridge, UK 2001, 140.

With regard to his vision of the Law, Paul walks on a tightrope and some of his statements can be, and, in fact have been exploited, as the author of 2 Peter towards the end of the first century CE denounces (cf. 2Pet 2,15-16). The *Paulusbild* of the Acts of the Apostles is considered of little reliability from the historical point of view. James's request, on the occasion of Paul's arrival in Jerusalem from his final missionary journey, demonstrates that, compared with the different tendencies among ancient autobiography and biography, the author of Acts knows more than is thought of the tensions caused by Paul's vision of the Law and the Jewish identity of the first believers in Christ: «You see, brother, how many thousands there are among the Jews of those who have believed; they are all zealous for the law, and they have been told about you that you teach all the Jews who are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children or observe the customs» (Acts 21,20-21). The libel on Rom 3,8 about doing evil (or not observing the Law) in view of the good of the grace in Christ or on the presumed antinomianism of Paul reaches Jerusalem before his arrival and becomes the principal reason for his arrest (cf. Acts 21,28).

ANTONIO PITTA  
*Pontificia università lateranense*  
*Piazza San Giovanni in Laterano, 4*  
*00184 Roma*  
*antoniopittaa@libero.it*

## Sommario

Più che Paolo e il giudaismo o il giudaismo di Paolo, il contributo approfondisce il pensiero di Paolo nel giudaismo. Nel giudaismo è stato formato seguendo il movimento farisaico e ha perseguitato la «Chiesa di Dio». Non è possibile trattare di Paolo nel giudaismo prescindendo dalle diverse conformazioni che assumono le comunità a cui si rivolge. Nelle sue lettere autografe manca qualsiasi prospettiva sostitutiva tra l'antica e la nuova alleanza, l'antico e il nuovo Israele. La Legge mosaica non è abrogata, ma è reinterpretata nel paradigma apocalittico della nuova creazione in Cristo che innesta il criterio per quanto fa la differenza. Il suo contributo che conduce verso la separazione delle vie è notevole, giacché sostiene che la giustificazione si realizza solo per la fede in Cristo e non chiede alcuna forma di sottomissione alla Legge per i Gentili che aderiscono al vangelo. Tuttavia si ritiene non apostata da Israele, bensì apostolo dei Gentili per Israele.