

JEWISH SENSIBILITIES IN THE LUKAN PAUL,
THE HISTORICAL PAUL AND JOSEPHAN JUDAISM

George P. Carras

Washington and Lee University, Lexington, VA, USA

1. *Purpose*

In the book of Acts, Luke presents Paul as sharing common features of Jewish identity at various points with a catalogue of Josephus's summary of the 'precepts and prohibitions' of the Jewish law in *Apion* 2.190-219.¹ This suggests that Luke presents Paul as a loyal Jew as depicted in categories of one dominant representative of diaspora Judaism. The first part of this essay will offer evidence supporting the view that Luke has presented Paul as a loyal Jew by casting him in ways descriptive of Jewish behavioral expectations and Torah parameters similar to those found in Josephus's *Apion* 2.190-219. The Jewish studies expert Geza Vermes considers the summary as 'one of the earliest and possibly the oldest, theological précis compiled by a contemporary of the New Testament writers'.² If so, we have a summary re-

1. The contents and arguments on Josephus and the Lukan Paul appear in George P. Carras, 'Jewish Sensibilities and the Search for the Jewish Paul—The Lukan Paul Viewed through Josephan Judaism: Interplay with *Apion* 2:190–219', in Isaac W. Oliver and Gabriele Boccaccini (eds.), *The Early Reception of Paul. The Second Temple Jew: Text, Narrative and Reception History* (Library of Second Temple Studies, 92; London: T. & T. Clark, 2018), pp. 167-78. The new contribution of this essay is to evaluate the Lukan picture on Pauline Jewish sensibilities alongside those in Paul's undisputed letters in conjunction with Josephus's *Apion* 2.190-219 as a window into Second Temple Judaism and Paul's relationship to it.

2. Geza Vermes, 'A Summary of the Law by Flavius Josephus', *NovT* 23 (1982), pp. 289-303 (301 n. 50). Vermes has not, however, offered any detailed

quiring consideration for New Testament reflection and Pauline experts. The second part of the essay will suggest that Paul presents within the epistolary arguments of his own undisputed letters a variety of core Jewish sensibilities.³

The themes in Acts to be considered include Torah observance, primacy of the Jewish God, affirmation of future hope, resurrection, Temple and regulations, purity regulations and the offer of the Jewish religion to non-Jews. I will suggest that several of these items form an integral part of Pauline argumentation in his letters. My task will be to determine the context and in what form the ideas and motifs occur in Paul's letters and reappear in the Lukan portrait of Paul and are placed in new contexts as he tells the story of Paul as Jew in Acts.

My purpose may be framed in the language of a classic article on Paul in Acts and in the letters even if the author of the article's precise intention is not to search for the Jewish Paul. Regardless, the distinguished German scholar Philip Vielhauer states that his attempt is to determine 'whether and to what extent the author of Acts took over and passed on theological ideas of Paul [in the letters], whether and to what extent he modified them ... [and] whether or not he [Luke] and Paul belong together.'⁴ My methodical

reflection on the importance this section of *Apion* may have for understanding the New Testament material (apart from some passing comments on the ethical and religious character of the teaching of Jesus). In a similar vein, E.P. Sanders suggests, in Sanders, 'Judaism and the Grand Christian Abstractions: Love, Mercy and Grace', *Int* 39 (1985), pp. 357-72, that the pattern of religion of Palestinian Judaism is also attested in *Apion* 2. However, he offers little assistance on how the *Apion* précis may permit a better understanding of the New Testament situation. What we are told (based on *Apion* 2) is that Judaism in the time of Jesus and Paul was a noble religion based on belief in God's mercy and grace, which was intended to inculcate in its members virtuous action and consideration for others. See also E.P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE*, London: SCM Press, 1992.

3. A more recent attempt to use Josephus to clarify aspect of the letters of Paul may be found in F.A.B. Asiedu, *Paul and His Letters: Thinking with Josephus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2019). Regardless, Asiedu does not use Josephus to illuminate the letters of Paul or Pauline portrayals in Acts in the way I propose in this article or my 1990 dissertation listed below in n. 7. This work too fails to utilize and analyze Paul from the perspective of common Judaism.

4. Phillip Vielhauer, 'On the Paulinism of Acts', in Leander E. Keck and James Louis Martyn (eds.), *Studies in Luke–Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of*

pursuit and conclusions do not follow those of Vielhauer exactly, but my overall strategy and terrain is similar.⁵

I will sketch these features better to appreciate whether Luke has recast material from Paul's letters, and if so, to what extent the reception of Pauline ideas in Luke falls within the realm of Jewish sensibilities. Therefore, I will show how, in Acts, Luke re-contextualizes and recasts the Paul of the letters. To what extent does each coincide with Josephus's summary of his version of the Jewish Torah? This is one of the distinctive features I seek to pursue in this essay.

It is notable to test whether the Jewish sensibilities of the Jewish Torah as depicted in *Apion* 2.190-219 are reflected in the Lukan Paul and historic Paul. If what is observable is in Paul's letters (written in the 50s of the first century) and the Lukan Paul (written in the late first century 80s), both pre-date Josephus's summary of the Torah (written in *Apion* in the 90s CE).

Therefore, the picture I have sought to examine is whether Jewish sensibilities in Luke and Paul based in the Torah and reflected in broader features including the Temple, moral guides of practice and definition of future resurrection as sketched in Josephus are also reflected in Paul's letters.

Paul Schubert, Buckingham Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation at Yale University (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), pp. 194-207. Our study is not a pursuit of the Paul in Acts and the Paul in the letters though it may indirectly contain some reflections relevant to the theme. See Stanley E. Porter, *The Paul of Acts: Essays in Literary Criticism, Rhetoric, and Theology* (WUNT, 115; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), pp. 187-206 (199, 205-6); Richard I. Pervo, 'The Paul of Acts and the Paul of the Letters: Aspects of Luke as an Interpreter of the Corpus Paulinum', in Daniel Marguerat (ed.), *Reception of Paulinism in Acts: Réception du Paulinisme dans les Actes des apôtres* (BETL, 229; Leuven: Peeters, 2009), pp. 141-55 (142-3, 155).

5. Regardless, the interchange between the Lukan Paul and the historic Paul on the notion of Jewish sensibilities would produce a corresponding balanced portrait of the Jewish Paul in the New Testament and the Paul of Acts with Paul of the letters on Jewish themes.

2. *Jewish Sensibilities—Josephus, Against Apion 2.190-219*

a. *Preface*

First, while comparisons between Luke and Josephus have an extensive scholarly history, none have considered Josephus, in particular, *Apion* 2.190-219, in the way I am proposing.⁶ Secondly, I will compare this text with Luke's portrayal of Paul as a Jew in Acts 21–28 and determine the function and purpose of these select examples. In my view, if shared Jewish ideals can be isolated from Josephus and documented within the argumentation of the Lukan Paul, this would offer additional evidence to legitimate Paul to the Jews of Luke's day. Our approach uses Josephus on Judaism as a sounding on Jewish sensibilities both in the Lukan portrayal of Paul and in the Judaism of the historic Paul of the letters. If *Apion* 2.190-219 themes are replicated in the Lukan Paul and are, too, evident in the letters of Paul, then we have dual attestation of *Apion* on the Judaism of the period. Finally, this would add emphasis to the view of Paul as an insider within Second Temple Judaism of the period.

b. *The Torah Depicted in Josephus, Apion 2.190-219*

Let us document Josephus's *Apion* 2.190-219 and the correspondence between Jewish traits that reflect those of the Lukan portrait of historical Paul as a Jew. I evaluated *Apion* 2.190-219 in an earlier study to determine whether Josephus's portrayal of Judaism reflects a realistic presentation of

6. Scholarly comparisons between Luke and Josephus have been investigated by E. Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), pp. 10, 25, 137; H. Schreckenberg, 'Flavius Josephus und die lukanischen Schriften', in W. Haubeck and M. Bachmann (eds.), *Wort in der Zeit: Neutestamentliche Studien. Festgabe für Karl Heinrich Rengstorf zum 75* (Leiden: Brill, 1980), pp. 179-209; Heinz Schreckenberg and Kurt Schubert, *Jewish Historiography and Iconography in Early and Medieval Christianity* (CRINT, 3; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1992), pp. 42-49; Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (NovTSup, 64; Leiden: Brill, 1992), pp. 365-89; Steve Mason, *Josephus, Judea, and Christian Origins: Methods and Categories* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009), pp. 329-73. These scholars have not pursued a comparison of *Apion* 2.190-219 alongside Luke with my purpose in mind.

Judaism in the late first century.⁷ While the material is polemical and apologetic in nature, does the summary of Judaism in *Apion* contain elements Jews would consider as central to their religious perspective?⁸ I will not rehearse detailed arguments here but provide several summary conclusions.⁹

7. George P. Carras, 'Paul, Josephus and Judaism: The Shared Judaism of Paul and Josephus's' (DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1990), 23-74, <http://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:32399280-d6af-4d1f-9fa9-13aeaeba6838>; this work is being renamed *Congruity in Jewish Perspectives between Paul, Josephus and Second Temple Jewry* in preparation for Novum Testamentum Supplement Series (Leiden: Brill); George P. Carras, *Two Diaspora Jews: Josephus and Paul* (Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming); George P. Carras, 'Dependence, Paraphrase or Common Tradition in Philo's *Hypothetica* and Josephus's *Contra Apionem*', *SPhiloA* 5 (1993), pp. 24-47. If one wishes to consider the source question of Josephus's *Apion*, see two works cited here plus George P. Carras, 'Philo's *Hypothetica*—Josephus' *Contra Apionem* and the Question of Sources', in David J. Lull (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature 1990 Seminar Papers: One Hundred Twenty-sixth Annual Meeting, November 17-20, 1990, the New Orleans Marriott, the Sheraton New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana* (SBLSP, 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), pp. 431-45. In these three publications, common Judaism and sources of *Apion* 2 are discussed in detail. These reflections suggest that Philo's *Hypothetica* and Josephus's *Apion* shared motifs. This is saying something different than that each shared ideals equal with Alexandrian Judaism. Alexandria's Judaism is larger than Philo though he is indeed dominant. There also are the *Pseudo-Phocylides* sentences that represent Alexandria and the first century CE time frame. I believe that there is a link between Josephus and some representative works from Alexandria such as *Hypothetica* and *Pseudo-Phocylides*, but I have not argued that case in this article. In order to make a link between Josephus and Alexandrian Judaism, we would need to study the documents in tandem.

8. A. Kashier, 'Polemic and Apologetic Methods in Writing in *Contra Apionem* in Josephus', in Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison (eds.), *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek* (AGJU, 34; Leiden: Brill, 1996), pp. 142-86; C. Gerber, *Ein Bild des Judentums für Nichtjuden von Flavius Josephus: Untersuchungen zu seiner Schrift, Contra Apionem* (AGJU, 40; Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 183-203.

9. Several notable scholarly contributions on our summary include: David Altshuler, 'The Treatise *περι εθων και αιτιων* "On Customs and Causes" by Flavius Josephus', *JQR* 69 (1979), pp. 226-32; Arnaldo Momigliano, *Quinto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Storia e Letteratura, 136; Rome:

The importance of Josephus's *Apion* 2.190-219, as stated already, is that it is one of the few summaries on the Jewish ideals and sensibilities and is relevant to my inquiry.¹⁰ The sensibilities that emerge from *Apion* 2 include: (1) God is portrayed as monotheistic in nature. He is in control of the world, the sole creator of the universe and its properties. He forbids idolatry and expects worship by the practice of virtue in the observance of the Torah (2.190-193). (2) The Temple is a symbol of Jewish identity (2.193). (3) The cultus, its existence, practices and priestly role of authority are perceived in actual use (2.193-198). (4) Prayer has a central place in the life of the cultic community (2.196). (5) Purity laws are to be observed (2.203, 205). (6) Jews are to behave toward each other in a prescribed manner. In particular, they must not steal, charge interest or bear false witness, but offer help to the needy and poor (2.207-208). (7) The Jewish religion is to be made accessible to non-Jews (2.209-210). (8) Hope of a future life is affirmed (2.217-219). (9) Obedience and disobedience to the Law bring their own consequences (2.215-218). (10) The foundation of the above injunctions is Moses, the legislator of the Jewish constitution.

Josephus presents a form of Judaism that shared ideals and sensibilities with a variety of Jewish testimony. One can itemize some of the points of common Judaism: separateness points to the view that Jews were God's

Storia e Letteratura, 1975), II, pp. 765-84; David L. Balch, 'Two Apologetic Encomia: Dionysius of Rome and Josephus on the Jews', *JSJ* 13 (1982), pp. 102-22; John M.G. Barclay, *Against Apion* (Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary, 10; Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 275-98; Gunnar Haaland, 'Jewish Laws for a Roman Audience: Toward an Understanding of *Contra Apionem*', in Jürgen U. Kalms and Folker Siegert (eds.), *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Brüssel 1998* (Münsteraner judaistische Studien, 4; Münster: LIT Verlag, 1999), pp. 282-304; Christine Gerber, 'Des Josephus Apologie für das Judentum: Prolegomena zu einer Interpretation von 2:145ff', in Kalms and Siegert (eds.), *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium*, pp. 251-69.

10. The other document is Philo's *Hypothetica* preserved in Eusebius's *Praep. ev.* 8.7.20. See Carras, 'Dependence', pp. 24-47. A third document though not a summary as such but containing some similar ideas is *Pseudo-Phocylides*. The use of these three documents together creates a picture of Second Temple Judaism that goes back to Paul Wendland, *Die Therapeuten und die Philonische Schrift vom beschaulichen Leben: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Hellenistischen Judentums* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1896), pp. 693-770. See also Barclay, *Against Apion*, pp. 353-61, on these three texts.

chosen people; they shared monotheism and this cut them off to an appreciable degree from other societies; Jewish standards of behavior, especially sexual behavior, distinguished them; most expected some form of life after death; community membership required obedience; the Torah was to be kept as an expression of covenantal membership.¹¹

3. *Paul as an Observant Jew in Lukan Portrayal*

a. *Overall Context*

We now come to the proposal and broader consideration of Paul as an observant Jew in the Lukan writings, in particular, the latter half of Acts.¹² As one means to legitimate Paul as an observant Jew, Brawley appeals to Hellenistic literary techniques.¹³ He maintains:

11. Carras, 'Paul, Josephus Judaism', *passim*. Jewish summary concurs with a view of common Judaism as belief in one God, the choice of Israel as God's special people, the giving of the law and the obligation to obey the law and its commands to maintain a covenantal relationship and God saving his people in the end, according to Sanders, *Judaism*, pp. 45-314. Other scholars who have pursued the notion of a 'common Judaism' within Second Temple Judaism are as follows: Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz (eds.), *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second Temple Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008); Fabian E. Udoh et al. (eds.), *Redefining First Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essay in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity, 16; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008), a volume which testifies to a quite extensive common Judaism thread well-documented in the Second Temple period; Eric M. Meyers, 'Sanders's "Common Judaism" and the Common Judaism of Material Culture', in Udoh et al. (eds.), *Redefining*, pp. 153-74; Shaye J.D. Cohen, 'Common Judaism in Greek and Latin Authors', in Udoh et al. (eds.), *Redefining*, pp. 69-87, who notes the shared points among pagan authors; Jürgen Zangenberg, 'Common Judaism and the Multidimensional Character of Material Culture', in Udoh et al. (eds.), *Redefining*, pp. 175-93, who endorses the notion of common Judaism based on archaeological evidence.

12. Several details of the following discussion appear in George P. Carras, 'Observant Jews in the Story of Luke Acts: Paul, Jesus and Other Jews', in Joseph Verheyden (ed.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (BETL, 142; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), pp. 693-708.

13. Robert L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology and Conciliation* (SBLMS, 33; Atlanta: SBL, 1987), p. 51.

if Luke legitimates Paul both by portraying him as faithful to the hopes of Israel and by outfitting him with evidence of authenticity in Hellenistic literary terms, then we possess clues that inform us about the type of Judaism toward which Luke accommodates Paul and about the environment in which Luke writes.¹⁴

Brawley contends that Luke links Hellenistic legitimating devices and his defense of Paul as an authentic Jew. The treatment of these themes together raises the question of what kind of religion Luke envisions as authentic Judaism. Brawley suggests that, for Luke, Judaism is not culturally exclusive, maintains a belief in the general resurrection and is open to intimate relationships with Gentiles. I suggest that these two characteristics emerge from *Apion* 2.190-219, but the list could include other Jewish ideals as a means to legitimate Paul as an authentic Jew based on *Apion* 2.190-219. This brings us to the second stage of the argument.

b. *Textual Content*

Most agree that Paul is Luke's hero. He devotes over half of the story of the emergence of the early church in Acts to Paul and a quarter of the entire narrative of Acts to an apology for Paul as a Jew. Beginning with 21.27 to the end of Acts, a defense of Paul is provided. The charges against and defense of Paul are stated throughout chs. 21–26. Paul is accused of profaning the Temple while he is observing a Jewish purification ritual.¹⁵ Rumors emerged from Asian Jews that Paul is teaching against the Law, people and the Temple. In response, Luke seeks to demonstrate Paul's fidelity and zeal for the law and loyalty to Judaism. The charges and refutations can be listed as follows:

(1) Charge in Acts 21.21: Paul teaches the diaspora Jews apostasy from Moses that they should not circumcise their children and do not need to live according to the customs of the fathers.

14. See also Stephen G. Wilson, *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), passim.

15. Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), p. 652; Gerhard Schneider, *Die Apostelgeschichte: 2. Teil* (HTKNT, 5; Freiburg: Herder, 1982), pp. 305-6; Rudolf Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte (Apg 13–28)* (EKKNT, 5; Zürich: Benziger, 1986), pp. 24-227.

(2) Charge in Acts 21.28: Paul teaches everywhere against the people, the Law and the Temple; he brought Gentiles to undesignated areas of the Temple area and defiled this holy place.

(3) Charge in Acts 23.29: The Roman version of the charge is that the problem concerns their (the Jews) laws.

(4) Charge in Acts 24.5-6: Paul has tried to profane the Temple.

(5) Refutation in Acts 25.8: Paul has sinned against neither the Law nor the Temple.

(6) Refutation in Acts 28.17: Paul maintains in his refutation that he has nothing against the custom of the fathers and the people.

The charges against Paul are that he sinned against Israel and is guilty of forsaking the Law and Temple. If these charges were true, Paul would be seriously at odds with distinguishing identity markers of Israel and permit the accusation that he is a false teacher in Israel. Luke refutes these charges in four apologetic speeches whereby the primary purpose is to defend Paul as a Jew. The content of the speech material does not consist of missionary kerygma, calls for repentance, scriptural proofs or appeals to eyewitnesses.¹⁶ Rather, Luke defends his hero first by claiming that Paul is a Pharisee and a Jew faithful to the Law (22.3; 23.1, 3, 5, 6; 24.14; 26.4-5). Secondly, he teaches only what Scripture says, and believes everything that is written in the Law and the Prophets (24.14-15; 26.22-23). A third defensive strategy used, although it does not appear as one of the charges against Paul, is that he adheres to the resurrection of the dead, a hope of Pharisaic Israel.¹⁷

4. *Jewish Sensibilities Surrounding the Lukan Paul (with Apion 2)*

Central to the charges and refutation is the connection between the people, the Law and the Temple.¹⁸ This interrelationship suggests that Paul was per-

16. Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 88.

17. Jervell, *Theology*, p. 87; Klaus Haacker, 'Das Bekenntnis des Paulus zur Hoffnung Israels nach der Apostelgeschichte des Lukas', *NTS* 31 (1985), pp. 437-51. The Jewish character of the refutation is also noted by Witherington, *Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 659-60.

18. See on the Law in the Lukan writings Kalervo Salo, *Luke's Treatment of the Law: A Redaction-Critical Investigation* (AASF, 57; Helsinki: Suomalainen

ceived as challenging fundamentals of Judaism since the Law is a sign of Israel as the people of God, and the Temple a supreme symbol of Jewish identity. It is suggested by Esler, based on scholarship from sociological analysis, that we know a great deal about how an ethnic group responds to living within a larger culture. The response ranges from total breakdown of the group's boundaries resulting in complete assimilation, on the one hand, to a tight maintenance of the group's separate identity, on the other. Esler maintains that, among diaspora Jews, one would expect to find the latter. Furthermore, he states that one finds among diaspora Jews a strong devotion to the Law and the Temple.¹⁹ A Jew such as Paul, who was perceived as teaching against the Law, the people and the Temple, would be a threat to Jewish identity and the social fabric of local Jewish communities, if found guilty. Whatever may have been other reasons for charges against Paul (e.g. taking a Gentile beyond legitimate boundaries of the Temple or attitudes on Gentile law-keeping), Temple and Law observance appear to be central and are critical in Luke's defense. For my purposes what is important is that these same features, the Law and Temple, are the identity markers Luke appeals to in defense of Paul. In the trial before Festus (Acts 25.8), Paul states that he sinned against the Law nor the Temple.

It is also these two Jewish descriptors (Law and Temple) that form a central place in the 'Mosaic summary' in *Apion* 2.190-219. I find Torah-based ideals for Jews described by Josephus as what constitutes the 'precepts and prohibitions' of Torah and it is assumed throughout our passage that Jews are to observe and accept the consequences for both obedience and disobedience. This 'Mosaic legislation' does not consist simply of a list of biblical laws, but rather is a 'carefully structured exposition' on God, humanity's relationship to God and to his fellow creatures.²⁰ The Josephan Law summary is followed by two appendices: one on punishment awaiting transgressors of the Law and the other on rewards of the future life awaiting faithful observers of Torah. Throughout the summary are a variety of Jewish ideals, many of which relate to biblical prescriptions and, as I have suggested, reflect

Tiedeakatemia, 1991); Stephen G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (SNTSMS, 50; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

19. Phillip Francis Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lukan Theology* (SNTSMS, 57; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 146.

20. Vermes, 'Summary', p. 289.

common Judaism.²¹ Regardless, whether some of the ideals are formulated more philosophically, for example, partition of the soul (2.203),²² the central place of Torah observance is unmistakable. Because the statements are given in a summary format, the lack of explanation may imply that the contents are assumed to be central Jewish ideals, sensibilities, at least of Josephus's perception of diaspora Jewry, if not Judaism more broadly.

A second descriptor used by Luke in defense of Paul, the Temple, illustrates another common Jewish symbol which also takes an important place in the Lukan account. When Paul defends himself to Felix, he cites coming to the Temple to bring alms and offering for the Jewish nation. He argues that he had not gone to Jerusalem to profane the Temple but to worship God, and the God he was to worship was the God of Israel. Luke also located Paul in the Temple after he had undergone purification. Therefore, where we find Paul is significant as an instrument to defend him against profaning the Temple. Luke places Paul in direct association with a central institution of Judaism, the Temple.

The Temple also plays a central role as a marker of Jewish identity in Josephus's summary (*Apion* 2.190-193). This is the second topic he considers in his summary on God. Josephus's rationale is that since there is one God and one community, there is one Temple. From this basic premise a sketch is given of the (1) duties of priests, (2) practices to be observed at sacrifices and (3) occasions for purity regulations. It is striking that, in a work written at the end of the first century, the sanctuary and sacrifices are represented as a present reality. The Temple that held these entities was destroyed some thirty years before. Several explanations are possible. With expectation of a quick restoration of the Jerusalem Temple, the portrayal is seen as a depiction of a utopian world in which the destruction of the Temple never occurred, or its inclusion reflects the central place of the Temple as a marker of Jewish identity.²³

21. Carras, 'Paul, Josephus and Judaism', pp. 23-74.

22. Even this Platonic ring of partition of soul may have its roots in Essene anthropology. See Josephus, *War* 2.154-155. Alternatively, Greek influence is held by Heinz Schreckenberg, *Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus* (ALGHJ, 10; Leiden: Brill, 1977), pp. 168-69.

23. Jacob Neusner, *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities, Volume 6: Negaim* (SJLA, 6; Leiden: Brill, 1975), pp. 273-75.

In addition to the Law and Temple (recognized symbols of Jewish identity), Luke includes the affirmation of the resurrection of the just and unjust (Acts 24.15) in his defense of Paul as a loyal Jew. This idea is considered a common distinguishing feature of Judaism by most Jews in antiquity.²⁴ Josephus's formulation is belief in 'renewed existence' (*Apion* 2.218-219), which, although terminologically different, is compatible with the concept of future hope in *War* (3.374; 7.344-350) and in *Ant.* 18.14. The inclusion of the resurrection of the dead in Luke's defense is a further indication of legitimating Paul as a loyal Jew by appeal to common ideals, sensibilities in Josephus's Mosaic constitution.

In addition to Temple, Torah observance and hope in a future resurrection, there are several others shared in Luke's defense of Paul in Acts and found in *Apion* 2. In Paul's curriculum vitae as a loyal Jew, Luke places on the lips of Paul the affirmation of 'zeal for God' (Acts 22.3). This zeal for God was to be expressed in meticulous observance of the Law. In affirming zeal for God, Paul is identifying himself with one of the most fundamental features of the Jewish religion.²⁵ The point has been made by some scholars that zeal for God is even more fundamental than zeal for God's Law.²⁶

Apion 2.190 begins, as we noted, with the affirmation of God. He is presented as the sole agent in creation and the one for whom any form of idolatry is prohibited. He is to be worshipped, and the form it should take is by the practice of virtue. God also controls and directs history. The idea of God's providence is tied to the doctrine of creation. As creator of the universe, God cares, governs and sustains it. While the idea of God as one who directs history is assumed in various accounts of Paul's defense, for example, in Acts 26.6, where Paul is on trial because of the hope in the promises made by God, the point is reiterated in the speech at Pisidia Antioch in Acts 13.16-41 which gives a historical recital of God's great acts in history. God

24. Sanders, *Judaism*, p. 179.

25. Margén Hengel, *Die Zeloten: Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n. Chr.* (AGJU, 1; Leiden: Brill, 1976), pp. 182, 187-88. On zeal in Paul more recently, see Benjamin J. Lappenga, *Paul's Language of Ζήλος: Monosemy and the Rhetoric of Identity and Practice* (BibInt, 137; Leiden: Brill, 2016), passim.

26. William Reuben Farmer, *Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus; An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956), p. 49.

directs and brings on the stage of human history the likes of figures such as David, Samuel and Jesus, according to his plan.²⁷ Similarly, Luke conceives of God as the one who has fixed the time of judgment (Acts 17.30-31). While different aspects of the divine are reflected, I assume that the monotheistic nature of God is intended by both Luke and Josephus. This is certainly the case for Luke, who often makes reference to the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. This is also the case with Josephus, who states that cult is based on the principle of unity (*Apion* 2.190-219). There is a sense of divine necessity, almost destiny in the actions of God to the church but also more broadly; he is the sovereign lord over the world.²⁸

Another indicator of shared ideals recorded in Luke's defense of Paul and the summary of Jewish virtues by Josephus is the observance of purity regulations set in relation to the Temple. When we consider Josephus's *Apion* summary of virtues, we know that purity regulations were to be observed since he provides three examples. In particular, Josephus states them in the following way: 'In view of the sacrifices the law has prescribed the purifications for various occasions: after a funeral, after child birth, after conjugal union and for many others' (2.198). These purity laws are found in Lev. 12 (child-birth), Lev. 15 (emissions from the body) and Num. 19 (death). People who were affected by these *changes of status*—life, death, and reproduction—were to stay away from the sacred (i.e. the Temple).²⁹

If we consider the specific purity regulations relative to Paul, details are absent. What we do find is the Lukan Paul presented as a Jew observing legal custom.³⁰ In Paul's defense to Felix (Acts 24.18), Luke recounts an incident that he appeals to when Paul arrived in Jerusalem (Acts 21.21). On the advice of James, Paul was recommended to take a vow to curb rumors that he was against the people, the Law and the Temple. Four men were under a Nazarite vow since they had shaved their heads. At the conclusion of the vow, an offering of sacrifice would be given at the Temple. The proposal was that Paul should pay the expenses of the sacrifice. Furthermore, Paul

27. See Marcel Dumais, *Le langage de l'Évangélisation: L'Annonce Missionnaire en Milieu Juif (Actes 13:16-41)* (Recherches, 16; Tournai: Desclée, 1976).

28. On God in Luke-Acts, see Richard B. Vinson, 'The God of Luke-Acts', *Int* 68 (2014), pp. 376-88.

29. Sanders, *Judaism*, pp. 70-72, 217-19.

30. Salo, *Luke's Treatment*, p. 262; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (Hermeneia; trans. James Limburg et al.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), p. 24.

was to undergo purification with the men, accompany them in the Temple and recording the time when the purification was complete and the sacrifices made. Difficulties surrounding this incident are well-known.³¹ The point that can be noted for our purpose is that purification regulations were a sign of loyalty in Judaism. Luke associates Paul with legal regulations related to Temple access.

The Jewish purification laws restricted Gentiles' access to the Temple. While the charge that Paul brought a Gentile to the Temple area is denied by Luke, he shows knowledge of the legal regulations regarding this injunction. The denial enables Luke to indicate the implausibility that Paul would engage in such an activity when his purpose for coming to the Temple was for prayer, worship, sacrifice to God and giving alms to his fellow Jews. It would have been incredible for a person engaged in such religious duties (alms or offering sacrifice) to desecrate the Jerusalem Temple at the same time.³²

I can now add one final example to illustrate the shared ideals in Luke's defense and the *Apion 2* summary. The Jewish religion was not to be kept a private possession of Jews and remain inaccessible to others. This goes back even to Abraham in Gen. 12.1-3. In *Apion 2.10* we read, 'To all who desire to come and live under the same laws with us, he gives a gracious welcome.' The one restriction is that casual visitors, considered by some to be God-fearers,³³ should not be permitted to know the intimate details of daily religious practice. This suggests that the offer to non-Jews of membership in the people of God reflects a common Jewish notion and one that is adopted by the early Christians.³⁴ Beginning with the infancy narrative in

31. Salo, *Luke's Treatment*, pp. 260-66; Joseph B. Tyson, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992), pp. 158-68; Esler, *Community and Gospel*, pp. 125-26.

32. I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC, 5; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), p. 379.

33. Lucio Troiani, *Commento Storico al «Contro Apione» di Giuseppe: introduzione, commento storico, traduzione e indici* (Biblioteca Degli Studi Classici e Orientali, 9; Pisa: Giardini, 1977), p. 192; Balch, 'Two Apologetic Encomia', p. 119.

34. E.P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), pp. 171, 179; Terence L. Donaldson, *Paul and the Gentiles: Remap-*

Luke's Gospel to the end of Acts, Gentile entry to the people of God is a belief that formed part of the kerygma of the early Christian preachers. It is also a notion included at several points in Paul's defense when he tells how and to whom God called him (Acts 22.15; 26.17-18).

Several of the features of shared sensibilities of Judaism documented from *Apion* are appealed to by Luke to legitimate Paul as a loyal Jew of the diaspora. The suggestion being made is not that Luke borrowed from Josephus, but that they shared common Jewish sensibilities. To whatever extent material in the speeches of Acts is Lukan redaction, the scenes are used to portray Paul as a loyal Jew by associating him with Jewish ideals, symbols and sensibilities of Jewish self-reference by some Jews, at least those to whom Josephus has projected to be his audience in Rome. The legitimation of Paul as a loyal Jew is affirmed by appealing to practices of the Temple, Torah observances, affirmation of the future hope, belief in the primacy of the Jewish God, regulation of purity and openness to the Jewish religion to non-Jews. Both the Lukan writings and Josephus's *Apion* 2 were thought to be written within a similar time frame, that is, latter portion of the first century. Luke was written in the 80–90s (though some scholars purport an earlier date) and Josephus's *Apion* around 100 CE or slightly before. Regardless, the arguments thus far are clear enough—the summary of Torah found in Josephus's *Apion* includes features of Jewish sensibilities found in Acts and appealed to in presenting Paul as a loyal Jew. This suggests from these two documents that Paul, as Luke has portrayed him, could be viewed as an insider within diaspora Judaism if viewed from the prism of a Josephan summary on Torah's 'precepts and prohibitions'. This is another piece of the argument.

5. *Paul as Jew in the Letters*³⁵

How should Paul be viewed as a Second Temple Jew from the perspective of his letters on the same themes as derived from Luke and Josephus?³⁶

35. The data sketched here may raise the question whether Luke could have been a convert from diaspora Judaism. Regardless, the general point being suggested is that Paul as presented is a loyal Jew. We are not also suggesting he is a diaspora loyal Jew but there are pointers in that direction as well. But this is a secondary point.

36. There is evidence in Paul's undisputed letters of an autobiographical nature of Paul's pre-Christian Jewish sensibilities. The explicit examples are Gal. 1.13-14, Phil. 3.4-6 and 2 Cor. 11.22, 24. There are a few implicit examples such as Rom. 2.17-20, 9.4-5 and 11.1. For treatments of these passages on Paul's Jewish past, see Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom, and Ethics* (WUNT, 2.16; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985), pp. 227-32; Schalom Ben-Chorin, *Paulus: der Völkerapostel in jüdischer Sicht* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1980), pp. 159-70; Markus Barth, 'St. Paul—A Good Jew', *HBT* 1 (1979), pp. 7-45; Jörg Frey, 'Paul's Jewish Identity', in Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz and Stephanie Gripenotrog (eds.), *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World: Jüdische Identität in der griechisch-römischen Welt* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity, 71; Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 283-321; Martin Hengel, *The Pre-Christian Paul* (London: SCM Press, 1996); Alan F. Segal, 'Paul's Jewish Presuppositions', in James D.G. Dunn (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul* (Cambridge Companions to Religion; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 159-72; Udo Schnelle, *Apostle Paul: His Life and Legacy* (trans. M. Eugene Boring; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012); Gerd Lüdemann, *Paulus und das Judentum* (Theologische Existenz heute, 215; Munich: Kaiser, 1983); E.P. Sanders, 'Paul's Jewishness', in Thomas G. Casey and Justin Taylor (eds.), *Paul's Jewish Matrix* (Bible in Dialogue, 2; Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2011), pp. 51-73; Carras, 'Paul, Josephus and Judaism', pp. 87-132; John Clayton Lentz Jr., *Luke's Portrait of Paul* (SNTSMS, 77; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); A. Pitta, 'Paul, the Pharisee, and the Law', in Casey and Taylor (eds.), *Paul's Jewish Matrix*, pp. 99-122 (for Paul's Pharisaic background, see p. 99 n. 1). See also the recently edited volume Gabriele Boccaccini and Carlos A. Segovia (eds.), *Paul the Jew: Rereading the Apostle as a Figure of Second Temple Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016) and George P. Carras's review of this book (see online: <http://enochseminar.org/pdfs/RES-2016.12.15-Carras-on-Paul-the-Jew.pdf>).

From Josephus's *Apion* I suggested that there is overlap with Acts on Paul and features in Josephus's summary. How do the letters fit into this picture?

a. *Method*

The third part of the overall argument of this essay is on Lukan reception of Pauline ideas as a Second Temple Jew. My task will be to take the features evident in the Lukan portrait on Paul as a loyal Jew and determine whether the themes can be uncovered from Pauline argumentation in his undisputed letters. Since the Jewish ideas in Paul's letters are bound up in debates, pastoral instruction and replies and exposition of Scripture and parenthesis, a different method of analysis is required.³⁷ How do the concepts previously assessed from Josephus and Luke appear in the epistolary correspondence in Paul's letters, and what can be conveyed about his Jewish sensibilities? As a result of my previous discussion on Josephus and Luke, I will assess the following ideas in Paul's epistolary writings: belief in the primacy of the Jewish God and Torah (the Ten Commandments, affirmation of the future hope, openness of Jewish ways and practices to non-Jews, practices of the Temple and regulations of purity).

The method used to assess Paul's letters will be to (1) determine the shared Jewish sensibilities with the above themes from Paul's undisputed letters, (2) access the contexts in Paul's letters whereby the ideas occur and (3) offer textual examples to serve as illustrations of the category. There is not space to follow a detailed presentation of all relevant texts. Therefore, I demonstrate from texts and contexts whereby Paul has incorporated established Jewish sensibilities in his epistolary arguments. Finally, my argument is not that all of the virtues of Josephus appear in Paul as seen in Acts or his letters, but to ask whether the Judaism of Josephus is replicated in the Pauline witness or vice versa, and therefore to demonstrate that the two authors shared similar motifs even if they are used and framed in differing ways. One can still claim that the two authors shared notions of Judaism and that Paul's portrayal and reflection of Judaism is found in the Josephan summary, too. This has been my point, not that the Josephan summary is all replicated in Paul's portrayal by Luke or in Paul's letter when he reflects on

37. The method will, in part, include determining Pauline presuppositions underlining his incorporating Jewish thought in his letters. See Segal, 'Paul's Jewish Presuppositions', pp. 159-72. See also Carras, 'Paul, Josephus and Judaism', pp. 87-306.

themes of a similar nature. Moreover, it is not the case that two other authors of the Second Temple period, Jews or other, would mimic the other. Each author presumably had a context and aims to fulfill. Even whether Luke in Acts and Paul's letters reflect a clear and consistent picture continues to be debated. The genres are different, as well as intention of Paul in his letters and Luke in Acts. But my piece demonstrates that there are significant overlaps. The final link is now to turn to Paul's letters.

b. *Jewish Sensibilities in Paul's Letters*

1. *God Language*. For Paul, his theological convictions begin with God. In Romans, there are 153 uses of θεός and that it occupies a central place in the letter is unmistakable. His beliefs on God are axiomatic. Therefore, Paul makes no effort to expound their importance, meaning or significance beforehand. The use of θεός is lodged within exegetical argumentation. Paul did not need to explain the given nature of *speech about God* because his audiences were Jewish converts and non-Jews, i.e., Gentile converts many of whom would have learned about the Jewish God from the diaspora synagogue. Therefore, there was a fundamental beginning point about Paul's theology: It was the traditional Jewish affirmation about God. In the two examples in Acts of speeches to non-Jews, Paul presents his case as though a Jewish preacher was speaking to non-Jews (Acts 14.15-17; 17.22-31). He sought to establish a commonality about God with his audience. In Acts 13.16-41, there is an example of Paul giving a speech to Israelites and God-fearers (non-Jewish sympathizers of the synagogue).

The most fundamental Jewish belief about God is his unity or that God is one.³⁸ Paul would have been taught from his youth to recite the confession from Deut. 6.4 also known as the Shema 'Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one' (ESV). This was an inherited Jewish conviction about God. There are examples of this in Josephus's *Apion* 2.167, 190-191, *Ant.* 3.91 and Philo's *Dec.* 65. Paul inserts three times in his letters a shortened ver-

38. James D.G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), pp. 28-31. Sanders concurs with this point as well that Paul also shared other ideas (see Sanders, 'Paul's Jewishness', pp. 61-62).

sion in Greek of the Shema in letter correspondence to his converts in Corinth, Rome and Galatia (1 Cor. 8.4-6; Rom. 3.29-30, Gal. 3.20).³⁹

To illustrate with one example, in 1 Cor. 8.4-6, the Greek formulations are οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς (v. 4) and εἷς θεός (v. 6). The formulations occur in a debate that has arisen in the Corinthian church over the significance that should be given to meat sacrificed to idols. There were some in the church who affirmed that idols did not exist, and in this context Paul appeals to the one God. It appears that some converts in Corinth may have accepted monotheism more than Paul did since they believed idols did not have powers. So, Paul refers to them as ‘so-called idols’.

From 1 Cor. 8.4-6 several points emerge. First, the central place held by Jewish monotheism is assumed. Secondly, Jewish monotheism was a common idea shared by the Corinthians. It follows from this that the same sentiment held about God’s unity present in the Jewish sources of Paul’s day was commonly shared by the Christians in Corinth as reflected in 1 Cor. 8.4-6. This shows that Gentile Christians took over commonly held Jewish beliefs about God, and so Paul uses this as part of his reply. Thirdly, by virtue of Paul’s use of the notion of monotheism in this text, it assumes that he has taken over this Jewish theology that he obtained in his Jewish past as part of his present outlook. Finally, while there are a variety of attributes of God in the Pauline letters, such as God as creator, judge, sovereign king, dispenser of justice, giver of grace, his covenant love and faithfulness, impartiality and one who offers salvation and righteousness,⁴⁰ we also find a significant

39. Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, pp. 31-33; Franz Mussner, *Tractate on the Jews: The Significance of Judaism for Christian Faith* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), p. 56; Ferdinand Hahn, ‘The Confession of the One God in the New Testament’, *HBT* 2 (1980), pp. 69-84; Vernon P. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (NTTS, 5; Leiden: Brill, 1963), p. 35; Charles H. Giblin, ‘Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul’, *CBQ* 37 (1975), pp. 527-47 (530); Paul Rainbow, ‘Jewish Monotheism as the Matrix for New Testament Christology: A Review Article’, *NovT* 33 (1981), pp. 78-91. For the Shema forming the basis of Paul’s argument in Rom. 3.29-30, see Mark D. Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul’s Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), pp. 179-92.

40. The variety of depictions of Paul’s notion of θεός is reflected in Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, pp. 27-50; Calvin J. Roetzel and Robert L. Foster (eds.), *The Impartial God: Essays in Biblical Studies in Honor of Jouette M. Bassler* (New Testament Monographs, 22; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007); J. Christiaan

number of clear referents to the God of Israel in the Pauline section of Acts. We will summarize this in our conclusion below. Regardless, 1 Cor. 8.4-6 illustrates Paul's appeal axiomatically to monotheistic God language in his epistolary correspondence.⁴¹

2. *Torah Observances.* God's aim for his people is their holiness. Integral to such a scenario was the place of the Torah's fulfillment. Paul adopts this view as well. In Rom. 8.3 he informs us that God's purpose in the condemnation of sin and the sending of Christ was that the *righteous requirement of the Law* is to be fulfilled in the believer by the Spirit. This sounds like a Christianized view of Torah's fulfillment. However, this text is not couched in specific terms. If we recall where Paul makes explicit rulings on concrete aspects of the Jewish Law, we can see that Paul made de facto distinctions between what he taught on the Law's fulfillment and the way concrete situations were handled. For example, circumcision, the keeping of food laws and the observance of special days were matters of indifference (1 Cor. 7.18-19; Gal. 6.15; Rom. 14.1-5). Nevertheless, Paul recognizes that Jews will probably carry on traditional Jewish commandments. In 1 Cor. 7.17 he expects Jews to remain circumcised. Both 1 Cor. 8 and Rom. 14 allow for divergent views on food, and Rom. 14 recognizes the existence of divergent practices concerning special days. In Galatians, on the other hand, it is wrong for Jewish Christians to follow food laws when in company with Gentile Christians, or to observe special days and seasons, this being tantamount to returning to idolatry (Gal. 4.10). Notable in these distinctions is that they were the same elements in Judaism that drew criticism from non-Jewish authors and that the Law required to be fulfilled as part of living within the confines of the covenant, as various Jewish texts indicate (Deut.

Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980).

41. The use of Shema echoes elsewhere axiomatically in Paul's letter; Rom. 3.29-30 is in the context of an argument for equal access for Jews and Gentiles to Christ based on justification by faith; in Gal. 3.19, a passage that has had numerous explanations, Shema echoes occur in a very different context in a law discussion along with mediator, angels and the unity of God (see Carras, 'Paul, Josephus and Judaism', *passim*).

14.3-21; 1 Macc. 1.62-63; *Jub.* 10.5; 12.1-20).⁴² Since, for Paul, the gospel was offered to the Gentile as well as the Jews, it was appropriate in practice to eschew in the case of the Gentiles certain aspects of the Law's requirements, for example, circumcision, Sabbath and food laws.

Let us look more closely at one example. In Rom 13.8-10 Paul informs his readers that they are to show love, both to those within the church and to those outside of it. In so far as one does this, one will show to have fulfilled the Law (i.e. Mosaic Law).⁴³ Paul offers specific examples in v. 9 to show what he meant by loving your neighbor as yourself. From the LXX he utilizes the sixth, seventh, eighth and tenth commandments of the Decalogue, which prohibit adultery, murder, theft and coveting respectively (Exod. 20.13-17; Deut. 5.17-21). These commandments as well as others are summarized in the single commandment of Lev. 19.18 'Love your neighbor as yourself, I am the Lord' (NIV). For Paul, the love commandment means treating his neighbor as the Law requires—that is, not to offend their neighbor in such matters as adultery, murder, theft and coveting. If one does this, they have fulfilled the Torah and have accomplished its righteous requirements. Paul concludes his reflections on the Christian's responsibility (v. 10) by restating what was said at v. 8b in a chiasmic form:⁴⁴ Love does no wrong to one's neighbor; love is the fulfillment of the law. The outlook presented at Rom. 13.8-10 occurs in a more succinct form at Gal. 5.14, citing Lev. 19.18 prefaced by the phrase 'the whole law is fulfilled in one word' (NASB). νόμος in this context is thought to be a reference to the Mosaic Law.⁴⁵

42. Menahem Stern, 'The Jews in Geek and Latin Literature', in Shmuel Safrai and Menahem Stern (eds.), *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions: Volume 1* (CRINT, 1; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1988), pp. 1101-59.

43. Spicq, however, takes exception to this view of νόμος with reference to the Mosaic Law (see Ceslaus Spicq, *Agapé dans le Nouveau Testament, T. II* [EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1958], pp. 259-61). He maintains that the view is to the 'regle de vie' or 'principe de la moral chrestienne'. I accept the view of Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), p. 360.

44. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, p. 361.

45. John M.G. Barclay, *Obeying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians* (SNTW; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), p. 137.

Therefore, we can see that Paul in the above example has formulated his ethical instruction by appealing to ideals shaped by the Decalogue. Paul's method was to cite Old Testament Scripture and allow its authority to speak for itself. In doing so, he is making certain assumptions about the fundamental importance the love commandment would have for his audience. If this was not the case, Paul's correlation between the love commandment and the fulfillment of the Torah would have proved ineffective in communities where Jews formed part of the audience and Gentiles had exposure to the synagogue. Furthermore, it is to be noted that although there is a difference in context between the use made of Lev. 19.18 in Romans and Galatians, there is not a substantive difference in content. Both in Romans and Galatians, fulfillment of the Mosaic Law results from loving your neighbor as yourself. Therefore, while it may be that Romans offers a more explicit definition of what this means, it should not be said that Romans is a *development* of Galatians. It is simply a fuller ramification of it. Paul's debt is self-evident in shaping his ethics to the Old Testament, and especially the Decalogue. He had the capacity to instruct his converts to observe Torah stipulations.⁴⁶

3. *Future Hope*. This leads us to the third trait of shared features between Acts and Josephus's *Apion* 2.218-219: belief in a future hope. I want to inquire whether within the letters of Paul there is evidence to support the view that future hope was a 'fundamental postulate of Jewish theology'.⁴⁷ In five

46. The above section on Paul and Torah arose out of sentiments in *Apion* 2. It was not my purpose to reflect on the entirety of Paul and Josephus and the Law. Indeed, to do so would require a monograph of its own (which has not been done and I may do). However, see my *Two Diaspora Jews* (forthcoming). I have been selective in examples used intentionally since my purpose was to ask whether Paul as Jew in the New Testament evidence is replicated in the testimony of the Josephan summary. Treatment of the Law is one aspect of my analysis. Furthermore, one must take care with the definition of the 'precepts and prohibitions' of the Law in *Apion* 2. Josephus seems to include many features so, for Paul and Josephus, Law may have different meanings and nuances. A new study on Paul and Josephus and Torah would need to tease all this out.

47. George W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in International Judaism* (HTS, 26; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972), p. 9. The general accuracy of the formulation does not preclude that there existed

of the seven undisputed letters of Paul, the idea of a future hope occurs (1 Cor. 15; 2 Cor. 5; Phil. 3.20; 1 Thess. 4.11, 13-15; Rom. 13.11-12).⁴⁸ What is significant for the present discussion is that in each of these examples the importance of the idea of a future hope is presupposed, though admittedly it is a Christian hope for the future highlighted by Paul. Luke, in his record of Paul (Acts 23.6), and Paul, in his own letters, indicate that there is a reality beyond physical death. One example is 1 Thess. 4-5, where two issues are raised regarding the parousia. First, when will those who have died before the parousia be raised? Or will their death exclude them from the future blessing? Secondly, what will happen to those who are still living when the parousia occurs? The implicit concern here is being caught unaware when the parousia happens. However, there is no question whether the parousia will take place. Rather, the only concern is with its time and the effect it will have on those living and those who have already died.

The locus classicus on the future hope is 1 Cor. 15. Here Paul makes no attempt to offer proofs for the existence of a future, particularly the resurrection, which he assumes to be its inevitable coming. He does, however, give an exposition to illuminate matters relating to its character, nature and form. The exposition is characterized by the *that* (vv. 1-34) and the *how* (vv. 35-58) of future resurrection.⁴⁹ This general point is illustrated by noting vv. 13-19 and vv. 20-22, where Paul gives consequences, both negative and positive, for believing and failing to believe in the future resurrection. The assumption implicit in this type of argument is that, if Paul's focus is on *consequences* in distinction to *proofs*, he must have considered the future resurrection to be commonly held opinion among converts. This is supported by the logical progression from belief in the resurrection to its consequences. Even if Paul's reply to the issues raised at 1 Cor. 15 is christologi-

diversity of formulation about details of the future hope. See Hans C. Cavallin, 'Leben nach dem Tode im Spätjudentum und im frühen Christentum I. Spätjudentum', in Wolfgang Haase (ed.), *Band 19/1. Halbband Religion* (ANRW, II.19.1; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1979), pp. 240-345.

48. The two exceptions, Galatians and Philemon, can be explained by the overall concern of these letters.

49. Murray J. Harris, *Raised Immortal: Resurrection and Immortality in the New Testament* (Marshall's Theological Library; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1983), pp. 114-15.

cally motivated, this does not weaken the present point, since, for Paul, a belief in a future hope and the resurrection of Christ are identical.

A presupposed belief in the future hope is also evident at 2 Cor. 4–5. In the 1987 Henton Davies Lecture, Professor Henry Chadwick argued for a distinct relationship between 1 Cor. 15 and 2 Cor. 4–5.⁵⁰ He maintains that 2 Cor. 4–5 is set in strong antithesis to 1 Cor. 15. While both passages affirm a belief in the future hope, the reality of 1 Cor. 15 is re-expressed in 2 Cor. 4–5 in language with metaphysical associations. Paul presents the same reality from two different points of reference: 2 Cor. 4–5 from a Greek point of view (Platonic and Pythagorean) and 1 Cor. 15 from the Jewish point of view. Since the Corinthians found the idea of a future hope in terms of resurrection in Paul's first letter unbelievable and unacceptable, in his second letter he restated *with great subtlety of shading in his language* the doctrine of the life to come in terms of the immortality of the soul. Both 2 Cor. 4–5 and 1 Cor. 15 illustrate how Paul tried different ways of presenting what form this hope would take. From these examples I have shown that Paul believed in a future hope but that he tried different ways of expressing this reality. Thus, 1 Thess. 4 offers a general affirmation that the parousia will occur, while 1 Cor. 15 presents a future hope from the Jewish stance of resurrection of the dead and 2 Cor. 4–5 from the Greek view of immortality of the soul. We can affirm the certainty of a belief in a future hope and a diversity of forms in which this reality was expressed.

These features, certainty of hope and diversity of form and expression, are not unique to Paul. The sentiments are found in several Jewish witnesses. One example of this is *Sanh.* 10.1, especially if Finkelstein's translation is correct: 'All Israel has a destiny in the future eternity.' The translation leaves open whether the future eternity is entered following the resurrection or by each soul at the time of death.⁵¹ A second author who reflects a lack of precision regarding what form the world to come will take is Josephus. In three separate works he refers to the future hope in different ways. In *Apion* 2.218, Josephus states that God will grant to a person at death a 'renewed

50. Henry Chadwick, '2 Cor. 4–5 and Christian Platonism', Henton Davies Lecture, Regent's Park College, Oxford University, February 1987. This view Chadwick credits to W.L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1939), pp. 128-43 (143).

51. Translation cited in E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM Press, 1977), p. 148.

existence' and a 'better life'. However, in *War* 3.374, indication is given to souls receiving a 'new habitation'. Finally, in *Ant.* 18.14, Josephus records that Pharisaic belief includes the reward for good souls of a 'new life'. These expressions taken together reflect the same reality, that is, a belief in the hope of a future life. A third example that illustrates the ambiguity in language regarding the future hope is the DSS. For example, at 1QS 4.7 and 1QH 6.29-34, it is unclear whether the future hope is expressed in terms of resurrection or immortality.⁵² From the above remarks I affirm that Paul shares a common Jewish view concerning the future hope, both its certainty as a general fact and diversity in the form of its affirmation. The overarching point I am making is that Josephus in *Apion*, Luke and Paul confirm a hope that is a future reality.

4. *Final Categories.* The final two features are access of non-Jews to the people of God and the Temple and purity regulations. We noted both features above in the Josephan summary and in association with Paul in Acts. Non-Jewish access to membership in the people of God is an assumption of Paul's mission in his letters. At the call of Paul recorded in Gal. 1.15-16, his call was to bring the gospel of Christ to the Gentiles. The offer of the blessing of the Jewish God to those beyond the Jewish nation goes back to the Old Testament, such as Abraham in Gen. 12. On this point of Gentile access, we can observe several other clues in Rom. 15. Paul viewed his action as part of the plan of God to bring the Gentile to glorify the God of Israel (Rom. 15.9-10). There was a long held Jewish expectation to bring Gentiles to worship God and now especially, since, for Paul, the final days had commenced. This was standard Jewish expectation about the end. Gentile access to non-Jews to the commonwealth of Israel in *Apion* 2 is not a new or surprising idea, though it was not the Christ-centered movement that Josephus had in mind. Further, its presence in Acts is not a new concept. We have strong attestation on this point from Paul's Damascus calling recorded in his letters and in Acts 9.15 and 22.17. But its focus on Paul's account is on the offer to non-Jews of the riches of God in Christ, not the riches of the Jewish commonwealth. The commonality shared between our authors is that entry into the people of God is not limited to those who are Jews by nationality.

52. E.P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1985), p. 392.

The final area is the Temple and its institutions in *Apion* 2.190-193 and is depicted in Luke–Acts surrounding Paul. This is absent from the undisputed letters of Paul, especially in the form we find it in the Lukan account.⁵³ We do find a reference to Temple worship (*λατρεία*) in the list of attributes given of historic Israelites in Rom. 9.4-5. Paul identifies with these brethren as Israelites, which serves as part of a lengthy argument on why the Israelites have not responded to the gospel (Rom. 9.6–11.33). Temple worship in Rom 9.4 is an attribute of the Israelites which Paul includes and identifies himself with, his Jewish brethren before he begins his reflections on Israel’s lack of response to the gospel.⁵⁴

6. Conclusions

Given the above discussion we can now derive some conclusions on the Lukan reception of Paul as Jew from Paul’s own letters based on the categories derived from Josephus’s summary on Torah in *Apion* 2. On the historical Paul’s appeal to the Jewish God, I highlighted that the fundamental aspect on God was his oneness and allusion to the Shema. I also mentioned in passing other features in Paul’s letters: God as creator, judge, sovereign king, his providence, dispenser of justice, giver of grace, his covenant love

53. Only examples of God’s temple in Paul’s undisputed letters are used with reference to the individual convert’s body being a temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6.19) and at 1 Cor. 3.16-17 the Corinthian congregation is referred to as God’s temple. These examples have no semblance to Rom. 9.4 or the usage made by Luke or Josephus.

54. Markus Barth, *The People of God* (JSNTSup, 5; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1983), p. 30; See also F. Dreyfus, ‘Le passé et le présent d’Israël (Rom., 9, 1-5; 11, 1-24)’, in Lorenzo De Lorenzi (ed.), *Die Israelfrage nach Röm 9–11* (Monographische Reihe von “Benedictina”, 3; Rome: Abtei von St. Paul vor den Mauern, 1977), pp. 133-34; Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, p. 89; Carras, ‘Paul, Josephus and Judaism’, pp. 116-17. For a sense of *λατρεία* in the present context that includes prayer, reading of Scripture, reciting of Shema and observance of Sabbath, see C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979), II, p. 463.

and one who offers salvation and righteousness to Jews and Gentiles alike.⁵⁵ The context for each of these traits in the Pauline correspondence is directed at converts of the Christ-centered gospel. Further, we noted the trait of Jews showing zeal toward their God (Rom. 10.2) and God's plan and intention over history and the affairs of his people (Rom. 9–11). In Luke, we noted two features, God's action and agency over history (Acts 13.16-41), knowing the time of judgment (Acts 17.31). But many other aspects could be mentioned by Luke in Acts: Paul's epiphany encounter with God (9.1-6); God's action through a vision to Ananias on behalf of Paul (9.10-17); God's encounter with Cornelius, the God-fearer (10.1-6); God being attributed with bringing to Israel a Savior (13.23-25); that God not being a respecter of person (15.6-11). In addition, the Lukan Paul, while on trial, claims 'I stand here on trial because of my hope in the promise made by God to our fathers ...' (Acts 26.6 NRSV). In the context of both New Testament writers (Luke and Paul), the divine attribution is used when explaining the gospel message in Acts,⁵⁶ and in Paul's letters for instructing converts, while in Josephus's summary the character of the Jewish God is part of the depiction of Torah stipulations.

On Torah observance, I showed from Rom. 13.8-10 and the Decalogue that the Old Testament was used to shape Paul's ethical outlook for Roman converts. We also showed that there was some latitude among Jewish converts regarding Jewish markers of identity; that was not the case for a Gentile convert. As for the Lukan Paul on Torah observance, we noted above that the Lukan record has Paul taking a Nazarite vow to curb rumors that he was against the Law. The advice is thus offered to Paul:

They [James and the elders] have been informed that you are teaching all Jews who live among the Gentiles to turn away from Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children or live according to our customs. What shall we do? They will certainly hear that you have come, so do what we tell you. There are four men with us who have made a vow. Take these men, join in their purification rites and pay their ex-

55. On providence in Paul and Josephus, see E.P. Sanders, 'God Gave the Law to Condemn: Providence in Paul and Josephus', in Roetzel and Foster (eds.), *Impartial God*, pp. 78-97.

56. In Pauline section of Acts 9, 13–28, there are at least twenty-two episodes where God is the agent of action (chs. 9–15, 17, 19, 21–24, 26, 28). It seems to be a quite consistent motif—God's action in the Lukan Paul's record.

penses, so that they can have their heads shaved. Then everyone will know there is no truth in these reports about you, but that you yourself are living in obedience to the law (Acts 21.21-26)

This is one cameo of Paul heeding this instruction and observance of Torah. On another occasion during a trial scene, the Lukan Paul states that he had done nothing wrong against the Law or the Temple (Acts 25.7-8). On a third occasion, we find Paul having Timothy, who was of Greek and Jewish ancestry, circumcised (Acts 16.1-2) in anticipation of going on a mission to include Jews. Finally, at the end of Acts 28.17, addressing the local Jewish leaders in Rome, Luke adds that Paul has done nothing against the ancestral customs. So the Lukan portrayal of Paul presents him as without guilt. Therefore, the record of the Lukan and historic Paul seems to speak in a similar vein, though very different points are made largely due to differing genres and contexts.

On future hope, we saw that Paul in his letters (1 Cor. 15 and 2 Cor. 4-5) confirms a future hope, even if the form of the resurrection may be a little ambiguous. Perhaps it may include immortality, depending on the context. In Acts, Paul echoes in a trial scene addressing the Sanhedrin that he is on trial for the hope of Israel, the resurrection of the dead (Acts 23.6), and the idea is restated as the resurrection of the just and unjust (Acts 24.15).

On non-Jewish access to the commonwealth of Israel, I found that both in Acts and in the Pauline letters, a shared sentiment occurs on the offer to Gentiles of the gospel, and this was central to the Pauline message received at his calling (Gal. 1.15-16). This point is reiterated on the lips of the Lukan Paul as well (Acts 9.15; 22.21; 26.23).

Finally, the Temple and its institution played a central role in the Josephus summary and Acts in relation to the Nazirite scene of Paul. In the letters (Rom. 9.4), a different use is made of the Temple and its institution. It is included as a feature of what constituted the attributes of an Israelite, Torah, promises, covenants and divine glory and Temple worship. In this context, Paul as a convert still identifies with his Jewish brethren *κατὰ σάρκα*.

From the above, I make the following conclusions: (1) I observed five categories above where there is evidence of similarity between Luke and Josephus on shared features of Second Temple Judaism. (2) The areas relevant to the theme of Lukan reception of ideas of the historic Paul as Jew are (a) the centrality of the Jewish God, (b) Torah observance, (c) future hope, (d) access of practice of Judaism to non-Jews and (e) temple institution and

regulations. (3) Luke shared each of these features with the historical Paul as reflected in his undisputed letters. Therefore, I find the Josephan portrait of Jewish sensibilities broadly reflected in Paul of the letters and its reception in the Lukan Paul as well. (4) However, when I considered specific examples of content, contexts and comparisons, I did not find exact details of similarity to postulate an exacting reception between the historical Paul of the letters and the Lukan Paul. This was, in part, due to the Lukan Paul and the historical Paul telling their stories by adopting different genres, formats and contexts for their respective portraits of the Jewish Paul. Two different source literary types (i.e. epistolary writing of Paul's letter and historical recital of Acts) were utilized to uncover the results. (5) Regardless, the historical Paul of the letters and the Lukan Paul reproduced shared Jewish features within Josephan Judaism but located material and sensibilities based on their own literary needs and required nuances on each author's context, purpose and audience necessity. (6) The audience reception between the historical Paul and the Lukan Paul showed each author invariably shared similar notions and understanding of the Jewish sensibilities that each would have expected their audience best to understand and appreciate, yet both were quite different. Was there a memory of inherent meaning and association for monotheism, future hope and other isolated Jewish sensibilities? (7) My claim is that, the three Jewish sensibilities that I noted in our three authors, namely, monotheism, future hope and law observance, contribute to confirming that Paul in Acts and Paul in the letters, while their materials appear in different contexts, genres and time periods, reflect shared commonalities of Jewish sensibilities. (8) These were placed in new contexts to show that both the historical Paul of the letters and Lukan Paul reflect a primacy of these sensibilities for Jews. (9) Equally, Josephus confirmed the common, shared nature of these as Jewish shared beliefs. Thus, my study contributes to bringing the study of Josephus within reach as a source by which to present Paul as a loyal Second Temple Jew. (10) Finally, the above conclusions demonstrate the roots of the Lukan Paul and the historical Paul of the letters are consonant with one proponent of Second Temple Judaism, Flavius Josephus, and the reception of the Lukan Paul directed within Second Temple Judaism is also reflected in the historic Paul of the letters.