4-15-1942

The Training and Education of Saul of Tarsus

Arlo Krueger
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_kruegera@csl.edu

THE TRAINING AND EDUCATION

OF

SAUL OF TARSUS

A Thesis presented to the

Faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Divinity

by

Arlo Alvin Krueger

Concordia Seminary
April 15, 1942

Approved by

W. H. Rehwinkel

P. E. Kretzmann

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FORWARD

The author wishes to express his sincere gratitude to Dr. F. E. Kretzmann, Prof. A.H. Rehwinkel, and Dr. Paul Bretscher for their kindly and painstaking advice and assistance in the preparation of this thesis.

PREFACE

In undertaking a study of this nature there are two possible avenues of approach. The one is the rationalistic approach, and the other we might call, for want of a better name, the reverent approach. Both of these methods of approach have their advocates and adherents among students of St. Paul's life. And it is right at this point where the majority of divergences have their origin. The one approaches the subject from a rationalistic, the other from a reverent standpoint; and consequently both arrive at widely divergent conclusions. Therefore it is of primary significance that, before entering upon our study, we determine which of these two approaches we shall choose.

At first thought the rationalistic approach has much in its favor. At any rate it is proposed and employed by some of the outstanding scholars of Pauline life and teaching. Then, too, it makes possible the exercise of mental ingenuity and the application of historical and archeological research where otherwise human reason would have to keep silent. One of the weaknesses of this method of approach, however, is that it all-too-easily runs amuck in personal bias or preconceived ideas. But the most telling argument against the rationalistic approach in a subject of this nature is that such a study invariably leaves the Apostle Paul meaningless, lost in the debris of environmental influences, a mere automaton, as it were - no longer St. Paul nor the Apostle of Christ.

A case in point would be Renan in his work entitled <u>The</u>

Apostles. This renowned scholar of the 19th century French rationalistic school opens his treatise by deploring the fact that he has been unjustly accused, as he believes, of destroying faith. He explains that he assumed the rationalistic approach only because true scholarship demands it. Since no human being can plumb the deep secrets of the Deity, he argues, we have to exclude all supernatural influences and study the lives of the Apostles on the basis of history, research, and psychology. On that foundation he undertakes to reconstruct also the Apostle Paul. Naturally, his approach likewise precludes the inspiration of Acts and St. Paul's Epistles, our only primary source material. Since these accounts were written, one by the zealot himself, and the other by a hero-worshiping satellite, they must be viewed with an eye on the look-out for personal and overenthusiastic bias. And the character who emerges is a devitalized Saul, a Saul constructed out of a Greek, Jewish and Roman environment, a Saul whose theology represents a meaningless fusion of the religious tenets of all three nationalities.

Such is the conclusion of all those who attempt to study St. Paul on the basis of rationalism. For any Christian who holds to the inspiration of the Scriptures, however, that procedure is *eo ipso* eliminated; and there remains then only the reverent approach. And it would almost appear that St. Paul himself is urging that approach in Gal. 1, 1-16a. This reverent approach we would define as the one which makes God responsible, from first to last, for the Apostle Paul. With that approach we would picture Saul as a lump of clay in the

hands of the divine Potter, whom the Great Architect then carefully molds into St. Paul the Apostle. In this sense all the external influences upon Saul would be merely the instruments which the Lord employed to shape St. Paul.

With that approach we shall proceed to fit St. Paul, as well as we can, into his time. This undertaking, too, will encounter difficulties. Unfortunately we can learn little of the physical, social, and educational development of Saul from Acts or St. Paul's Epistles. And when we attempt to follow the general rule of those times we meet with more difficulties. We find that our best source materials - with the exception of the Bible - are permeated with enthusiastic hyperbolies and characteristically Jewish overstatements and hosts of contradictions.

Therefore we shall proceed with great caution. In the rare instances where we have direct information from the Scriptures we can speak authoritatively. Elsewhere, however, We must needs be very objective, carefully weighing the evidence pro and con. And consequently the conslusions which we shall be able to make will have to rest on what we know so far. Some questions will have to remain open in lieu of further research.

With that approach our study of the pre-conversion training and education of St. Paul will be truly profitable and will lead to a new and greater appreciation of the great Apostle to the Gentiles.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Before proceeding to reconstruct the educational development of Saul of Tarsus, it might be well first to define the term "education" as it is to be employed in this discussion. Out of bare necessity the concept "education" must be understood here in its broadest scope, as expressive of all the various influences which were exerted upon Saul during the various stages of his life up until his conversion, and the part they played in shaping his personality and character. In attempting to group these influences we might gather them under three heads: Parental, scholastic, and external influences.

The parental influences would include all the various traits for which he was indebted to his parents, either by heredity or environment. These would include Saul's native endowments, those characteristic traits which he inherited from his Jewish ancestors as well as the social, political, economic and religious heritages which his parents passed on to him. Again it is necessary to take account of the home environment in which the boy Saul found himself. That includes the occupation of his father, the relationship between parents and children, and the language they employed in their daily conversations. And, finally, most important of all is Saul's childhood training. We shall draw attention there to his secular training for a craft but especially the characteristic Pharisaic training of children both in religion and morals.

With respect to his scholastic training we shall try to determine what influences his education had upon him. As far as possible we shall try to draw a fairly complete picture of the school which St. Paul may have attended at Tarsus, and then again, describe as fully as our information warrants the type of school which he attended in Jerusalem. In both instances, of course, special emphasis will be laid on the subject-matter, philosophy of education, and methods of instruction, because our aim is to lay the groundwork for the study of what reflections of his scholastic training we can find in St. Paul's own pedagogy later on.

However, to complete the picture it will be necessary also to paint the proper background, to take cognizance of the external influences under which Saul lived. In this connection we shall try to relate as much as we know today about the city of Tarsus in which Saul lived, both as a child and as a young man, and how these observations and experiences helped to mold the Apostle. Nor dare we lose sight of life and events in Jerusalem at the time when Saul was attending school there, and how he reacted to them.

All these influences deserve careful observation in the study of St. Paul's development. All of these must be included when we speak of the education of Saul.

CHAPTER II

A HEBREW FAMILY IN A PAGAN CITY

That St. Paul was a native of Tarsus is expressly mentioned three times in Luke's narrative (Acts 9,11; 21,39; 22,3). In two other instances the name is connected with Paul (Acts 9,30; 11.25). The city of Tarsus was situated in the province of Cilicia, which lies in Asia Minor at the northeastern corner of the Mediterranean Sea. Cilicia was at the time a Roman province, and its capital, Tarsus, had been made a free city by Mark Anthony. Since that time its inhabitants, though not Roman citizens, were governed by their own laws and apparently enjoyed also the protection of its own soldiers, though, as in every Roman province, there was undoubtedly a Roman garrison stationed there also. The city of some half million inhabitants was situated at the foot of the Taurus mountains and on the river Cydnus approximately 10 or 12 miles inland from the Sea.[1] At the time of St. Paul Tarsus was a famed commercial as well as intellectual center. From the standpoint of commerce it occupied a strategic position inasmuch as it formed the connecting link between Eastern and Western trade. At the same time Tarsus was renowned as an intellectual center. It was the seat of a great university, famed for its men of great learning and for its Stoic and Cynic

---

[1] David Smith, The Life and Letters of St. Paul, pp. 17. 18, states, however, I know not on what authority, that Tarsus was situated only three-fourths of a mile inland from the Sea, adding also that its port, at the River's mouth, was Rhegma.

philosophers. Small wonder that St. Paul later on points with pride to his home town and calls it "no mean city." (Acts 21, 39)

Naturally most of the inhabitants of Tarsus were of Greek extraction. At the same time, however, it was a cosmopolitan city and could boast of representatives of almost every then-known nationality among its residents. Among its foreign inhabitants undoubtedly the largest number were Jews, Jews of the Dispersion. And among these lived the parents of Saul, who though they were far removed from their fatherland, were nevertheless "Hebrews of the Hebrews," (Acts 23,6), that is, of pure, unadulterated Jewish stock, and members of the tribe of Benjamin (Phil. 3,5).

What had occasioned their coming to Tarsus or when they came is difficult to determine. St. Jerome has preserved an old, though precarious, tradition to this effect: "De tribu Benjamin et oppido Judaeae Gischalis fuit, quo a Romanis capto cum parentibus suis Tarsus Ciliciae commigravit?"[1] This tradition is fraught with grave difficulties. If Saul was born in Gischala, as Jerome affirms, his parents must have moved to Tarsus very soon thereafter; else this view contradicts St. Paul's own affirmation that he was a native of Tarsus. Moreover, making the exodus of the Pauline family contemporaneous with the fall of Gischala would make it take place in 70 A.D. - after St. Paul's death! It is quite likely that here again, as at other times, Jerome is guilty of an inaccuracy. More likely it is that Saul's parents before his

[1] Quoted in Smith, op. cit., p. 19.

birth already, or even his earlier ancestors had moved to Tarsus. But even then we have this difficulty: How did the Pauline family become citizens of Tarsus? The privilege of citizenship was not bestowed upon persons simply by virtue of their or their ancestors coming there. In that case they would have been mere "residents" (incolae), not citizens. One explanation that has been suggested, though a rather unlikely one, is this: Perhaps the Pauline family obtained its citizenship in Tarsus by virtue of some distinguished service which Paul's father or older ancestors had rendered the State. Much more plausible would seem the conjecture of Ramsay[1] to the effect that the parents of Paul might have come to Tarsus as members of a colony planted there by Seleucid kings. At least it has in its favor the observations that this very thing did happen in Tarsus and that Seleucid kings appear to have had a preference for Jewish colonists.

At the same time Paul was also a Roman citizen (cf. Acts 22,25 - 29; 23,27; etc.), and when he felt the need for it he was not afraid to insist upon his rights as such (Acts 25,11). From Acts 22,28 it seems quite evident that he had inherited this privilege from his father. How his father or earlier ancestors obtained it we do not know. We do know, though, that some of the wealthier Jews secured this franchise for a designated sum of money. Then again, it may be that one of Paul's ancestors obtained his Roman citizenship through some distinguished service to the imperial government. Both conjectures seem rather forced, but more we do not know.

---

[1] W.M. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen, pp. 31.32.

Now let us attempt to learn what would be the status of such a Jewish-Greek-Roman family in Tarsus. What would be its social position? By the very force of circumstances it is true when Riddle states that "the home into which Paul was born and in which he lived was one of a social, cultural, and religious minority group."[1] However, by reason of the very social nature of man, it is overstating the case to hold, as some do, that a Jewish family in Tarsus would live in a little world by itself, practically altogether cut off from intercourse with Greek society. Ramsay throws additional light on the subject when he says: "In Tarsus, so far as the scanty evidence justifies an opinion, the Jews seem to have been regarded in a less degree than elsewhere as an alien element."[2] And in the case of the Pauline family we must take into consideration also their Roman citizenship. That distinction itself would tend to place them on a higher social level than the common run of Jewish inhabitants; for the privilege of Roman citizenship was in the first century a prized and an enviable distinction, from which the great masses of people were excluded.

Very closely allied with, and at the same time having considerable effect on, their social standing is the financial and economic status of the Pauline family. Research has revealed that the predominant trade among the residents of Tarsus was tent-making. Moreover, St. Paul himself relates how later on in the course of his missionary travels he was able to support himself when occasion demanded by the trade of tent-

---

[1] D.W. Riddle, Paul Man of Conflict, p.27.
[2] W.M. Ramsay, The Cities of St. Paul, p. 139.

making (1 Thess. 2, 6.9; 2 Thess. 3,8; 1 Cor. 9,12.15). From those two facts we can draw the conclusion that Paul must have learned the trade in Tarsus and, at least the inference, that his father, too, was very likely engaged in the same trade. Now then, what was the economic, and consequently, social status of the tent-maker of Tarsus. Very much as England in our own day, so Graeco-Roman society in St. Paul's day distinguished between the wealthy class and the common masses, between proprietors and hirelings. If then we may assume that the father of Paul was a tent-maker by trade, we will have to assign the Pauline family to the second and lower class; for members of that guild belonged to the laboring class. Therefore the observation that "the tent-maker from Tarsus, though to us he may be Paul the Great Apostle, was to the upper stratum of Corinthian (and, for that matter, Tarsian) society but a laboring man"[1] is essentially correct. At the same time we ought to bear in mind that in this lower class we have to distinguish at least two, if not several levels. It is true, the tent-makers as a class were customarily looked down upon and rather poorly paid. However, calling to our support the citizenship of the Pauline family and the fact that Saul's father was able to give his son such a fine education, we are inclined to place the Pauline family at least into the upper bracket of the laboring class, thus grouping them with the artisans.

Finally, then, what was the religious status of the Pauline family in Tarsus? This question is important because of its bearing on the religious development of Paul, and at

[1] H.E. Dana, The New Testament World, p. 223.

least significant inasmuch as it reflects upon the social attitudes of the Pauline family and consequently eventually determines the extent of Hellenistic influence upon Paul. The best and surest clue to the religious standing of the Pauline family is given by Paul himself in Acts 23, 6; 26, 5; and Phil. 3, 5. From those passages it is manifestly clear that his parents were Pharisees, what's more, Pharisees of the strictest kind, and that he was brought up under that Pharisaic influence. Since the imperial Roman government granted to its conquered nations religious tolerance, though not religious liberty, we may assume that the Pauline family was permitted to worship almost or altogether as it chose. Even of the Dispersion Jews in general it is true that they remained signally faithful to their ancient religion and traditions. As proof for that statement we offer the general existence of Synagogues among all the Jews of the Dispersion. And in the case of Saul's parents we must bear in mind that they were not merely Judaistic but very strict Pharisees. Hence they were even more meticulous than the ordinary Jew in their adherence to their religion. Therefore there is no justifiable reason to assume that any pagan influence entered into the childhood home of Saul, and anyone who is familiar with Pharisaic tendencies will have to arrive at the conclusion that "birth in Tarsus .... did not mean for Paul any adherence to a liberal Judaism, as distinguished from the strict Judaism of Palestine."[1] This conclusion is very important. It will be applied again and again. Many inferences will be drawn from it.

---

[1] J. Gresham Machan, The Origin of Paul's Religion, p. 176.

CHAPTER III

THE PRE-SCHOOL LIFE OF SAUL

Thus far we have sketched the surroundings and circumstances into which the child Saul was born. With that picture in mind we shall, in the succeeding paragraphs, undertake to describe, as well as our information warrants, the life of Saul from his birth up until the commencement of his formal schooling. It is, of course, self-evident that our description will not be restricted merely to those years, but will include also his home life and the influences which his parents exerted upon him during the years of his elementry schooling.

If only we were able to determine the exact date of Saul's birth we might be able to say more later on about the possibilities of his having seen Christ or come in contact with Christianity during his studies in Jerusalem. However, due to an almost complete lack of information, the date is variously computed to be between the birth of Jesus and 12 A.D. Those who lean toward the later date base their arguments on Philemon, verse 9, where St. Paul calls himself "Paul the aged," and Acts 7, 58, where it is stated that at the time of Stephen's stoning Saul was "a young man." But obviously it is hard to determine just what ages the designations "Paul the aged" and "a young man" indicate. Another group, with perhaps a bit more plausibility, computes the date from the work falsely ascribed to St. Chrysostom, Oratio Encomiastica in Principes Apostolorum Petrum et Paulum, in which the statement is made: "Thirty-five

years he (St. Paul) served the Lord with all eagerness; and having finished his course in the cause of religion he went to his rest about sixty-eight years of age."[1] The fact that this ancient writer records these figures with such a degree of precision and confidence suggests that they were the generally accepted ones. On the basis of that testimony, then, St. Paul would have been born between one and five years after Christ, depending upon whether we accept the early date, 64, or the latter, 67 or 68, as the year of his martyrdom. Though it apparently carries more weight than the former, this argument, too, is by no means conclusive.

There can be no justified reason to doubt that the Pharisaic parents of Paul circumcised and named the child on the eighth day in accord with Jewish ecclesiastical law. By the rite of circumcision the child Saul would be put under the bondage of the Law, as it were, and made partaker both of the duties and privileges which it implied. At the beginning of the ceremony a benediction would be pronounced upon him, and at its close a prayer would be offered for his growth and preservation in the Law of God. At the same time also the name Saul, "asked" of God, would be given him. As to his other name, Paul, the theory that this is only the Latin form of the name Saul is no doubt incorrect; for philology knows nothing of the "s" changing into "p" in transliteration from Hebrew to Latin. We know that the Dispersion Jews frequently had, besides their Hebrew name, also another name, whereby they were known among the Gentiles. That may well be the origin of the name Paul.

---

[1]Quoted and translated in David Smith, op. cit., p. 645.

How many members there were in the Pauline family we have no way of ascertaining. It does seem rather evident, though, that Paul must have had at least a sister; for in Acts 23, 10 we hear of "Paul's sister's son" saving his life at Jerusalem. The allusion is, however, too brief to be of any value to our present study.

With respect to the relationships existing within the Pauline family we again cannot make any definite statements. All we can do is try to outline from what we know of ancient Jewish family life, what the normal Jewish parent-child relationship seems to have been. The characteristic Jewish family is, I believe, very aptly and correctly pictured in the following statement: "Jewish family life, indeed, far surpassed that of the Gentiles in the purity of its relations, in the position it secured to women, and in the care which it bestowed on children, who were regarded as a blessing vouchsafed by God and destined for His service by fidelity to the Divine Law."[1]

In all we read of Jewish history we make the repeated observation that the Jewish estimate of children was indeed very high. Contrary to pagan practices of abortion, exposure, and neglect, every Jewish child was cherished and reared as a trust from God. These facts are not even vitiated by such statements which at first appear to express a rather low estimate of female children as we read for instance in the Talmud: "The birth of a male child causes universal joy - but the birth of a female child causes universal sorrow."[2]

---

[1] Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. V, Art., "Education," p. 229.
[2] Niddah, 31b.

Such statements occasion no difficulty when we recall how eager the Jewish family was to perpetuate its name, to be able to trace its genealogy all the way back to Abraham. And the great difference between the Jewish and pagan estimate of children has only one explanation: The Law of God, especially the Book of Proverbs.

Before proceeding to a discussion of the characteristic training in a Jewish home, it might be well to outline briefly the duties of children over against their parents. Above all else it was the duty of every Jewish father and mother carefully to teach their children the Law of God and to train them in the exercise of the moral, civil, and ceremonial regulations which it laid down. In this sphere the Jewish parent had the right to exercise full authority and demand strict obedience. And meanwhile the children were impressed with their duty to obey their parents as God's representatives. Already very early in life they became familiar with those strict admonitions of the Torah which warned them, on pain of death, against disobeying their parents.

In attempting now to describe the childhood training of Saul we are again drawing our inferences from the general rule. In the first place, we must constantly bear in mind that Saul's parents were strict Pharisees and that therefore their child would be reared in accord with the most rigid Jewish practices. At the same time his parents, though Hellenists, were by no means Hellenizers in theology. Such statements as Acts 23,6; 2 Cor. 11,22; and Phil. 3,5 rule out any tendency on their

part to be influenced by Greek religion and morals. For the purposes of our study of Saul's childhood training it will be sufficient to give only a brief summary of the characteristics of Pharisaism. The very name "Pharisee" signified "Separatist." Their chief characteristic was their emphasis on tithing and ceremonial purity. Their other outstanding characteristics may be enumerated thus: 1) Legalism; 2) Emphasis on divine providence; 3) Belief in the existence of angels; 4) Simple living; 5) Emphasis on antiquity and tradition; 6) Group loyalty and fellowship; 7) Little interest in politics.[1] In a degree at least, these characteristics may be said to underlie also Saul's training.

The duty of child training was considered a very important one among the Jews. "We take the most pains of all with the instruction of children," according to Josephus.[2] And that responsibility lasted until the children reached adulthood.

With such emphasis on child training, it does not strike us as remarkable that the Jews began to train and educate their children from the first awakening of consciousness. And right here, at the very outset of the child's training, some of the most modern educational methods were employed. As a case in point, we have their use of symbols and symbolic rites in order to stimulate the child's interest and curiosity. "Throughout his life, from birth to death, the Jew was surrounded by an endless succession of sign and symbol ceaselessly exhorting him 'to remember.'"[3] For instance, at the

---

[1] Dana, op. cit., p. 118.
[2] Apion, 1:12.
[3] Nathan Morris, The Jewish School, p. 117.

door-post of the Jewish home, especially among the Pharisies, was the "Mesusah," "a small longitudinally-folded parchment square, on which, on twenty-two lines, these two passages were written: Deut. 6, 4-9, and 11, 13-21."[1] Though its use was in no way prescribed in the Torah, it was believed that, when a person touched it with his fingers on entering or leaving the house, it would convey the benediction of Psalm 121, 8: "The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in from this time forth, and even for evermore.".

Again the Jewish weekly and yearly festivals would be observed in the Pauline home as rigidly as their location and environment would allow. To what extent the great yearly festivals were celebrated and what modifications may have become necessary in the Dispersion, we can no longer accurately determine. Nevertheless, the weekly Sabbath, as well as the Passover, feast of Dedication, of Esther, of the Tabernacles, and others, would be celebrated if not in strict accord with Palestinian practice, then at least in miniature. All these, as they were celebrated time and again, would impress themselves, together with their rites, deeply upon the young mind of Saul. However, not only the rituals of these various feasts, but also their significance was to become familiar to the Jewish child. For instance, with regard to the teaching purpose of the Paschal Supper, Edersheim gives us this information: "Indeed, at a certain part of the service it was expressly ordained, that the youngest at the Paschal table

[1] Alfred Edersheim, Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ, p. 107.

should rise and formally ask what was the meaning of all this service, and how that night was distinguished from the others; to which the father was to reply, by relating, in language suited to the child's capacity, the whole national history of Israel from the calling of Abraham down to the deliverance from Egypt and the giving of the Law; 'and the more fully,' it was added, 'he explains it all, the better.'"[1]

Moreover, as soon as the child was able to speak, it was taught to memorize prayers, chants, and selections from the Torah. Naturally the first selections to be learned in all three cases would be those in common usage at the family altar and in the Synagogue liturgy. It would begin by memorizing the "Shema," made up of the following passages: Deut. 6,4-9; 11, 13-21; Numb. 15, 37-41. Then there would follow the memorization of certain Psalms, especially the child's "birthday Psalm." And gradually new selections would be learned until even the humblest Jew could boast of having memorized large parts of the Torah and of being rather familiar with all of it.

Another teaching agency among the Jews, which we may be sure the Pauline family enjoyed to the full, was the local Synagogue. They would take their son along with them, at a very tender age, to the Synagogue on the Sabbaths and feast days. There he would be fascinated by the colorful vestments, ceremonies and liturgies, as well as deeply impressed and inspired by the solemnity, the awful presence of Jehovah, and the precious heritage of his face.

Did the Pauline family possess a copy of the Scriptures

---

[1]Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 110.

from which the child Saul might read and study? This point has been gravely doubted because of the prohibitive cost of transcribing the entire Book. However, these points deserve note: To the pious, and especially the Pharisaic Jew his religion was the center of his life. He lived in the Torah. Therefore, if he possibly could afford it, he would have in his possession a treasured copy of the Law. Moreover, there were large hosts of Scribes throughout Jewery whose duty it was to transcribe the Scriptures; and consequently the parchments may not have been as expensive as we may think. At the very least, almost without exception, the Jewish family had in its possession the parchment roles containing the "Shema," the "Hallel" (Ps. 113-118), The portion relating the history from the Creation to the Flood, and the first eight chapters of the Book of Leviticus.[1] Therefore, in view of the prevalence of the Scriptures among the Jews, the Pharisaic standing of the Pauline family, and their at least fair financial status, we are certain that they possessed at least portions of the Scriptures and very much inclined to believe that they were in possession of a complete Old Testament Bible.

It might also be added that among the Jews provisions were made for adult training, in order that they might be so much more capable of teaching their children. Besides the Synagogue service itself, which was largely a teaching service, there were held, in connection with the various synagogues, informal public forums, wherein the Scribes taught and discussed with the people the Torah. Saul's parents would be

[1] Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 117.

Among those present at the Tarsus Synagogue on Sabbath and feast-day afternoons.

A most significant question must be touched upon here. What was, as far as we can tell, the language in use in the Pauline home? In the first place, we must remember that the Scriptures were written in Hebrew. At the same time, the Hebrew language had largely passed out of common usage and the Aramaic had become the every-day language of Jewish conversation. And finally, we have to consider the extent of Hellenistic influence upon the Pauline family. Our chief problem is to attempt to discover how much the Pharisaical Pauline family was influenced by the vernacular Greek of the city in which they lived.

As our first consideration we might take cognizance of the fact that at Philo's time a knowledge of Greek was rather common among the upper classes in Jerusalem. Moreover, from the account of the translation of the Pentateuch contained in the Letter of Aristeas we learn that, "Not only the authentic copy of the Law but the qualified translators are brought from Jerusalem."[1] It may be inferred, and with a degree of plausibility, that the Jews of the Dispersion were influenced by the Greek language to an even greater extent. But how about the Pharisaic Pauline family? We are assured that among the higher classes Hellenistic culture prevailed. Did the Pauline family belong to the higher class? Undoubtedly not if Saul's father was a tent-maker. Moore assures us that the Hellenistic Jews provided themselves with Greek translations

[1] Quoted in G.F. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, Vol. I, p. 322.

of the Scriptures, and that therefore it wasn't necessary for them to read the original Hebrew. Only the learned among the Jews, he claims, busied themselves with the study of the original. In the case of the Pauline family that rather sweeping statement may require some restrictions. That might well be true of Saul's parents if their great-grandparents already moved to Tarsus, more unlikely if his grandparents had come there, and, we might say, quite unlikely if his parents themselves had moved from Palestine (where they certainly would have spoken Aramaic and studied the Hebrew Scriptures) to Tarsus. Here we must recall the Pharisaic insistence on tradition and their consequent preference for the traditional Hebrew Scriptures and Aramaic dialect. At the same time Moore's statement of their relation to the Hebrew Scriptures at that time does not well agree with the Jews' relation to their own Yiddish Scriptures and tongue in our own day after an added 1900 years of the Dispersion; for it is often to be noticed that, not, indeed, among the educated and liberal, but rather among the lower class of Jews the Yiddish Scriptures and even the Yiddish language are in frequent use. Moore's whole argument, of course, presupposes the use of the Greek vernacular in their daily conversation. In defence of this point we might offer the evidence of recent philological investigation to the effect that Paul's use of the Greek language in his Epistles is of such quality that he must have become familiar with it already in childhood. On the other hand, we might suggest that that familiarity may be due largely to his contact with the Greek language among the inhabitants of

Tarsus. We would offer here the familiar example of children of German-speaking families in English-speaking neighborhoods acquiring a fluent usage of the English already before school age.

Machen, who holds the view that the daily conversation of the Pauline family was in the Aramaic language, offers an intriguing argument to prove his point, which I should like to quote in full. He says:

> In 2 Cor. 11,22, Paul is declared to be a "Hebrew," and in Phil. 3,5 he appears as a "Hebrew of Hebrews." The word "Hebrew" in these passages cannot indicate merely Israelitish descent or general adherence to the Jews' religion. If it did so it would be a meaningless repetition of the other terms used in the same passages. Obviously it is used in the narrower sense. The key to its meaning is found in Acts 6,1, where, within Judaism, the "Hellenists" are distinguished from the "Hebrews," the Hellenists being the Jews of the Dispersion who spoke Greek, and the Hebrews the Jews of Palestine who spoke Aramaic. In Phil. 3,5, therefore, Paul declares that he was an Aramaic-speaking Jew and descended from Aramaic-speaking Jews; Aramaic was used in his boyhood home, and the Palestinian tradition was preserved.[1]

It is evident that his whole argument rests on the interpretation of the word "Hebrew" in those passages.

We shall not pursue the argument any farther at this point because it will be taken up from here and continued at various other points throughout our study. Suffice it to say, then, that on the basis of the information we now have and the inferences we can make, we will have to favor slightly the view that the Aramaic language was the language of daily conversation in the home in which Paul grew up. Whether they used the Hebrew Scriptures also is more difficult to determine because the evidence is even more meager. If, however, their

---

[1] Machen, op. cit., p. 100.

use of the Aramaic language could be proven, it would be practically self-evident that they used the Hebrew Torah also.

With reference to the language in use in the Tarsus Synagogue the problem is simplified because of lack of information. For the use of the Septuagint Scriptures and the Greek vernacular in the exposition we have only the evidence that it was done especially in later centuries. For the use of the Hebrew Torah and the Aramaic in the exposition we have only the characteristic Jewish exclusiveness and their extreme "nationalism," which would incline them to the Scriptures and language of their fatherland. Would it be too ridiculous to suggest that, with Jewish emphasis on universal "Church attendance" and education, both Greek and Aramaic services may have been held in the Tarsus Synagogue? That Saul had opportunity to hear the Greek language in the Synagogue of Tarsus seems quite likely then; whether or not the Hebrew and Aramaic were used, we cannot show.

Dismissing for a while the vexing language problem, we may continue with Saul's home training. Having sketched the religious training of the characteristic Jewish child of that day, we may turn now to its application, the training in morals. The underlying principle of all moral training was, of course, Jehovah and the obedience to his laws. Thus Philo says that his people "were from their swaddling clothes, even before being taught either the sacred laws or the unwritten customs, trained by their parents, teachers, and instructors to recognize God as Father and as Maker of the world."[1] In this

[1]Quoted in Dana, op. cit., p. 153.

training the parents were to be very strict. If the child disobeyed, it was the father's duty to chastise it. Brutality, however, was forbidden; and chastisement of a grown-up son was forbidden on pain of excommunication. Earnest admonition was preferred to the application of the rod. The dominating principle pervading all of Jewish moral training was the integration of religion and life.

> The sharp distinction between the religious and the secular, which often renders futile the best efforts of the modern teacher of religion, was not known then. Religion was not confined to certain hours and to certain places; and nothing would have been stranger to the minds of those people than special lessons devoted to it. It was co-extensive with life and controlled every action of man.[1]

Such training alone deserves credit for the high state of morality among the ancient Jews, so that "no other Oriental people of their day has remained, but the Jew with his moral discipline is with us yet."[2] Such was the childhood moral training of Saul of Tarsus.

At the same time the duty would devolve upon Saul's father to teach his son a trade. There is no absolute proof for the fact that Saul's father was a tent-maker, but the indications that we have point, as we have shown, in that direction. And, according to custom, Saul would inherit his father's trade. His father would begin teaching him the trade of tent-making in his childhood already. "Learning of any kind unaccompanied by a trade ends in nothing, and leads to sin," said Gamaliel.[3] Another Rabbi had said, "Whoever does not teach his son a trade is as if he brought him up to be a robber."[4] We shall have

---

[1] Moore, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 228.
[2] F.P. Graves, A Student's History of Education, p. 27.
[3] F.W. Farrar, The Life and Work of St. Paul, Vol. I, p. 23.
[4] Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 190.

more to say on this point in connection with Saul's taking up the Rabbinate.

And finally we learn from Jewish tradition that the father was expected also to take at least an occasional part in the child's amusements. There was wisdom even in this, as we can readily realize when we compare the Greek custom of giving the child's recreation to the "Pedagogue" who all too often taught the child immorality and homosexuality rather than games and sports. The Jews seem, however, to have had little interest in gymnastic exercises, and wrestling with scanty attire was especially loathesome. Whether Saul's father took time on Sabbath and festival days to teach him new games we do not know. He did, however, undoubtedly teach his son to swim; for that duty was required of every Jewish father. And these first lessons in the Cydnus or the Mediterranean apparently stood him in good stead later on (Acts 27, 43.44; Especially 2 Cor. 11,25).

CHAPTER IV

SAUL'S FIRST FORMAL SCHOOLING

In all fairness it must be admitted here again that we have in all of our primary sources not one direct statement to the effect that St. Paul attended the elementary school in Tarsus as a child. Nevertheless, such statements as we find in Acts 22,3 and Phil. 3,5 imply very strongly that he did attend an elementary school there. Then too, his later studies for the rabbinate in Jerusalem almost necessarily postulate an elementary education in Tarsus. But we find still other reasons in Jewish history.

Our first reason arises from the widespread character of Jewish education. Nathan Morris tells us that, "the compulsory and universal system of education is, of course, entirely a product of the modern national state."[1] That statement is true if correctly understood to mean that national laws enforcing universal education are a modern innovation, However, among the Jews there was an unwritten law that every city with ten Jewish families (according to Maimonides, 120 families or 25 boys of suitable age) should establish a school. In fact, the duty of education was clearly implied in the Torah itself. And so, in Palestine at least, it must be admitted that schools were quite general. Tradition has it that Joshua, the son of Gamala, introduced compulsory education in every town for all children above the age of six. Highly fabulous is the tradition that at one time there were 480 schools in Jerusalem

[1] Morris, op. cit., p. 46.

alone. Somewhat closer to the truth may be the assertion that it was considered unlawful, sinful to live in a city where there was no school. However, when referring to the Diaspora we must qualify our statements. The assertion that "there would, at this time, be an elementary school wherever there was a synagogue"[1] might not hold true in every case because of circumstances themselves. One writer[2] has correctly observed that we must not, from the general references in Josephus and the Talmud to the duty of child education and the emphasis placed upon it, conclude that a universal education by any means existed in the Dispersion, in fact even in Palestine and Babylonia. Nevertheless, it must be said that the clearly implied duty to educate children was there. It may well be that at first, in the Dispersion, the parents attempted to carry out that duty themselves, or, with the aid of a tutor if they could afford one. But such instruction must necessarily be insufficient. Therefore, as soon as there were enough Jews settled in one locality to enable them to establish a Synagogue, they would attach to it a school soon after. In so far it was a parental duty.

And once such a school was established, then it became a stringent duty of all parents to send their children. However, the method followed was encouragement rather than compulsion. Hillel said: "The more teaching of the Law, the more life; the more schools, the more wisdom," and "The ignoramus cannot be truly pious."[3] In fact, the study of the Law was esteemed above all other deeds and virtues. Moreover, it

---

[1] J. Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. I, p. 650.
[2] Morris, op. cit., pp. 18-20.
[3] Goldberg and Benderley, Outline of Jewish Knowledge, Vol. III, p. 518.

was also the duty of the community to provide education for the poor. Little receptacles were provided in the Synagogue, into which free-will contributions were to be thrown for the education of the poor and orphans.

However, all this refers only to education for the boys. Girls, with but few exceptions, received no more education than that which their parents could give them at home. That would consist, of course, also in an elementary study of the Torah, but primarily in the cultivation of the domestic arts to prepare them for marital duties and motherhood. Above all, they would learn much of the Law in their attendance at the Synagogue worship. "Women," it was said, "are of a light mind;"[1] and therefore it was unwise to give them too good an education. Naturally the main reason was, that Woman's place was in the home.

Though we cannot conclusively prove that a Synagogue school existed in Tarsus at Saul's time, we have, as we have shown, very good evidence for its existence. St. Paul's own statements in Acts 22,3 and Phil. 3,5, the fact that the Jews always established a Synagogue school as soon as the Jewish population and their means warranted it, and that there was at Saul's time, as history shows, a rather large population of Jews in Tarsus, - these facts make it almost necessary for us to assume that there was an elementary school in Tarsus. And so, while Saul's sister would receive her training at home, the young boy would be diligently sent to the Synagogue school by his Pharisaic parents. There could be little doubt

[1] Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 133.

but that, since no doubt such a school did exist there, Saul would attend that school in preference to a Greek school. From what we know of the paganism and consequent immorality pervading the Greek schools (especially in Tarsus) at the time, we could hardly conceive of a Pharisaic family sending their son to such a school. That argument would require serious consideration even if it could be proven that no Synagogue school existed in Tarsus at that time.

Before proceeding to describe the characteristic Synagogue school of the time, it might be well to sketch briefly the Jewish school system with its various levels. The Jewish male's life was outlined in the following manner: "At five years of age, reading of the Bible; at ten years, learning the Mishna; at thirteen years, bound to the commandments; at fifteen years, the study of the Talmud; at eighteen years, marriage; at twenty, the pursuit of trade or business (active life)."[1] Most of these statements ought to be regarded as the ideal rather than the general rule.

In its golden age Jewish education distinguished four kinds of schools. The first, similar to our present-day Kindergarten was an infant school which the child attended approximately from the 4th to the 6th year. Next came the elementary school including the years between 6 and 9. Then there followed the advanced elementary school, or high school, comprising the years from 10 to 14. And finally, there came the Academy, or college, whose classes the boy would attend until his 18th or 20th year.[2]

---

[1] Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 105.

[2] P.F. Kretzmann, Education Among the Jews, pp. 87-94.

Beginning with the Dispersion, however, this well-arranged school system underwent great modifications. In most cases only two kinds of Schools, into which the others were incorporated, were maintained, the Beth Ha-sefer, or elementary school, and the Academy, or college. In some instances the intermediate school, or high school, called the Beth Ha-middrash, was also maintained. Thus, normally, the Jewish boy would attend the dementary school from his 6th to his 13th year, and from his 13th to approximately his 20th year, that is, if he studied for the rabbinate, he would attend the Academy.

Before advancing to the set-up of the dementary school we ought first to reflect briefly upon the Jewish philosophy of education, the connection between a Synagogue school of the Dispersion and the Temple at Jerusalem, and the extent of Greek influence in a Synagogue school of the Dispersion.

The following is, I believe, a very fine summary of the whole theory underlying all of Jewish education:

> Hebrew education is unlike any other whatsoever in that it made God the beginning. It began, therefore, by teaching the child the most general and universal, and not the particular. It began with the social and not the individual; with the personal and ethical, and not with things. It began with the abstract and unseen, and not with the seen and the concrete; with obedience to law and reverence for God, and not in the acquisition of the arts of reading and writing. Truth was deduced from this divine, original principle, and not learned by induction. Jewish education was spiritual, and therefore it stood in direct contradiction to the empirical and naturalistic systems of other peoples. The fact that it has outlasted every other system whatsoever makes it the most successful educational experiment ever staged in the history of civilization.[1]

---

[1] P.J. Marique, History of Christian Education, Vol.I, p. 157.

Indeed, that was the end and aim of all Jewish education, to establish the proper personal relationship between the individual and his God. To gain and maintain that relationship the child had to become, as soon as possible, familiar with God's will. And that will was laid down in the Torah. Therefore, Josephus informs us: "Our principal care of all is this, to educate our children well,"[1] and "We take most pains of all with the instruction of children and esteem the observation of the laws and the piety corresponding with them the most important affair of our whole life."[2] From that thorough education, it was hoped, would flow also a moral, upright life. That duty, too, was impressed upon the child, not only for its own sake, but for the sake of its community; for the Jews felt that the whole welfare and destiny of the Jewish nation depended upon the upright life of the individual himself. Thus R. Eleazer b. Shamua' said: "Teaching must not be interrupted even for the reestablishment of the sanctuary in Jerusalem."[3] The last, though quite secondary, reason for a thorough education was to enable the individual to take an active and intelligent part in the worship and rites of the Synagogue.

The connection existing between the central Synagogue, the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem and the Synagogues throughout the Dispersion seems to have been a very close one. The Roman government, we learn, recognized the Sanhedrin's authority in spiritual matters throughout Judaism. And the Synagogues,

---

[1] Antiq., p. 765.
[2] Apion., 1,12.
[3] The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol.V, p. 43.

the schools connected with them, in fact, all the Jews, of the Dispersion looked to Jerusalem for government and direction.

Much as we would like to know what was the language of the Synagogue school in Tarsus when Saul attended it, we have no way of determining. When we learn that the Greek influence was felt even in Palestine to the extent that, among the upper classes at least, there was a broadening and secularizing of the otherwise somewhat narrow Jewish horizon, that physical exercises, a bent toward the artistic, skepticism and pagan religions filtered in, and that the Greek language and literature was rather frequently employed and studied,[1] we might argue by comparison that the Greek influence must have been much more keenly felt among the Jews in the Dispersion. And various of the foremost critics of St. Paul are strongly inclined, from their study of his Greek style, to believe that his childhood education was either all or predominantly in the Greek language. Equally as many others, however, incline toward the opposite view. The argument for the Greek language thus rests on the style of his Greek and not on history. The argument for the use of the Hebrew and Aramaic language, on the other hand, rests on the Jewish characteristic of holding to tradition and of intense "nationalism." Though it adds no weight to the latter argument, the following saying of the Pharisees is interesting: "Cursed be he who feeds swine: and cursed be he who teaches his son Greek literature."[2] The evidence on either side is too

[1] Marique, op. cit., pp. 154.155.
[2] Quoted in Smith, op. cit., p. 23.

scarce to warrant a conclusion. More will be said of this in connection with Saul's return to Tarsus as a young man and especially, when we take up the question whether he attended a school of rhetoric there.

The age at which Saul would enter upon his studies at the Synagogue school depends largely upon what his physical condition was. The Jews were careful not to overwork their children at this tender age, because they realized the serious impairment to health that might be involved. Normally, in its 6th year - in exceptional cases at the age of five - the Jewish boy would enter the Beth Ha-sefer.

Before entering upon the details, however, we must describe the general set-up of one of these schools. The question whether the school would be held in the Synagogue itself, merely in connection with it, or at a private home has been debated loud and long. In exceptional cases the school was held in private homes; but normal practice seems to have been to maintain the school in connection with the Synagogue, if not within the Synagogue itself.

The history of the teaching profession among the Jews is a study in itself, and at the same time one on which we have quite a wealth of information. The Jews were not willing to give such an important duty as the education of their children over to a slave, a pedagogue, as the Greeks usually did. But away back in Old Testament times already those who taught were called soferim, that is, "scribes" or, "biblical scholars." Of the teacher's moral prerequisites Morris does not overstate the matter in the least when he says: "An

unimpeachable moral and religious character was an essential qualification for a teacher."[1] That was necessary because of the great responsibility which the office involved, "He who instructs a child is as if he had created it," said the Talmud.[2] He was required to be a married man, so that he might the better understand and sympathize with children and take a loving interest in them. In order that he might devote all his time and energies to his profession, the scribe was not permitted to engage in any other occupation.[3] He enjoyed a high social grade. With all respect the people addressed him as "Rabbi" (רַבִּי -"My master;" literally, "my great one"). He had to have a fluent speech. Patience was a requirement. With respect to the subject matter we are told: "The first qualification was an acquaintance with the whole store of learning."[4] In fact, we are told that, if he was found to be deficient in this point, he could be discharged. A favorite maxim was: "A teacher who knows a little thoroughly is to be preferred to one who knows much superficially."[5] And he was to have a thorough understanding of the subject matter. Said Ben-Sira: "My son, if thou seest a man of understanding, get thee betimes unto him, and let thy feet wear out the steps to his home."[6] Because of the huge amount of material that had to be covered, the teacher was to be brief and to the point in his explanations. There is much argument on the question, whether the teachers were paid or not. Apparently those of the elementary school were paid for their

---

[1] Morris, op. cit., p.65.
[2] Kretzmann, op. cit., p. 76.
[3] G.F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, p. 309.
[4] A Cyclopedia of Education, Vol. III, p. 544.
[5] J.Hastings, Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol.V, p. 195.
[6] J. Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. I, p. 649.

teaching services, while those of the Academy taught without charge. If the elementary school teacher was not directly paid for his instructions (for it was evidently frowned upon to receive pay for teaching the Torah, since it ought to be looked upon as a privilege), then at least he received pay avowedly for keeping the children in his care. Sometimes the pay was agreed upon between the teacher and the children's fathers. More generally the community would levy a tax, the amount in each case depending upon the financial ability of the family, to pay the teacher's salary. The well-to-do were required to pay enough to finance the education also of the poor and the orphans.

The relation between the teacher and the pupil was always to be one of mutual love and respect. The children were to honor their teacher because he was instructing them in the Law of God. How the teacher was to regard his pupils may be inferred from such high estimates of school children as are voiced in the Talmud: "Every day an angel goes out from the presence of the Holy One, blessed be He, to destroy the world and turn it into nothing. Then He bethinks Himself of the school-children and immediately His anger is turned into mercy,"[1] and "By the breath from the mouth of school children the world is sustained."[2]

In the fourth century the restriction was made that no teacher dared instruct more than 25 pupils in one class without the aid of an assistant.[3] However, at Saul's time this practice was observed only where the facilities permitted it.

---

[1] Morris, op. cit., p. 167.
[2] Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. V, p. 43.
[3] Morris, op. cit., p. 168.

As to the books and instruments that were used, we are told: "The whole equipment consisted of wax tablets and pointers, and of scrolls, which were scarce and very expensive."[1] Indeed, we shall soon see how that was all that was necessary. The teacher would sit on an elevated dais or stand, while the pupils sat around him, either on small stools or on the floor, so that they were said to be "educated at his feet" and to "powder themselves in the dust of the feet of the wise."[2] In order that the child might not be overworked, the number of hours was adjusted to the child's strength and endurance. It seems that classes began very early, at sunrise or soon after, and, especially for the older pupils, lasted all day. The lower classes, however, were generally excused from about 10 to 3. Between the 17th of Thamuz and the 9th of Ab (about July and August) only four hours of instruction per day were permitted. Apparently there were no extended vacations, the only free days being the Sabbaths and the great feast days.

Now we are prepared to enter upon a discussion of the subjects young Saul very likely studied in the Tarsus Synagogue. In a general way we may say that in the elementary school he would become familiar with the three R's. Reading, we may say, was the predominant subject. It was, however, not taught as an independent subject, but primarily in connection with the Torah. Writing, too, became less and less of a special study and was studied also largely together

---

[1] Morris, op. cit., p. 168.
[2] Smith, op. cit., p. 26.

with the Torah. Arithmetic was taught with the primary purpose that the boy might learn to compute the time, the dates of the feasts, and the tithes. However, that does not mean that the training in these subjects was self-evidently superficial. On the contrary, the training was an intensive one, but always it centered about the Torah. A little music was taught in connection with the study of the liturgy. Otherwise science, art, and gymnastics had no place in the curriculum. The literature that was studied was almost exclusively religious. In all of this we are speaking from the standpoint of the Hebrew-Aramaic school. Essentially there would be but few modifications if the Greek language were used. The only difference that would enter in would be in the field of reading and writing. Since the method of teaching the Greek alphabet and language is essentially the same as that which we use in the English, its description is being eliminated here in favor of the unique and more difficult teaching of the Hebrew and Aramaic.

After this brief over-view we must study in greater detail the method of teaching, especially with reference to reading and writing. It is no doubt proper to say that in the elementary school the Jews had but one textbook. That textbook the child used from the day he entered school to the day he graduated. It was his great duty to gain as good a knowledge of it and to memorize as much of it as he possibly could. That book was the "Book of Books," his Bible. Said R. Eleazar b. Shamua': "The study of the Torah outweighs all other religious commands."[1] Edersheim pays a

[1] The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. V, p. 43.

justified tribute to his Jewish ancestors when he says: "In the days of Christ the pious Jew had no other knowledge, neither sought nor cared for any other - in fact, denounced it - than that of the Law of God. To the pious Jew .... the knowledge of God was everything; and to prepare for or impart that knowledge was the sum total, the sole object of his education."[1]

Naturally, the first step in the child's training would be to learn the alphabet, its forms, sounds, and perhaps numerical value, and the names of the letters. Sometimes, we are told, the alphabet was used as material for moral and religious instruction in this manner: A little verse would be attached to each letter or group of letters, and the child would thus memorize the alphabet as well as the verse.[2]

The reading course was for the Jewish pupil an extremely difficult one. The difficulty lay in the absence of the vowel pointings. Therefore the Rabbi, in teaching the alphabet, could proceed neither from the individual letter to the word nor vice versa. "The common practice seems to have been for the children first to read in their books, and then to memorize at least one verse a day."[3] Individual words could not be taught because the same radicals with different vowel pointings would be pronounced differently. For example, the three radicals ד ב ר may be pronounced in 8 or 9 different ways,

---

[1] Jewish Social Life, p. 124.

[2] An interesting example of this method is to be found in Morris, The Jewish School, pp. 147 ff. To him I am indebted for the entire subject of teaching reading and writing.

[3] Morris, op. cit., p. 153.

depending in each case on the vowel pointings. Thus we cannot speak of the teaching of reading in the strict sense until after the vowel system was introduced.

Once the child had mastered the alphabet, it entered at once upon the study of the Torah. The teacher together with the pupils would read the verse as a whole, reread it many times, until the pupils had memorized the pronunciation of the verse as a whole.

Later on the child would be taught both to read and translate portions from the Torah into the Aramaic. When they came to passages that were no longer well understood, since the Hewbrew had long since become a dead language and been supplanted by the Aramaic in daily conversation, the rabbi would read the verse and then paraphrase it. In many cases that paraphrase, which was originally only intended to be an explanation, became an accepted translation and was regularly used. The practice was apparently adopted from the custom of "targuming" used in the Synagogue. The procedure of studying the text in the elementary school, then, may be described thus: "First a reading of the verse in the original; then a translation, or explanation in the vernacular; and finally, another reading in Hebrew alone."[1]

As the description so far clearly indicates, learning was almost entirely oral. In fact, as far as we can determine today, silent reading for sense and thought was all but unknown in the Jewish school. And the procedure employed for learning the lesson was memorization by means of endless repetition. The teacher's great ideal was to impress the Law

[1]Morris, op. cit., p. 167.

without variation or error indelibly upon the mind of the child. And, by the very nature of the case, it is not true that "Quantity was all-important, sometimes even at the expense of accuracy."[1] The converse is more accurate. However, it is no doubt true that, with such emphasis on memorization, the content was often not understood; for, after all, the main object in teaching was to impress the subject matter. Therefore the child would memorize the material first, and later on, with the aid of the teacher, learn to understand it. The memorization was accomplished in this way: The teacher would read aloud, from the Scriptures, one sentence; then the pupils would recite it in chorus after him. Again and again the pupils would repeat the sentence, the teacher in each case pointing out any errors in pronunciation that might have occurred. With what care and diligence this was carried on may be seen from a common saying of the day, "To review 101 times is better than to review 100 times."[2]

To a casual observer it might appear that such endless meticulous repetition must have been almost unendurable to the average pupil. But that danger had been obviated by the wide and general use of various mnemonic devices. For instance, sentences were grouped in alphabetical order and then memorized, backwards as well as forwards, by two's, and so on until the entire material had been mastered. Numerical symbols, too, were frequently used. And this employment of mnemonics, especially in later Talmudic times, pervaded the

---

[1] Morris, op. cit., p. 127.

[2] Quoted in The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. V, p. 43.

whole educational gamut from the study of the alphabet to the mastery of the Mishna.

Indeed, taking into consideration the type of material that had to be learned and the great precision with which it had to be memorized, the Jewish system of teaching needs no apology. Josephus voices just pride in the Jewish mode of instruction when he says: "From the dawn of understanding we learn the laws by heart and have them, as it were, engraved on our souls."[1]

We have evidence, too, that allusions and illustrations were used in the elementary school, especially in the explanations and applications. Says Morris[2] "We also hear of what were apparently Aesopian fables used to illustrate biblical verses. Out of three hundred only three have survived, and these clearly bear the character of elementary school material."

Nor was the practice of having tutors unknown in that day. On the contrary, it was general practice for the teacher to appoint older students to assist the younger, and more backward ones. And, from that evidence we have, it appears that homework was also assigned by the Synagogue school teacher of the Talmudic period.

From the general picture of the teacher of this period we gather that it was expected that the teacher be rather stern with his pupils. Levity at least seems to have been very definitely excluded. Only one case of severe brutality is recorded: A teacher was dismissed because he had beaten

---

[1] Contra Apion, II, 18.
[2] Op. Cit., p. 74.

some of his pupils so severely that they died; and, strangely enough, he was later restored to his position. Otherwise discipline in Saul's day seems to have been less severe than in earlier centuries. In general, the teacher was in all cases to temper his discipline in such a way that he might always retain the respect of his pupils. Kindly exhortation and admonition was advised in preference to corporal punishment.

As to ways and means of maintaining discipline and evoking interest, we find that both negative and positive methods were used. While the lazy or misbehaving pupil was punished with the strap or, in the case of the older ones, severely reprimanded, encouragements such as emulation and rewards were used to encourage obedience and diligence. We are told: "There is sufficient evidence to show that teachers generally recognized the desirability of arousing the pupil's interest in his work."[1] That was most necessary, especially in the elementary school, because of the very nature of the studies themselves. We do not, however, read anything of the teacher's trying to stimulate interest in the subject matter itself. Interest is usually sought for by external methods, for instance, by attaching small bells to the scrolls from which the child studied. Later on, however, when the child began to study the thought, the teacher would strive to arouse his interest in the material itself.

One more, undoubtedly the most distinctive, characteristic of ancient Jewish education was its integration of

[1] Morris, op. cit., p. 144.

religion and life. Though the study and knowledge of the Torah was admitted to be absolutely necessary; yet the Jewish educator realized that such knowledge alone would not mold a moral character. The child must be taught to live its religion. Therefore, besides learning the Law, he must be taught also how to observe and practice it. With great care and diligence the teacher must initiate him into the religious observances and divinely-prescribed social customs of his people. When this other half of his lesson had been well learned, when the child could be clearly seen to live his religion; then first was the elementary education considered complete. Many centuries later Herder constructed his system of educational psychology largely on the groundwork of this Jewish synthesis of religion and life.

With that we have completed our study of the characteristic elementary school of Saul's day. We have outlined the principles that guided his elementary training; we have enumerated the subjects; we have described the methods of instruction - all these combined characterize the elementary school training which young Saul of Tarsus may very likely have received.

If now we may again apply the general rule to the boy Saul, we may say that in all likelihood he graduated from the Synagogue school when he was about 13 years of age. However, as to the exact extent of the average Jewish boy's education at the time of his graduation from the Beth Ha-sefer, we lack specific information. We have this general statement characteristic of Josephus: "Our people, if anybody do but

ask them about our laws, he will more readily tell them all than he will tell his own name."[1] However, from the courses and method of teaching them which we have outlined, we may say that, in the sphere of the Torah at least, Saul would have committed large parts of it to memory and be able to read any of it very fluently; for so much we do know: By the time the Jewish boy graduated from the elementary school he was expected to be able to take part in the reading of the lessons from the Pentateuch and Prophets in the Synagogue. In fact, at times he was even expected to be able to serve as translator if called upon, though he could be coached if necessary.

With his elementary training completed, what chanced did the average Jewish boy have of going on to the Academy? Naturally only a very few were able to continue their education. Among the Jews the illustration was frequently applied; usually a thousand enter the study of the Bible; of these one hundred proceed to the Mishnah; of these, again, ten go forward to the study of the Talmud; and only one of the whole number attains to the position of a recognised scholar."[2] In general there were two prerequisites to continuing in the Academy. First, the student must have manifested special talent and aptitude during his previous schooling. And, secondly, his parents must be at least more well-to-do than the average; for in most cases the son was expected to become an apprentice under his father and to earn money to help

---

[1] Antiq., p. 792.
[2] Morris, op. cit., p. 95.

support the family. Saul, however, possessed both of these requisites. In fact, he was no doubt destined for the rabbinate already from early childhood.

When next we take up Saul's scholastic career it will be in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel. Before proceeding to that point, though, it will be necessary for us, in order to complete the picture of his childhood education, to study what young Saul learned from and observed among the pagan people of Tarsus.

CHAPTER V

CHILDHOOD INFLUENCE OF TARSUS

Though the parents of Saul must be grouped with the artisans or shopkeepers rather than with the aristocracy, as we have shown, nevertheless we must place them among the higher class of laboring folk, into the well-situated middle class, as it were. Saul himself being a Jew, naturally it is only fair to assume that his principal childhood associates were Jews. However, it is not necessary, as some hold, to conclude that, since Saul was a Jew and a son of Pharisees, he would maintain a rather strict seclusion from Gentile associations. That conclusion would seem to be unnatural as well as to overemphasize the fact that he belonged to a family with Pharisaic tendencies. On the contrary, since there seem to have been a rather large number of Jews in Tarsus and since it appears they enjoyed rather cordial relations with the native inhabitants, we may well conclude that young Saul associated a great deal with the other extra-Jewish children of Tarsus.

And in these associations the fact that interests us most is that he would thereby come into contact with the Greek language. Besides the fact that Greek culture and philosophy flourished in Tarsus at the time we know, too, that the Greek language was the language of daily conversation among its inhabitants. However, we must not confuse the Greek of the streets with the classical Greek. The Greek spoken among the common folk was the Koine, or vernacular,

the more free and idiomatic popular language. And there is no justifiable reason to doubt that young Saul became rather familiar with the Greek vernacular during these first thirteen years of his life when he was in daily contact with it. It is quite likely that, besides being able to understand it, he was able to speak it rather freely and fluently also. This early contact which Saul had with the Greek vernacular constitutes one of the important points in the study of St. Paul's Greek style later on.

Besides the effect of the Greek language, Tarsus must have served to broaden the young boy's outlook considerably also. The very nature and location of Tarsus would tend to "cosmopolitanize" Saul. Tarsus was, after all, a harbor city. Lying close to the sea, it engaged in international trade and commerce. At the coast, near the wharves there were large warehouses where the merchandise was stored after the ships had brought it into port, or awaiting a vessel to carry it to some distant port. From the forests of the Tarsus mountains logs were floated down the River to Tarsus, where they were hewn and finished off, used for building ships or loaded into boats to be hauled to some far-off port on the Mediterranean. Archeologists have recovered coins from Tarsus which represent huge bales of merchandise, thus testifying to the mercantile prominence of the city. Large seafaring vessels became a familiar sight to young Saul. Little did he dream that later on he would do much of his travelling on just such ships, nor that he would be more than once shipwrecked on such as these.

Due to the strategic position of Tarsus it would have among its inhabitants and frequent visitors also peoples of many nationalities, people from nearly every country of the then-known world. There would be especially sailors and merchantmen representing many lands and races. Among these Saul would hear strange languages spoken, langauges which he did not understand, but languages of which he may have retained a few common words or expressions. There Saul would learn to recognize the many diversities of human character. He would notice the strange habits and customs of these foreigners. The following report is significant in this connection:

> The figurines of the gods of many nations, the oriental Sandon, the Greek Herakles, the Egyptian Serapis, which were yielded by the Roman strata (in excavations on the site of Tarsus), are witnesses to the mixture of nationalities and cultures in the midst of which Saul of Tarsus was born and reared.[1]

However, even more important for Saul's later career would be his childhood observations of the religious and social life of the city of Tarsus. There is a wealth of information to be found on this subject. For our present purpose, however, it will suffice to give only a brief outline of Tarsian idolatry. The predominant religion of Tarsus was the religion of the Greeks and Athenians. The Greeks were polytheistic. Their gods were deified ideals of human beings, whose lives were blighted with the same foibles, pleasures and vices as the Greeks themselves. Greek polytheism never did sponsor a personal or mystical

[1] Geroge A. Barton, Archeology and the Bible, p. 274.

relation between the individual and the gods. With the entrance of the mystery cults this feature was added. At the same time the philosophers had destroyed faith in the gods, and consequently the religion of the Greeks had degenerated to little more than a succession of public feasts and ceremonies with few of the people taking any of the gods seriously. There were to be found religions, deities and the worship of northern Syria, of Babylon, Egypt, Rome and numerous other lands. And so in Tarsus, we might say, Saul saw represented nearly every religion and cult of any consequence at his time. All these idol temples, priests, images, rites and ceremonies served to give the boy Saul an insight into heathen religion and worship. It gave him an opportunity to observe the features common to all of them and the base morality to which they all inevitably led.

The one outstanding consequence of Tarsian polytheistic idolatry, as writers and poets, history and archeology testify with one accord, was gross immorality. F.W. Farrar says:

> The seat of a celebrated school of letters, it (Tarsus) was at the same time the metropolis of a province so low in universal estimation that it was counted among the .....three most villainous K's of antiquity - Kappadokia, Kilikia, and Krete.[1]

The immorality naturally had its origin in the service of the idols themselves. Some of the features of this idol worship were sensual and coarse beyond description. Here St. Paul received his first glimpse of and insight into the sensual corruption, lust, and vice which he so vigorously denounced later on.

---

[1] The Life and Work of St. Paul, Vol. I, p. 28.

There in Tarsus young Saul had an excellent opportunity to observe how degraded pagan immorality affected the sacred institution of marriage, the various family relationships, and the status of women and children.[1] Marriage and its responsibilities were regarded with little less than outright scorn in all too many instances. Engagement did not spring from spontaneous love on the part of the two parties. Instead the marriage was contradted by the parents. "The dominating considerations in betrothal and marriage were wealth, lineage, and social standing."[2] The average age at which a girl was married off by her parents was 16, and frequently as young as 13.

With that kind of marriages, especially among heathen, marital love and faithfulness could not be expected to follow. And so the chief purpose of marriage came to be simply to bring forth legitimate offspring who would care for the parents in their old age and give them a respectable burial. The average family was small. It frequently happened that a father or mother, after having brought several children into the world, would forsake his spouse and children to enjoy a life of luxury and profligacy in a large city. Woman in general occupied a rather low position. She was regarded as the husband's personal property and was expected to yield to his every will and whim. It was her duty to remain at home and bear and rear his children, while her husband enjoyed the

---

[1] In the following presentation I am indebted largely to H.E. Dana, The New Testament World, pp. 206 - 212.

[2] Dana, op. cit., p. 207.

company of the intellectual and aristocratic society with a mistress. Divorces occurred with startling frequency.

The position of a child was little better. The child was the property of his father. If the father was displeased with it for any reason at all, he might punish it brutally or kill it. If he was in debt or craved more money for indulgence, he might sell it into slavery.

Naturally this description paints the darker side of the picture. Nonetheless the protrait is very truthful, However, there were also cases of fine, decent, upright, moral living. But, especially among the upper classes, these were fortunate inconsistencies rather than the rule.

We need not dwell at length upon the deep impression that this paganism and consequent low standard of morals created upon the young mind of Saul the son of a Pharisaic family, the boy who was reading and hearing every day of the sanctity of marriage and children, how God condemned the idolater and promised his curse and condemnation to all those who lived a life of vice and excesses and wickedness. From that standpoint these pagan institutions and practices must have offended him deeply. No doubt they filled him with disgust. What his childish reaction must have been we can almost feel when we read those descriptions and denunciations of pagan idolatry and immorality as we find, for instance, in Romand 1, 24 - 32.

CHAPTER VI

SAUL GOES TO THE ACADEMY

In the preceding chapters we have traced, as far as existing information permits, the boyhood development of Saul of Tarsus. If only more direct information on these most impressionable years of his life could be found, it would no doubt throw much light on the Apostle Paul. Nevertheless, even the facts that we do have will prove very helpful. And as we continue now to study the further development and education of Saul in a new environment, many more characteristics of St. Paul will find, if not a convincing, then at least a plausible explanation.

At the very outset of our study of Saul's career at Jerusalem we are confronted with another difficutly: How old was he when he began his rabbinical studies in the Academy? Three views are held. One group of scholars holds that Saul was a man of about 30 when he went there. Only suggested by James Querach,[1] this view is definitely expressed by Walter Eickmann,[2] who holds that, "not until Saul was a man past thirty" did he journey down to Jerusalem to study for the Rabbinate. On the other hand, some hold to the opposite extreme, that Saul was only a small child when he came to Jerusalem. They base their views on Acts 32,3 and 26,4. The most generally accepted view, however, is that Saul was about 13 years old at the time.

---

[1] St. Paul, His Life and Times, p.4.
[2] Pilgrim Paul, p.5.

In examining these three theories it must be admitted that his age at the time can be by no means absolutely determined. The theory that he was 30 years old when he began his studies at Jerusalem has, it would seem, the most difficulties to surmount. In the first place, in view of the Jewish custom of entering upon the rabbinical studies at about 13, it would seem strange that Saul should first begin at about 30. Again, this theory would have to prove that our present chronology of Saul's life, for instance, the date of Stephen's stoning, Saul's conversion and all succeeding events of his life, is erroneous. And finally, such passages as Acts 26,4 and 22,3 render that age designation very doubtful. The other extreme, however, which makes Saul a young, or even very young child and bases its view on Acts 26,4 and 22,3 has less difficulties to meet. One rather formidable objection, though, is that this theory makes it very difficult to explain St. Paul's free and expressive use of the Greek vernacular later on in his Letters. Again, the ἀνατεθραμμένος of Acts 22,3 in its connection apparently means nothing more than "brought up" - "with the predominant idea of forming the mind."[1] In fact, the πεπαιδευμένος apparently is a parallel and stands in opposition to this word. With respect to the word νεότητος in Acts 26,4, its usage in 1 Tim. 4,12 shows clearly that the word need not refer to early childhood. The generally accepted view, finally, is still the one most easily reconciled with what we know of Jewish custom and of St. Paul. Nor does it involve any

[1] Thayer, Greek-English Lexicon, (ἀνατρέφω), p. 43. Cf. also The Expositor's Greek Testament ad hoc.

serious difficulties.

It has been conjectured that Saul's parents moved down to Jerusalem at this time; again, that Saul made the trip in conjunction with a journey to one of the festivals. There is no worthwhile evidence to support these statements. More likely is the view that he came by ship from Tarsus to the harbor of the new city of Caesarea which Herod had rebuilt, and journeyed on foot from there to Jerusalem.

Before following Saul to the Academy we ought to enumerate the facts which we have about his studies there. First of all, we must disagree with Riddle[1] and hold that Saul certainly did attend the Academy at Jerusalem and that Gamaliel was his teacher. The very fact that St. Paul when visiting the Synagogue in Antioch of Pisidia was called upon to speak (Acts 13, 15) proves that, even if Paul did not function as a rabbi, he at least had rabbinical training. And where he got that training we know from his own statement in Acts 22,3, where he tells us that he was a student of Gamaliel, who, as we know, was one of the famous rabbis of the rabbinical Academy at Jerusalem. And, in the second place, we know from his own statement in Gal. 1, 14 that he studied diligently and made excellent progress. Though we have no more direct information,

[1] "The tradiditon that Paul studied for the rabbinate in Jerusalem is as old as Luke-Acts. Since the "life of Paul" is usually a weaving together of the data of Luke-Acts, information from the letters and other traditions, several examples of rabbinical exegesis and theology are conveniently found to prove that Paul was a trained rabbi; however, serious doubt is thrown upon the assertion when the primary sources are critically studied. In this matter, as in others, a negative attitude should be taken to a tradition which owes its currency to tendentious elements in Luke-Acts." - D.W. Riddle, Early Christian Life, p. 18.

these facts enable us to paint a rather clear picture of the school he attended and the subject which he studied there.

The school which Saul attended at Jerusalem would correspond to our present-day college. It was called also an "Academy," a term which "seems to have been confined to the schools of the great educational centers .... in Babylonia, and Jerusalem ....., "etc.[1] And finally, its most general name was "Beth Ha-midrash," or "house of study." Concerning the beginnings of these Academies we are told:

> Such Academies had grown up as free associations of scholars around some central figure. A scribe announced that he was willing to teach, and young men flocked around him to obtain a training and ordination as rabbis.[2]

The statement of Moore,[3] that these schools had their beginnings in gatherings of the soferim, for the purpose of mutual study and edification, sounds more plausible. It seems that this Beth Ha-midrash, growing out of these gatherings of the soferim, was distinct from the Temple, though closely connected with it. Incidentally, the Academy was held to be on a higher rank than the Synagogue to which it was attached.

This school would have for its teachers, of course, the most learned of the scribes, and especially those of the Pharisaical sect. About 50 years before Saul's arrival at Jerusalem two renowned rabbis had taught there, Hillel and Shammai. Both became founders of their own schools, the one of the Beth-Hillel ("House of Hillel"). the other of the Beth Shammai ("House of Shammai"). The following characterization

---

[1] Kretzmann, op. cit., p. 92. 93.
[2] F.P. Graves, op. cit., p. 25.
[3] Op. Cit., Vol. I, p. 311.

of the two schools will bear out the difference between them:

> They differed but slightly in their teachings, yet widely in temperament, Hillel being a lenient and reasonable liberalist, Shammai a hard austerely orthodox literalist.[1]

So the proverb originated, "Be gentle as Hillel, not harsh as Shammai."[2]

The struggle between these two schools continued until long after their founders had died. In the end, however, the spirit of Hillel triumphed. And it is his gentle and lenient spirit that has expressed itself in nearly all expositions of the Law since that time.

Of his instructors at the Academy St. Paul expressly mentions Gamaliel. Research knows of three outstanding Gamaliels who lived during and after the time of St. Paul. Of these the youngest was the teacher of whom St. Paul makes his boast in Acts 22,3 as far as research can determine today. Whether that is true or not, really makes little difference; for all three were Pharisees and belonged to the same school. All three of these Gamaliels were so eminent in their day that they were among 7 Rabbis of antiquity to whom the Jews gave the title "Rabban." Moreover, all three of them, each in turn, received the high distinction of "Nazi," or "President of the School." The Gamaliel under whom Saul studied seems to have been the grandson of the Great Hillel. Some believe he was the son of the Simeon of Luke 2, 25. That is very doubtful. If we have identified

---

[1] W. Eickmann, Pilgrim Paul, p.7.
[2] Ibid.

this Gamaliel correctly, he died 18 years before the destruction of Jerusalem - about the time of St. Paul's shipwreck at Malta. He was buried with highest honors, we are told. Contrary to much wishful thinking, he lived and died a Pharisee.

The Jewish estimate of Gamaliel is brought out in the saying that "from the day when Rabban Gamaliel the Elder died, the Law ceased, and purity and abstinence died."[1] They called him the "beauty of the law."[2] He is supposed to have made the statement: "Appoint for yourself a teacher; thus you will avoid what is doubtful."[3] His outstanding and most beloved characteristic seems to have been tolerance and broadmindedness. Every statement of his which we have from extra-Biblical sources agrees fully with what he said in Acts 5, 35-39. He was not given to the narrow bigotry of his sect. His broadmindedness is a most interesting characteristic for our present study, because we learn that that trait quelled in him the Pharisaic antipathy toward Greek. Research reveals that he at least permitted the use of pagan Greek literature in his Academy. Whether he himself taught it is most doubtful. At any rate, here again Saul would have opportunity to contact the Greek language, if not in the classroom, then at least in books by Greek authors. In this connection it is worthy of note that "Tradition had it that a knowledge of Greek was an essential qualification for membership of the Sanhedrin."[4]

---

[1] Quoted in David Smith, op. cit., p. 29.
[2] Quoted in The Footsteps of St. Paul, (no author), p. 26.
[3] Quoted in G.F. Kent, The Work and Teachings of the Apostles, p. 73.
[4] Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. I, p. 651.

On that foundation we shall now build our outline of the subjects taught and the methods employed in the Jerusalem Academy. The training here naturally was of a professional, rather than a general nature. Therefore the chief subject was again the Law. The student here continued and broadened his knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures by taking up, not merely the Law proper, but also the Prophets and the Hagiographa. And other subjects that were studied were taken up only to the extent in which they would assist the student in his later Rabbinical career. Thus we learn that

> the religeous study of the Law was the center from which all subjects radiated. Nature was observed in order to lead man to admire the greatness of God and to recognize their own insignificance. Mathematical and astronomical knowledge were of importance in making the calculations necessary to determine the Jewish calendar. An acquaintance with the plant and animal world was sought to throw light upon the meaning of various sacred treatises, and with human and animal anatomy to understand certain precepts and allusions. Languages were studied to explain obscure terms in the Scriptures.[1]

But the Law was always the central, dominating theme of all studies.

For that reason the student would receive instruction in the interpretation of the Law by applying the oral tradition. He had to become familiar with all the various interpretations that had been given to the passages by his predecessors, then weigh and sift the evidence carefully, and finally arrive at his own interpretation. This method would of course develop in the student the capacity for judgment, while at the same time giving him an intensive, and quantitative as well as a qualitative knowledge of the Scriptures. Merely to engage in

[1] F.P. Graves, op. cit., pp. 25.26.

the study of the Law alone, it was said, "is a way, but not the real way."[1]

The name for this tradition was "Mishnah." The method was known as "Midrash," or the careful exegesis of the Law for the purpose of deriving from and confirming by it the unwritten law. It included two branches, the "Haggadah" ("story, tradition") and the "Halachah" ("rule, custom"). As to the distinction between the two, David Smith has this to say:

> Halachah was the systematisation of the precepts of the Law, the definition, application, and reconciliation of the legal code; and it issued in a vast complexity of casuistical distinctions and vexatious restrictions. Haggadah, on the other hand, dealt with the historical and didactic portions of the Scriptures, elaborating and elucidating them by the aid of parable and legend. It pursued the method of allegorical exegesis, recognising in Scripture a fourfold meaning, denoted by the consonants of the word "Paradise": peshat, the simple or literal remez, the suggested meaning; derush, the meaning evolved by investigation; and sod, the mystic meaning.[2]

In all its basic features there is little difference between the method of teaching in the elementary school and that employed in the Academy. The same emphasis on learning by repetition and memorization persisted also in the Academy. In this connection the Talmud distinguished four classes of students:

> There are four sorts in those who sit before the Sages: Those who act as a sponge, a funnel, a strainer, and a sieve; as a sponge which sucks up all, as a funnel which receives at one end and lets out at the other, as a strainer which lets the wine pass through, but retains the lees, and as a sieve which lets the bran pass through but retains the fine flour.[3]

In order to facilitate memorization the practice of chanting was introduced. Not merely in the Torah, but also in the

---

[1] Quoted in G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 319.
[2] Op. cit., p. 27.
[3] Aboth, 9, 138.

Mishnah the students would chant the lessons. Besides the help this practice offered to memorization, it was employed also to bring out the meaning of the text. Incidentally the chants varied in mood and color in accordance with the mood of the portion chanted.

One essential difference there was, however, between the method of teaching in the Academy and that employed in the elementary school. The class was conducted after the fashion of a debating society. It was a controlled discussion group. It is said, we know not on what authority, that this method of disputation employed in the Academy owes its origin largely to Hellenistic influence. That is very doubtful and appears to be a case of predicating indebtedness because of mere similarity. At any rate, the professor acted as chairman and referee. One student would open with an exposition of a passage from Scripture or a discussion of some previously assigned topic. The thesis would be opposed by some and defended by others. The most contradictory opinions were allowed free and open expression. "Various interpretations were given: aphorisms were propounded: allegories suggested: and the opinions of ancient doctors quoted and discussed."[1] After all the discussion had been concluded, the teacher would present a summarization and draw the conclusion. Naturally this system benefitted the student in that it made him familiar with the Old Testament Scriptures in the original, trained him in the art of dialectics, taught him to be able to anticipate objections quickly and to make an acute reply, enabled him to speak fluently and accurately on a given point at

[1] Conrybeare and Howson, The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, pp. 58-59.

a moment's notice, and in general developed clear, logical and quick thinking besides a highly retentive memory. Throughout all the rest of his life St. Paul was much indebted to the Rabbinical school for the type of training he received there, and he gives evidence of that indebtedness on every page of his Letters.

That is a brief summary of the training Saul evidently received during his studies at the Academy. Though his whole training so far centered in one course, the Torah, we must remember that many subjects which we today study as separate courses also entered into and formed a part of this major study. In general we may apply the summary of Dr. Kretzmann[1] to Saul and enumerate the subjects which he had studied or touched upon thus:

> A systematic, thorough instruction in Religion, Reading, Writing, Grammar, Rhetoric, Logic; a less systematic, perhaps somewhat insufficient instruction in Philosophy, Geography, History, Geometry, Physiology and Hygiene, Astronomy, Zoology, Botany, Music, Medicine.

---

[1] Op. Cit., pp. 96.97.

CHAPTER VII

EXTRA-ACADEMIC EXPERIENCES

What contacts Saul may have made, what experiences he may have had, what extra-scholastic activities he engaged in while at Jerusalem is from first to last a matter of conjecture. There are, however, certain questions in this connection which deserve at least a brief consideration in our study.

Our first problem is: Did Saul while at Jerusalem have any contact with Jesus and if so, did he see Him or meet Him? That the two must have come very close to each other becomes quite evident when we reflect upon Jesus' activities in Jerusalem and remember that, as far as we can determine, both of them must have been at least in the same city at one or another time. Much of the Savior's activity in Jerusalem centers in the Temple. If Saul studied for the Rabbinate his school would be very closely connected with the Temple at least. And yet, apparently Saul never met Jesus, never knew Him personally before his conversion. A careful study of 2 Cor. 5,16 will show that it can hardly be made to say that St. Paul met Him in his youth. On the other hand, if he had met the Nazarene, we might well expect that the Apostle would have made much of it in his sermons and Letters later on. But he mentions no such meeting.

To what extent, then, did young Saul come into contact with Christianity, with the disciples, the followers of Christ,

While he was at Jerusalem? Here again we have no direct statement. Our view, both with respect to the possibility of his meeting Christ and the likelihood of his contacts with Christianity, will have to rest largely on our chronology of Saul's life. If he was born approximately 5 to 7 years later than Jesus, if he concluded his studies at Jerusalem at about the age of twenty, and if, at the close of his Rabbinical studies, he returned at once to Tarsus, there would arise grave doubts as to whether he made any contacts with Christ or his followers at all; for the Nazarene would still be relatively unknown to the general public, except perhaps for a few fantastic reports of miracles He had performed or claims He had made. In that case, of course, there would still have been no disciples of Jesus, nor would Saul have any knowledge of Christ and His teachings at all before he left Jerusalem again. If, however, it could be proven either that Saul first came to Jerusalem at a later date, or, that he remainéd there for, say 10 years, after he had completed his studies; then there might be good reasons to believe that he would have met some of Jesus' followers, if not heard quite a bit of the Messiah Himself. In the final analysis, it doesn't make any great difference what Saul's contacts with Christianity may have been at this time; for we know from Luke's record and St. Paul's own laments that he did have considerable contact with the sect at least before the time of his conversion, so that he knew to whom he spoke when he cried out, "Who art thou, Lord?" (Cf. Acts 9, 5.6)

The normal attitude of Saul as a Pharisee throws light

on this subject too. What his reaction to Christ and the Christian sect would have been we can gather from the Pharisees who constantly opposed the Savior and at whom most of His bitterest denunciations were hurled. To the true Pharisee Christ was an imposter. They sought a kingly, not a suffering Messiah. Consequently they despised Him. In fact, one observes that their regard for Him was so low that in many cases they preferred to send their agents to deal with Him rather than undergo the degrading influence of disputing with Him themselves. We must remember that, even at the time when Gamaliel suggested that policy of non-committal waiting (Acts 5, 33-40), the Apostles had not yet begun to preach the abrogation of the Law nor advocated putting the Gentiles on an equal basis with the Jews. However, after these seeming abominations were proposed by the Christian sect, no doubt Gamaliel, and surely his youthful, impetuous pupil Saul were filled with loathing against the Christians. That would explain the attitude Saul would have assumed had he heard of the Christians, and it explains also his actions when he did hear of them.

It has been suggested that Saul also became a member of the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem. According to our chronology of his life, however, that office, if he ever had it, would have come to him first after his return to Jerusalem some years later. In this connection it may be well to remember that Saul was a man of rare talent and ability. It is altogether possible that these qualities put him into prominence and may have won for him the distinguished position of Rabbi. Another

and somewhat stronger indication is that in Acts 26, 10-12.[1] Saul's activity, as it is described there, is a rather strong indication that he may have been an active Rabbi. Since then, we have no evidence whatever to oppose this view, we may say that, on the basis of what evidence we have it is at least possible that Saul was a member of the Sanhedrin.

As to how long Saul stayed at Jerusalem, we have, as already indicated, no reliable evidence. However, since, as we observed, he apparently did return to Tarsus, since no mention is made of any activities which might have kept him there longer, we assume that he returned at the conclusion of his Rabbinical studies. The whole course seems to have lasted normally about 7 or 8 years. Thus he would have returned to his home approximately in his 20th or 21st year.

---

1. "Which thing I also did in Jerusalem: and many of the saints did I shut up in prison, having recieved authority from the chief priests; and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them. And I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme; and being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities. Whereupon as I went to Damascus with authority and commission from the chief priests, ..."

CHAPTER VIII

SAUL AT HOME AGAIN IN TARSUS

As has already been indicated, we are perhaps most correct in looking for Saul in Tarsus after his 20th or 21st year. Certain other indications point in that direction. First of all, it was the duty of every Rabbi to learn a trade, and Saul taking up the trade of tent-making may be assumed to have studied the trade in his home-town where it was commonly practised. Again, how could we explain the absence of any mention of Saul's contact with Christ or the Christians during this time if he was right in the midst of the scene of their activities all the while? Nevertheless, it must be admitted that we cannot absolutely prove that he did return to Tarsus. But if, on the basis of the before-mentioned facts, we may assume that he did return home, we may assume that he stayed there for about 8 or 10 years until he returned again to Jerusalem to take up the gruesome work of a persecutor.

If Saul did return to Tarsus, what did he do while he was there? In the first place, did he marry? Quite a few scholars hold that he did. The arguments advanced in favor of this view are these: Among the Jews it was a duty, practically a law, to marry; and therefore a strict Pharisee like Saul would not shirk this responsibility. Again, since Saul was a Sanhedrist and it was a prerequisite of every member of the Sanhedrin to be married and be a father, Saul would be married. But these are only arguments from inferences. On the other hand, we must also consider these facts: Many

of the laws and customs observed among the Jewish Am Ha-aretz ("the people of the land"), the common people, did not necessarily apply to the Rabbi. Then, too, it cannot be proven conclusively that Paul was a Sanhedrist - though, it is true, Acts 26, 10 may suggest that. Moreover, we have no mention anywhere of his wife and children. Likewise 1 Cor. 7,8 seems to be at least a rather strong indication that he was not married. However, on the basis of that same passage, some hold that he was married but that his wife had died by this time. That view, too, is open to most of the previous objections. Nevertheless, the question cannot be categorically answered either in the positive or negative.

Another one of those attractive but unfounded conjectures is that Saul, upon his return to Tarsus, exercised his ministry in the local Synagogue. However, there is not one good reason which would prompt us either to accept or reject this suggestion.

Somewhat more plausible, though, is the statement to the effect that Saul likely took up during these years the trade of tent-making. Besides the reasons for his doing so, which we mentioned already in connection with his childhood in Tarsus, we might add a few more at this point. Among the Jews it was considered a part of a man's education that he learn a trade; and St. Paul evidently was a tent-maker by trade, as we see from the fact that he labored at it in Ephesus and Corinth.

Here it ought to be observed that such apparently disparaging estimates of physical exertions as we sometimes find

in Jewish literature are by no means characteristic of the Jews at the time. The statement of Ecclesiasticus 38, 25, "How shall he become wise that holdeth the plough, that driveth oxen and is occupied in their labors, and whose discourse is of the stock of Bulls?" is not to be understood as despising labor, but merely as distinguishing between the comparative value of occupations. The only restriction in the case of the Rabbi was that he should practise an easy trade which would enable him to exercise his highest powers in his theological labors.

In fact there was a warning against the neglect of teaching a son a trade. An old proverb said: "Whoever does not teach his son a trade is as if he brought him up to be a robber."[1] But even the Rabbi was bidden to learn a trade. Thus it was said:

> Fair is the study of the law, if accompanied by worldly occupation: to engage in them both is to keep away sin; while study which is not combined with work must in the end be interrupted, and only brings sin with it.[2]

No doubt then also Saul the strict Pharisee took up a trade in Tarsus. And that trade was tent-making. It may be that this trade which he learned during these years was of benefit to him later on also in another respect. We know that at his time already those who worked at a common trade frequently organized themselves into trade guilds. One of the advantages which membership in a guild gave to the craftsman was that he could enjoy the hospitality of any other member of his guild while traveling and also obtain employment in a new place

---

[1] Quoted in Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, p. 192.
[2] Ibid., p. 190.

through him. The various ways in which the Apostle Paul would benefit from his membership in a guild are evident.

As already indicated, the trade in which a man engaged himself largely determined his social standing. From that we can learn reasons why Paul often did not obtain converts among the honored and noble, but more generally among the low and humble. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that, since tent-making was in the case of a teacher only an auxiliary trade, St. Paul would be viewed more from the standpoint of his ministry than from that of the tent-maker. Therefore it is not entirely correct to regard St. Paul as being on a low social plane in the estimate of those to whom he preached, simply because he was a part-time tent-maker.

But now we find ourselves face-to-face with perhaps the most interesting and at the same time the most difficult question in connection with Saul's life in Tarsus. And the question is this: Did St. Paul ever attend the University at Tarsus? One thing we ought to say at the very outset: We are going to attempt to outline the arguments both for and against as briefly as possible, and not to repeat any more than necessary those which we have already pointed out earlier in connection with Saul's contacts with Hellenism in Tarsus.

Strabo[1] tells us that Tarsus was at the time greatly renowned for its culture and learning, that, in fact, in the field of philosophy and general education it surpassed even Athens and Alexandria. It was famed, not only for the number, but also for the high scholastic level of its schools. The

[1] Geography, XIV, 5, 13.

number of famous learned men who were educated in these schools is nothing short of extraordinary. "The most delebrated schools of Tarsus were those of rhetoric, where the Greek classics received the first attention."[1]

Just how much evidence is there for our assuming that Saul attended one of these famous schools of rhetoric and philosophy in Tarsus? In order to get a good, objective profile of the evidence, we shall consider first, the arguments that would favor his having attended and, second, the arguments that are advanced against this view.

Our first general argument in favor of Saul's having attended a university in Tarsus is the fact that we know that, already before the fall of Jerusalem, the upper classes of the Dispersion Jews especially, rather frequently taught their children the Greek language, some Greek literature, even some other non-religious subjects. And Saul's parents must be considered to have been at least in the upper stratum of the laboring class. Moreover, the ease and facility with which St. Paul handles the Greek vernacular would strongly suggest at least somewhat of a classical training. Another argument that is frequently used is that St. Paul's Letters are strongly flavored with philosophical, especially Stoic words and terminology. Here attention is drawn also th the three classical quotations of St. Paul: I Cor. 15, 33; Titus 1, 12; Acts 17,28. In fact, Ramsay, couples with that at once the claim that St. Paul is indebted to the Greek university for his philosophy itself, when he says: "Such a philosophic

[1]Earnest Renan, The Apostles, p. 149.

view could not have been thought out in the form which Paul gave it without a training in Greek philosophy."[1] That argument, of course, goes too far. However, we might draw attention to at least two instances where St. Paul seems to have employed the Greek syllogism; namely, Rom. 3 and I Cor. 15.[2] Then, too, it would be difficult to explain in any other way some of those beautiful passages in St. Paul which rise to classical heights. Says A.T. Robertson: "If 1 Cor. 13 and 15; Rom. 8 and Eph. 3 do not rise to literary flavour and nobility of thought and expression, I confess my ignorance of what literature is."[3] Some of these arguments carry much weight and deserve careful study.

What evidence have we, on the other hand, that would lead us to believe that Saul did attend a university in Tarsus? First would be the natural antipathy of the average Jew toward Gentile learning. The Pharisees had a saying: "Cursed be he who feeds swine: and cursed be he who teaches his son Greek literature."[4] Says C.F. Kent: "The attitude of the young Jew of Tarsus toward Greek learning was, on the whole, one of distrust, if not contempt."[5] It might be said, however, that the objection of the Jews and especially the Pharisees was directed, not so much against Greek culture itself, but rather against the degrading influence that an idolatrous teacher and the pagan immorality might have on the student. Another argument that has frequently been urged is that his dialectics are Talmudic rather than after the manner of the Greek philosopher. Thus Renan speaks very definitely: "He certainly knew

---

1 W.M. Ramsay, The Cities of St. Paul, p. 13.
2 This argument was suggested to me by Dr. Paul Bretscher.
3 A Grammar of the Greek New Testament, p. 88.
4 Quoted in D. Smith, op. cit., p. 23.
5 The Work and Teachings of the Apostles, p. 72.

nothing of the peripatetic logic. His syllogism is not at all that of Aristotle; but on the contrary his dialectics greatly resemble those of the Talmud."[1] A third argument that has been advanced is this: St. Paul's oratory and rhetoric need not be credited to a course in a Tarsian university, but may well have been learned at the Academy in Jerusalem. We know that these arts were taught there; however, it is hard to determine to what extent they were taught. A fourth argument, advocated also by Renan; namely, that his Greek abounds in Hebraisms and Syriacisms,[2] has long since been discredited. However, at the same time, it is to be remembered that his Greek is not the classical Greek of the Greek university but rather the vernacular Greek in use among the common people.

What then shall we answer? James Querach drew this conclusion: "There is notevidence, indeed, that he was a student of the schools of Tarsus, or that he had made a systematic study of the masterpieces of Greek literature. Rather there is evidence to the contrary."[3] Ramsay, on the other hand, takes the positive view: "The education and method of Greece had deeply affected Paul's mind."[4] We cannot deny that there is evidence on both sides. Nevertheless, we might say two things: In the first place, we will have to admit that it is not absolutely necessary to maintain that Saul in his youth attended the university at Tarsus. In the second place, however, we have good arguments for postulating his attendance there, and surely it is rather difficult to explain St. Paul

---

[1] The Apostles, p. 150.
[2] He has, indeed, a few; but their number is negligible.
[3] St. Paul, His life and Times, p. 2.
[4] The Cities of St. Paul, p. 79.

without postulating his attendance at a Greek university. And then we might make the concluding remark that, though 19th century scholarship quite strenuously denied that he had any classical Greek training, it seems that the highly scholarly studies of 20th century students like Deissmann, Ramsay, and Robertson give indications that lean somewhat more toward the view that St. Paul did have a classical training in a Greek School, - though Machen again tenaciously holds the opposite view. There are good indications that further investigation may throw considerably more light on the entire subject.

What other contacts with Hellenism may we predicate to Saul during his stay in Tarsus as a young man? When studying this question we must always bear in mind that St. Paul was beyond question a highly gifted man, very intelligent, extremely wide awake, and we do not hesitate to call him an intellectual genius. Then it is quite natural to assume that a man of such caliber would, while in Tarsus, make every effort to acquaint himself as well as he could with the people, the views, the beliefs, and the language about him. Whatever his connections with the local Synagogue may have been, he would be making a careful study of the Greek language. He would at least be studying, if not actually preaching from, the Greek Septuagint. He would seek wide associations. In a less objectionable way he would engage passers-by, especially the learned, in conversations, as Socrates was accustomed to do. Meanwhile he would acquire a richer vocabulary. He would learn new ways of expressing thoughts in the Greek language, new technical words and phraseology as he conversed

with men of various occupations. No doubt in these conversations he became familiar with quite a few maxims, proverbs, and pithy sayings which were in common use. As a student he would carefully remember them and commit them to memory. Then, too, he would acquire at least a smattering of knowledge concerning some of those things which he could not have learned in childhood: for instance, the popular views and beliefs, perhaps even some of the philosophical theories of his time. He would gain a deeper insight into more and other of the numerous religious cults to be found in Tarsus at the time. He would learn to find more and more readily the connecting link between pagan idolatry and pagan immorality. These and many other things Saul would be carefully observing, studying and weighing in his analytical mind, with the view of broadening his understanding and making himself more capable of performing the great work which he had chosen as his life's calling, - unwittingly, however, preparing himself under the directing hand of God for the great work of preaching Christ crucified to the benighted heathen world.

And finally, we might reflect briefly on the contacts which Saul would have with Roman civilization during this time. Only a few facts are known. For one thing, he would see, yes, very likely have in his possession and use Roman coins. He would study their inscriptions and learn in that way various Latin words and terms. Roman soldiers were a common sight in Tarsus. He would hear some of their conversation and so perhaps learn a bit more of the Latin tongue. Just how much Latin he may have known cannot be learned. Likely it would be very

nearly correct to say that, at this time at least, he was not well acquainted with the Latin language, having in his vocabulary perhaps little more than a few names, stock words, stereotyped phrases and some legal terminology. The Latin language was too unpopular for him to learn much more of it in his youth. However, a study of his Letters gives good indications that he did acquire at least a passing knowledge of popular law, that famous and efficient system of Roman laws which was in force throughout the Roman empire. He could hardly have had any other worthwhile contacts with the Roman civilization by this time.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY

Thus we conclude our study of the educational development of St. Paul. For our purposes it is unnecessary to trace his life any farther. The great story of his persecution of the Christians, his conversion, and the changes it brought about in him is a study by itself and does not directly concern our subject.

Nevertheless, from the survey which we have made we are thoroughly convinced that the pre-conversion Saul had indeed a fineeducation, an excellent training, and a wide experience. In the field of education he had run the whole gamut of the Jewish school system from a small boy to a full-grown youth, from the "Bhoma" to the oral interpretation, from the humble elementary school of Tarsus to the great Rabbinibal school of Jerusalem. In terms of the Jewish educational system he had reached the top: He was a well educated man, prepared now for the Ra binate. In fact, due to his outstanding merits, his mental acumen, and sincere zeal, he stood among the highest in his calling; he was a Pharisee of the Pharisees.

Besides that he had had also a rich and varied experience. His early life was not one of strict seclusion from all Gentile influences. He was at heart, indeed, a Jew. But his early life, his travels, and his youth had brought him into contact with peoples, customs, langauges, and religions of almost

every country of the Mediterranean world. These associations had served to deepen his understanding of the Gentile, to realize the complete vanity of all idolatry, and perhaps even to pity the poor worldly-wise, yet spiritually ignorant, heathen who, as he well knew, were destined one and all to God's eternal punishment.

And yet, in spite of his wide experiences, Saul was still at heart a thorough-going Pharisaical Jew. To him God's law was all in all. To him it was discouraging enough that there should be heathen who know not God but worshiped dead idols of wood and stone. But beware, whosoever should rise up to oppose his Pharisaical religion. Such a one was not to be tolerated. That makes it easy to understand how he could later on persecute with such relentless futy. These people were of his own stock, people who knew better. They had rejected the Law of God and followed after this "Imposter." For such the Jew could have no pity. For such Saul the persecutor could have only the greatest loathing and disgust. Thus is becomes clear how ridiculous is the theory advocated by many present-day ratinnalists, that the change from Saul to St. Paul came about quite naturally by a process of gradual inner development in the mind of St. Paul himself. No indeed, but for the mighty hand of God Saul the Pharisee could never have become St. Paul the Apostle.

From the viewpoint of Him, however, who had chosen him for His slave, Saul was now fully prepared for the final master stroke. His educational and experiential background was now complete. The potential energy was there in abundance. It

remained only for the Lord to utilize it, to divert the misdirected energies and mistaken zeal of Saul of Tarsus into the proper chanels. So far he was only a Doctor of the Law; but by God's provicence he was to become the Apostle of the Gospel.

This thesis was originally intended to consist of two parts, the first picturing the educational background of Saul of Tarsus, the study we have just completed, and the second showing how St. Paul reflects his training and education in his own life and pedagogy. However, two considerations have necessitated a change in this plan and the termination of the thesis at this point: First, the study here completed has become far more lengthy than was at first anticipated; and, second, it has become apparent in the meantime that to trace the reflections of St. Paul's education and training in his life and pedagogy would constitute a major study in itself. Nevertheless, it is hoped that the present study may form a background which may some day be of assistance in showing how the Apostle Paul reflects his education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Broecker, W. "Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi," Synodal-Bericht des Oestlichen Distrikts, No. 2 (1907). St. Louis, Mo: Concordia Publishing House.

2. Catholic Encyclopedia. Vol. V. Article, "Education." Vol. VIII. Article, "Jews."

3. Conybeare, W.J., Howson, J.S. The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. Vol. I. Seventh Edition. New York: Charles Scribner and Co. 1868.

4. Cyclopedia of Education, A. Edited by Paul Monroe. Vol. III. Article, "Jewish Education."

5. Dana, H.E. The New Testament World, Third Ed. Revised. Nashville, Tenn: Broadman Press. 1937.

6. Deissmann, Adolf. Light from the Ancient East. New and Revised Ed. New York: George H. Doran Co. 1927.

7. Edersheim, Alfred. Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. 2 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich: Wm. B. Erdman's Publishing Co. 1940.

8. _____. Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ. New York: Hodder and Stoughton. (n.d.)

9. Eickmann, Walter, Pilgrim Paul. 446-21st St., West New York, N.J. 1934.

10. Footsteps of St. Paul, The. (no author). New York: Robert Carter and Bros. 1855.

11. Friedlander, Gerald. Hellenism and Christianity. London: P. Vallentine and Son's. 1912.

12. Goldberg, Israel, and Benderly, Samson. Outline of Jewish Knowledge. Vol. III. New York: Bureau of Jewish Education. 1931.

13. Graetz, Heinrich. History of the Jews. Vol. II. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 1941.

14. Graham, William Creighton. "The Jewish World in which Jesus Lived," The Journal of Religion. Edited by Shirley Jackson Case. Vol. VIII. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1928.

15. Graves, Frank Pierrepont. A Student's History of Education. Revised Edition. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1937.

16. Hastings, J. Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. I. Article, "Education."

17. _____. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Vol. V. Article, "Education (Jewish)."

18. Kent, C.F. The Work and Teachings of the Apostles. Chicago: Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1916.

19. Kretzmann, P.E. Education Among the Jews. Boston: The Talmud Society. 1915.

20. Lewin, Thomas. The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. Third Edition. Vol. I. London: George Bell and Sons. 1875.

21. Machen, J. Gresham. The Origin of Paul's Religion. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1936.

22. Marique, Pierre J. History of Christian Education. Vol. I. New York: Fordham University Press. 1924.

23. Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. 2 Vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1927.

24. Morris, Nathan. The Jewish School. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1937.

25. Nilsson, Martin P. The Historical Hellenistic Background of the New Testament. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. 1941

26.

26. Offermann, H. "Paul and Hellenism," The Lutheran Church Review. Vol. XLIII, No 4, October, 1924. Mt. Airy, Phil-

27. Querach, James. St. Paul, His Life and Times. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co. (n.d.)

28. Ramsay, W.M. Pauline and Other Studies. New York: A.C. Armstrong and Son. 1906.

29. _____. St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen. Nineteenth Printing. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1896.

30. _____. The Cities of St. Paul. New York: Hodder and Stoughton (George H. Doran Co.). 1907.

31. Renan, Ernest. The Apostles. Translated. New York: Brentano's. 1863.

32. Riddle, D.W. Early Christian Life. Chicago; Willett, Clark and Co. 1936.

33. _____. Paul, Man of Conflict. Nashville: Cokesbury Press. 1940.

34. Schaff-Herzog. Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. Vol. IV. Article, "Family and Marriage Relations, Hebrew."

35. Scheurer, Emil. A History of the Jewish People in the Times of Jesus Christ. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T and T Clark. 1924.