Critical scholars have long claimed that most of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament were not actually written by the persons traditionally named as their authors: that the disciple Matthew did not write the first Gospel, that the apostle Peter did not write 1 Peter, that James did not write James. Some people find these claims unsettling and possibly wrong-headed. Is there any evidence for them? Can there really be forgeries in the New Testament? Would authors of the early Christian literature have lied about their own identities in order to get their messages heard? These are among the many questions to be addressed in this new Adventures in Ideas seminar by Professor Ehrman.

BART D. EHRMAN is James A. Gray Distinguished Professor of Religious Studies. The author or editor of twenty books, he has published extensively in the fields of New Testament and Early Christianity. Professor Ehrman is also the winner of numerous teaching awards. His new book is Jesus, Interrupted: Revealing the Hidden Contradictions in the Bible (And Why We Don’t Know About Them).
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- Philipp = Philippians
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- RCC = Roman Catholic Church
- Thes = Thessalonians, 1 Thes, 1 Thes
- Tim = Timothy, 1 Tim, 2 Tim
- WWII = World War II

**Literary Deception in Antiquity: Forgery as an Ancient Cottage Industry**

**Introduction:** The controversial claims of modern times have led us to see that the Bible is a very complex book with often contradictory messages. It is a historical document and, for some, a venerated holy object in itself. In today’s world it is not a disinterested project to interpret. There were no copyright lawyers and all has been claimed in authorship, and understanding the context is important to delve into the authorship.

Bart Ehrman was educated at Wheaton as an undergraduate, Princeton Seminary for his Ph.D., and has appeared many times on national media. He has had many teaching awards, today drawing from his most recent work, *Jesus, Uninterrupted*.

I will start with when I got interested in literary forgery. It may go back to being a student under my teacher, Bruce Metzger, a great NT scholar. He told a story about
one of his professors, in Classics, Paul Coleman Norton who wrote an article dealing with discovery of a North African manuscript found at a monastery where he had been stationed in WWII. He had time on his hands, and he was told there was a very old Arabic manuscript. He was a Greek and Latin scholar. He thumbed his way through it and found a page stuck into it -- a spare page -- written in Greek. It was a Greek commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, somebody stuck it in here. A passage in Matthew talking to disciples says those who will be cast into outer darkness will be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth. ‘What of those who have no teeth?’ The Master wrote, ‘Teeth will be provided.’ He found this humorous line, did a detailed study of this manuscript. For years, people believed him. Metzer pointed out in his classes before the war told the joke about teeth will be provided, so in other words he made the whole thing up.

I will be talking about ancient forgeries in the ancient world, giving a technical definition in this lecture, setting the stage what will happen in Christianity, and it is also a background to use in speaking of forgery in ancient world more broadly. I am not saying Christians were the only ones, in fact it was common, so I call it an ancient cottage industry.

**A famous incident: Heraclides and Dionysius the Renegade:** He was an ancient philosopher, originally a stoic and they believed that you should’t let external circumstances impact your well being; you should be independent regardless of what happens, but what you cannot control should not affect your happiness. Dionysius held that view till he got sick and had a lot of pain. He then gave up on being a stoic and became a renegade, a bit of an untrustworthy fellow, and fell out with his teacher Heraclides. He wrote a play and signed it in the name of Sophocles and put it in circulation and claiming he had discovered it. Heraclides read it and took the bait. Once an article published Dionysius had achieved his objective and then admitted he had fooled him because Dionysius had written it. Heraclides did not believe it. ‘No, Sophocles wrote this play.’ Dionysius said ‘I wrote it.’ He had hidden some hints in it to show he had written it. Showed Heraclides the first lines, the first letter of each and they spelled the name of his male lover. But Heraclides said, ‘It is accidental, just circumstance.’ But there was another longer clue.

Pancalus was his lover. An old monkey is not caught in the trap, oh he is caught but it takes time! Heraclides is ignorant of letters and is not ashamed of his ignorance. Then it was over. Publically, he was shown to be an idiot. That was his revenge on his former teacher.
Forgery involved conscious deception, intentionally making a false authorial claim. Writing a play and claiming to be Sophocles when in fact you are not, that is a forgery.

Forgery was meant to succeed. People wanted to convince people they were the person they said they were, an important point. People did not expect others to know, and often it worked. As in the case of Pancalus.

A topic I’ve thought about for a long time. I have spent the last 4-5 years reading about ancient forgery. And last year I was on sabbatical and spent every day reading about it. Got very interested and read a lot. We need to be clear.

Pseudonymity: “falsely named”: You hear about pseudonymous, there are two kinds. Pen names, for example when Mark Twain wrote Huckleberry Fin, he was Samuel Clemens and was not trying to fool you. George Elliot was using a pen name to convey being a man. If she wrote calling herself as Abraham Lincoln, that would be different.

Well-known names (-Pseudepigraphy): Using a well-known name is widely used among classicists, books written by someone claiming to be someone who is famous. Literally means ‘falsely inscribed.’ Sometimes pseudepigraphic writings are falsely attributed, people would write things anonymously and not have a name then somebody else would come along and say somebody wrote it.

Gospel of Matthew writer did not claim to be Matthew, but the title says Gospel of Mattew. Author did not do that, but somebody telling you. If it is false it would be pseudepigraphy a falsely inscribed. I happen to think Matthew did not write it.

Another form an authorial claimed but is not = forgery. A book whose author falsely claims to be a well known person. You claim to be Apostle Paul, that a false authorial claim. It is important to differentiate from forgery from related terms.

Homonymity: “the same name” c.f. the Revelation of John. It is written in the name of the author the same name of somebody famous. Most people did not have last names. In NT several Mary’s. The author has to tell you which one. Same thing with Herod -- which Herod -- the one that killed the babies was not the same that killed John the Baptist.

Book of Revelation is written by someone named John, an exceedingly common name. So which John was it? It was brought in by people thinking it was John son of Zebedee, and there are good reasons to think it was not, but a homonymity.
Anonymity = no name, like Matthew.

False ascriptions an anonymous book and they say someone wrote it and did not correctly ascribe.

It is all related to Plagiarism, a hot topic on the internet. Students can find a term paper on any topic. Kids today are born being able to use those gizmos, a four year old is better than we are, and by the time they are college students, so now software has been devised to help you detect when it has been stolen. There is a game going on to see how to beat it, so plagiarism is not just a modern term.

Forgery is when somebody claims to be a famous person, writing something that he claims belonged to other person. Plagiarism is using somebody’s words and claiming it is yours. In ancient world, people today think it was not that big a deal.

Fabrication: is somewhat different, but related. You invent stories, traditions, that really didn’t happen. That happened a lot in Greek, Roman, and early Christianity. We have all these gospels that did not make it into the NT, stories of JC as a five year old, powerful son of god a 5 year old brat. So when playmates get on his nerves, he withers them, kills his teachers by one word. Nobody thinks that really happened! Somebody made it up, people fabricated in early Christianity about his life, his death, his resurrection. It was not started by Christianity.

Falsification: Finally the other related phenomenon is falsification: You take a writing and you change it. I have been interested in it for many years. My main area from graduate school for 20 years, how scribes changed the NT manuscripts. We do not have the original NT and not copies of the original, copies of copies, etc. We can compare and they’re all different because scribes were changing things. It occurred sometimes because they were sleepy, sometimes because they wanted to change the text. That is a falsification, and it was much easier to do in ancient world. They didn’t have printing presses or carbon paper. If you wanted a book you copied by hand and changed it any way you wanted. Kind of like forgery, if you claim to be famous and write it out, when you falsify say that Paul wrote it and then you put your own thoughts into it, sounding like Paul said it. To keep some taxonomy of dealing with texts.

I will not be dealing with these six, but on forgery. People don’t like it saying it is too negative and demeaning. I gave you the other words and a lot of scholars when you talk about forgery in NT they will call it pseudoepigraphy, but outside the NT they will call it forgery. So this is a problem. I understand that it is demeaning but think about how ancient people thought about it. Greek is my main research language and the same thing in laten.
Ancient Greek terms- (= falsehood/lie)

**Pseudo** in greek = falsehood/lie. Most of the time, it means a lie, the person knows it is false and is trying to deceive you. If you did it to convince somebody you were right. It is the Greek words for lie.

**Nothos** (=illegitimate child, bastard): They call forged books Nothos because they are not really related to the assumed father, an illegitimate father not related to ostensible father, so they are called lying bastards. So at least I am not calling them lying bastards, but in ancient times it was

**Pagan Circles:** The *Case of Galen*, a polytheist who was a physician in the Roman world, a prolific author, wrote so many books, and many not ever translated into English. He talked about an incident walking down street in Rome, passing by a book seller shop, a book on sale that was said to be written by Galen. Because two people were arguing, one saying, ‘It is Galen,’ the other guy said, ‘This is not his writing style it is not Galen.’ Galen paid close attention to the conversation, and wrote a book and its title was something like this: *How to recognize books written by Galen*. He did not like what had happened, a common attitude in Galen and Roman sources and later in Christian sources, they called it lying, and it was not seen as acceptable practice. NT scholars will often say in their writing, when often they have not read the ancient sources, will say, ‘It is an extremely wide practice and therefore was acceptable.’ Like adultery? Cheating on your taxes? Think of things that are practiced a lot but that does not make them acceptable.

**In the 4th century:** The *Apostolic Constitutions* about 300 years later claimed to be written by the Apostles, I am Matthew, and here’s James giving this instruction. I Thomas, speaking in the first person. Apostles give instruction to readers, near end of book, there is one instruction that the reader should not read books by people who claim to be apostles who are not. He’s telling you not to read books written that way.

**The Authorial Claim (universal):** How did they convince readers? They were really that person. If you claimed it, most people accept it. Sometimes, that is all you need. Some forgers went out of their way to make sure the writing style was like that of the original author. If you want to imitate.

**Verisimilitudes** (c.f. 2 Timothy): Makes you think it is the real person. I will talk after dinner about letters claiming to be written by Paul which are not. 2 Timothy has many verisimilitudes, such as he left his cloak behind and be sure to bring it and the book I left behind. It makes it sound like Paul, what scholars call a verisimilitude.
The author did that to make you think that person did something that sounds very plausible, a ploy. If you find a verisimilitude, you should be on alert.

**Discovery narratives (Apocalypse of Paul):** Paul is allegedly taken on a tour of heaven and hell, among the blessed and the damned, which was written 200 years after Paul died. If you were claiming it was written by Paul and you don't know where it was, some came up with a discovery narrative -- like it was hidden for 200 years. An author is living in a house where Paul had lived 200 years earlier, and then he was told by an angel to dig up the floor, and the 3rd time he was told, the angel beat him up, so he went down and dug up and found a book sealed shut with molten iron. Took it to local people and then to the Roman emperor, and explains why it has been gone for 200 years. When it has a discovery narrative you can get suspicious.

**Why did they do this? Some motives:**

**Profit (Libraries of Alexandria and Pergamum):** Dionysius the Renegade wanted to pull a fast one on his teacher, but sometime there is a profit motive. In the ancient world, there were no libraries where books were borrowed, but where scholars came to read, they could not take them out. A book by Plato is in Turkey. They had a contest who had the biggest collection. The King agreed to pay money for original volumes, gold for these authors, but not for later copies. They wanted the real thing. If you are willing to give gold for Plato, then you'd be amazed how many turn up.

My students no longer remember the *Hitler Diaries* of the early 1980's, and it was a ruse that fooled the world for a couple of days, supposedly going from 1932 to end of war, but after 2 days of big news, experts came in and showed they had been forged and how they caught the guy. His friend's nick name for him was Connie, ('con') the whole thing written up, Selling Hitler, a fantastic account. He made tons of money. Murdoff got the English rights made millions. When he got out of jail started business where he painted in imitation, sold them as imitations and made lots of money, then people were forging Rembrandts. He then wrote a book on his lie as a con man, then another book written claiming Pougout [??] wrote it.

Sometimes people wrote to attack an enemy. One set of Gospels the Pilate Gospels, Pontius Pilate plays a major role, letters that he wrote to the Emperor, a group of these back and forth, one thing consistent Pilate blamed Jews for killing JC because he is the one, but not written by Pilate but by later Christians who want to blame him for killing JC.

Sometimes very personal, to defame an opponent (Diotimus) Epicurus was thought a profligate who indulged in pleasure, a hedonist. It was a false charge, he was not
interested in wild bouts of pleasure but simple pleasures, and restricting pain. Decent food, friends, discussion, those are the pleasures. But he had a bad reputation and a lot of enemies including Diotimus who decided to defame. He wrote 50 obscene letters signed them by Epicurus and put them in circulation.

Sometimes they just wanted to get a hearing. You write the Gospel of George and you have an understanding of Jesus you want to push. I got an email from a high school kid, he had uncovered the fundamental flaw in my point of view. I am sorry but you are in high school. ‘No, I don’t want to hear it!’ You will write it and say Gospel of Peter, John, Mary, but you will do better to pick somebody who will be listened to. They wrote forgeries because they wanted people to hear them.

There is some question as to whether in philosophical schools for students that they’d write a treatise and sign it in the name of their master. NT scholars claim this commonly happens, a philosopher would have students who felt everything came from the master so they write a treatise and sign his name. Throughout NT scholarship it is claimed. If you ask one ancient source that claimed that happened and you will get a blank stare. So it seems to be true just because everybody said it, but tracking the source of information is not easy to be found. An off the cuff remark, a 3rd century in one sentence said that Pythagoras wrote in the name of the master, but does not demonstrate that this occurred – we are talking about writers 800 years earlier and no one in the next 800 years ever says any such thing, including followers of Pythagoras who write in their own name. I don’t think this is evidence for what was going on in the ancient world. We don’t have anyone who says this is why I wrote it.

The extent of forgery: How do they justify? It was very common in antiquity, more common then than now, it was so much easier to do back then. No data retrieval systems like today. If a new book appears, by next week that was claimed had been discovered in their attic by George Eliott, there would be many scholars who could do the research and show you if it was by GE or not. They had to go more on basis of feel. We do not know how extensive.

In early Christianity, there was a list of books charged as forgeries in 400 years, over 100 of them in my list, not including books that now we think that, but only what they thought in ancient thoughts. We have 27 books in the NT and many are forgeries.

How many ancient people perceived it as forgery? They thought it was deceitful and lying, bastards, lies, inventions, and as a result, it was not sanctioned. To my knowledge, just occurred to me, I think we have one instance in ancient world where somebody approved the use of forgery. Happens in 5th century Thalvian?? Claiming to be Paul and Timothy.
Christian forgeries pose a particular problem. Christian authors that we have all celebrate the importance of always speaking the truth. Truth was very important because Christians claimed they had the truth and those who did not agree were standing in error. Insiders spoke the truth. Truth was very important. Jesus was the way, truth and the life, no one comes to the Father except by me. Christ speaks, you shall know the truth and the truth will set you free. Yet Christians wrote forgeries, some that they wrote celebrate the truth and insist on people claiming the truth. This is why they tell you it was OK to do it in the ancient world. Well, nobody thought it was OK – it was condemned even by people who themselves were writing forgeries.

One explanation in 3 lectures, the Noble Lie, goes back to Plato in the 4th century, that there are times in the opinion of the ancients that it is right to tell a lie. If your daughter is dying and refuses to take medication, then telling her a lie is OK to get her to do it. A General of an army and your troops are getting beaten, it is OK to say reinforcements are coming even if you know it is not true. A lot of people agreed it was better to lie than not tell the truth. In Christian circles, it was trashed by Augustine in 5th century. He said it is never OK to lie, if she can be saved from fire of hell still not right to tell a lie, better for her to roast than for you to tell a lie. He stressed this and most people then and now did not agree with him. The end justifies the means, if good can be reached by deceit, well and good. They wrote forgeries to promote the truth which were better than telling the truth.

**How many people did Paul know first hand who had an encounter with Jesus?** He says James, brother of Jesus, Cephas [Peter], John, the disciple and the only ones he names. But at one point he went to Jerusalem and spent time with the Apostles which could assume the Eleen, but does not name other than Peter James and John

**When you assigned motive, could you speculate could you make millions?** No that was not the most common reason. My hunch is the most common was to get people to listen to your point of view. If you are a philosopher and your name had never been heard, you’d sign it ‘Aristotle.’ The profit thing on occasion, sometimes people thought they could do it to get away with it, but people wanted their points of view to be heard.

**How many of ancient fathers were aware of these forgeries and, if so, how did they decide what would be admitted into the canon?** Great question. Did they know about it and how did they decide what to put in. Yes, they knew and they talked about it, church fathers talked about which ones were forged. Some books that made it in were thought to be forgeries by some people, like 2 Peter. In NT 2 epistles claimed by Peter, they are two ancient books and also a Gospel of Peter, Acts of Peter,
3 Apocalypses, and in the ancient world, they thought many of these were forged. But the church fathers, at end of 4th century said 2 Peter was a forgery but some said it was his.

What about Revelation and is it same as Gospel of John? Some said yes, some said no.

What were the criteria for deciding what went into the canon? Book of Jude, James were questioned. So church fathers were cognizant, whether it was authentic. One way was to say it was not written by an Apostle. But the church fathers didn’t spell it out but if you analyze they followed something like this:

1) **It had to be ancient**, some works were read and liked a lot but it is not ancient, and to go back to the apostles

2) **It had to be apostolic -- an Apostle or companion of an Apostle.** In the 4 gospels, they are all anonymous, no names attached but then appearing with names. Whose is this, according to Matthew, John, and adding names. Two of them have names of apostles, Matthew, the tax collector and John, the Beloved, two were thought to be companions, Mark, the secretary for Peter, Luke companion for Paul. So that is OK. Other books attributed.

3) **It had to be used throughout Christendom, not just local usage.**

4) **It had to be orthodox**, e.g. evidence the right belief. Problem is there were lots of Christians with different beliefs. Who gets to decide? The person who gets to decide is ‘Orthodox’ and if not, you are heterodox, another opinion. Each group had their own favorite claimed as apostolic. One group won out gave us, the Nicene and Apostles Creed, the hierarchy with Deacons, Bishops and eventually the Pope. They decided which would be in or out. Never decided by a church council -- it kind of evolved by the beginning of 5th century.

My students find it amazing, they think that after JC died, you have the NT, but they circulated, people deciding this or that. First time listed the 27 books was in 367 CE, by the Bishop of Alexander, Athanasius, who wrote a letter to his churches that these are the ones that can be read in worship services, not others. This was after 300 years. He didn’t decide it for everyone, but that is when we see the canon forming up.
At a later stage who claimed what was orthodox? At beginning, in Luke is it a verisimilitude? Is it part of original text or not?

Can we trace the origins of attributions of the four Gospels? We can point to first instances but I don’t think we can know what the origins were. We had 4 anonymous and then attributions, other gospels claimed to be by Philip and others.

Patias in about 130 CE, but quoted in 400 CE, makes two statements. Mark was the interpreter of Peter, when Peter was preached, Mark would write them down but not in sequence. He says Matthew wrote down in Hebrew and everybody interpreted that. This is taken by scholars as the first references. I think Patius did not talk about our Matthew and Mark. He said that Matthew wrote down in Hebrew language but Matthew was not written in Hebrew. Not talking about our Matthew, is he talking about Mark?

So in 130 CE Matthew and Mark, later......first time definitive attributions were Irenaeus in 185 CE, a famous church father wrote Against Heretics and says MMLJ, no more no less

Luke, begins by author talking in first person. GL author says many have undertaken to write an account I have followed all this and now writing an orderly account, talking in first person. I think somebody saying he did some research but does not say who he is. I think it is original and anonymous.

What about the Q Source and why no attributions? MML and J, J is outside, most of MML is not in 4G. MM so alike they had to use the same sources, same stories, same sequence some time word for word. That means somebody talked to somebody. In class for a demonstration, I fiddle around a few minutes then stop, and tell the class to take out pen and paper, write down everything you saw me do in last 3 minutes. I take 4 volunteers, I want you to see if you wrote the same sentence in any one of these, read them, 2nd, 3rd people. And the most there will be is one or two words the same. What if I pick up 2 papers, if there is a paragraph word for word, we’d say they cheated! Suppose we talk about a Gospel about you 40-50 years after the events described in it and they did not ask you but friends or neighbors who once knew you, and they are alike? Inevitably, in class, somebody says “It is a miracle!” Mark is thought to be the first, Matthew and Luke got many from Mark. GM and GL have stories that are not in Mark. They have sayings ...beatitudes in GM and GMk but not in Luke. Scholars came up with idea of another source, they did not copy each other but Quelle, is German for ’source.’ So the short of it is that Quelle no longer survives.
**Why was Q not in the canon?** Nobody knows. Maybe because no death and resurrection so it was not included.

**Christian Forgeries in the Name of Paul**

I want to talk in this lecture about Paul and his significance to the NT and forgery, made by Christians in the name of Paul. As you know there are 27 NT books. Thirteen claim to be written by Paul. There are historians who will say next to JC he is the most important figure in Christianity. St. Augustine is hugely important, Thomas Aquinas, but more important than Paul? Some go further and say he should be considered the 2nd founder of Christianity, without Paul you would not have Christianity. JC preached that there should be repentance and the coming kingdom of God. But Paul preached about faith in Christ, death and resurrection, not what JC preached. I don’t agree with it but without him it is a good question what would we have. He is very significant for the NT.

One other (Hebrews) was accepted because they thought Paul wrote it but he didn’t. One other book is about Paul, the Book of Acts. A story of the spread of Christianity and missionary journeys of Paul. So I want to devote this lecture to one aspect of Paul.

**The Pauline NT corpus:** Romans, 1-2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1-2 Thessalonians, 1-2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon.

Six are disputed by one scholar or another to be written by Paul. Ephes, Col, 2 Thes, 1-2 Tim, Titus thought not to be Pauline. Virtually nobody disputes the other seven. If you agree on the seen as undisputed, then you can compare the others to them to help decide: Does it have a consistent vocabulary, writing style, are the theological views similar, is the historical situation consistent? In some instances, it is very different when you compare the others to the core seven.

** Mentioned in 1 Cor 5:9:** Some letters been lost. He certainly wrote other letters. Paul is talking to Corinthians ‘the letter I previously wrote to you,’ but this is I Cor. So what we call I Cor is a response to things they earlier wrote to him, that appeared to have been in some urgency. In 7:1 he says people in Corinth -- if it was true -- that men and women should not have physical contact even if married. A man should not touch a woman. You can appreciate the urgency!

**Mentioned in Col 4:16:** Paul tells them they are to share this letter with Laodiceans and to read the letter from them. The irony is that scholars doubt whether Paul wrote Colossians. Was that part made up? Hard to say.
Paul probably wrote a lot of letters. Why wasn’t Q preserved, why were not these? They maybe thought Jesus was returning next Thursday and thus they were not preserved. There are others that allegedly are Paul, but not authentic letters outside the NT. A lot of people forging in the name of Paul probably.

**3 Corinthians:** Known Pauline forgery. There’s not a scholar on the planet – oh, a lack of scholars -- I would say. I get a lot of emails from people. Last two days in heated debate with a guy who is absolutely convinced that JC never existed. They get upset, they know I’m agnostic so if you are agnostic, then you shouldn’t think JC did exist. So I shouldn’t say ‘no scholar thinks’ but in fact I do not know of any.

**1-2 Cor by Paul, 3 Cor not in NT.** Not a best seller, found in the Acts of Paul. In NT we have Act of the Apostles. Another book called the Acts of Paul, a legendary account of his missionary activities. I am not saying the NT book is perfectly accurate, as Acts also has historical problems but certainly there are more problems in those books outside the NT. Paul in the wilderness confronted by a lion that has a thorn in its paw, the lion is limping along. Paul realizes its problem, pulls it out, the lion thanks him and asks to be baptized, and Paul baptizes the lion.

Fast forward -- Paul is arrested years later and is in the arena to be executed, set for the wild beasts to come get him. ‘Paul, is that you?’ The lion he baptized! Not too many people think this is historical. It is supposed to be an account of missionary activities.

One of the major sections is the plot of Paul and Thecla. Thecla was at one time the most well-known famous and adored woman in Christendom, right up there with Blessed Virgin Mary, worshiped as a saint, a very famous saint. Her story, in the oldest form, is in Acts of Paul. The short version of the story: Thecla a young woman engaged to be married, the fiancé is from a wealthy family, to be married to the richest young man in town. She is sitting by her window on 2nd floor. Paul comes in to town at a house church next door and is preaching. ‘The way to be saved is to abstain from sex,’ so she decides to live a life of chastity. Her fiancé was not happy, not happy with Paul, and he arranges to have Paul arrested. She refuses to agree to get married and so she is arrested and then sent off to be executed because of violating the norms. He is exiled. She is to be burned at the stake. God sends a thunderstorm and puts out the fire and she escapes. She travels with Paul, gets in trouble in another town where a man approaches her, a powerful man, she is sent to arena to battle the wild beasts. Paul had refused to baptize her, and you can’t have eternal life if you haven’t been baptized. There is a vat of water with man-eating seals. Thecla realizes she will be eaten, so she jumps into the water and baptizes herself, God sends a lightening bolt,
kicks the seals and she escapes. Paul commissions her to preach becomes a missionary on her own. This is the account.

One of the interesting things is it raised huge controversies. She is a woman, baptized herself, and became a preacher? Didn’t Paul say women are supposed to be quiet? May have been generated as a counter story to the I Tim 3:16 admonition.

Paul’s proclamation is not what you expect if you read the NT. In NT, the way to be right with God is to believe in death and resurrection of JC. Now it is living in chastity. The fabricator of this account got caught. One of the few we have caught red-handed, a church leader in Asian Minor was found out and he left church office as a result. People in the ancient world did not take kindly to making a false proclamation.

An incident in which Paul receives a letter from Christians in Corinth, two heretics had shown up preaching and they are not sure if they are right. They write a letter to find out. This letter is quoted in Acts of Paul. Believers of JC not to appeal to prophets of OT, humans not made by God, not born of Mary, world not created by God but by angels. Paul doesn’t like any of it. He writes a letter back, God is creator of the world, flesh is good and will be raised, believers in JC will be raised in the flesh.

What is the status of the flesh? Some say what is this about? This idea was condemned by early church fathers. Today, he died, his soul lives on, what matters is your soul. Early church fathers didn’t like it, believe God created the earth good and it can’t be inherently bad. If God made your body, it will live. In your body, people think body does not live but you will recognize people? I dunno. My experience is people don’t think. Early church fathers insist you live in your body, that your flesh matters, will rise from dead and live in your body. They were trying to combat people who say the flesh doesn’t matter.

Later called heretics would point out the misery and suffering. If you say God did it, all these things, birth defects, then a lower divinity did it. You need to escape. Author says share 3 Cor to Laodiceans and vice versa. So where is the Letter to Laodiceans? We don’t have one so somebody came up with one, but it is not in Greek, but in Latin. Boring with some phrases from Paul but no point to it.

Another set Letters of Paul and Seneca, the great Roman philosopher a great 1st century intellectual. At one point, a tutor to Nero when He was a boy. Seneca ended up on Nero’s bad side and compelled to commit suicide by the Emperor, his former teacher. Christians in 3-4th century thought Paul was a great intellectual giant. Some 14 letters. Paul, your letters are so wonderful I showed them to the Emperor the other day. Rome burned in 64, everyone thought Nero did it. He had some plans designed for
the city and it was suspected that he torched and then blamed the Christians. To middle ages they thought it was authentic up to 4th century.

Paul the 1st person mentioned taken into 3rd heaven and cannot be repeated. He saw how they were doing. He includes bishops who didn’t do their job right.

**Are there Pauline forgeries in the NT?** Yes, in opinion of NT scholars.

Evidence, hard evidence is not easy to refute but already in NT period, forgeries floating around regarding Paul. You don’t have to wait 3-4 centuries. 2 Thes 2:2 he tells his reader they are ‘not to be led astray by a letter as if by us,’ to the effect that the day of the Lord is almost here. In other words, a forgery that claims the end is almost here. 2 Thes written to correct that impression left in a forgery, so at least one floating around in his name. But scholars question if 2 Thes not written by Paul, and if it wasn’t, then it is a forgery warning you against the forgery. We’d have to be here all weekend but a couple reasons they question whether he wrote it.

1 Thes corresponds with others, continuity with the 7.

2 Thes verbal parallels to 1 Thes, phrases are virtually the same, you think then they’d be the same. No, you don’t remember what you wrote several months ago, unlike other letters introduced like 1 Thes, somebody had a copy and put it in with some other things. There are parts not like 1 Thes appear to contradict 1 Thes. You have passages very similar which look the same, looks suspicious. And in contrast, it is not that way in 1-2 Cor. Having to do with “eschatology” teaching of the end time. 1 Thes written to teach them about end times, JC coming back soon. Gonna come quickly and unexpectedly, a thief in the night. You need to keep watchful, could happen any time.

2 Thes warns against the view that it could happen any time, not gonna happen right away, a series of events has to happen first, so there has to be a delay. Somebody living after knew it had not ended right away, wrote in Paul’s name but giving a new eschatology given the new situation. It is epigraphic, or a forgery.

There are even more certain cases, Pastoral letters, 1-2 Tim + Titus.

Scholars think he wrote 2 Thes, some do not, I don’t.

**Pastoral 1-2 Timothy, Titus:** Called ‘pastoral’ because they are written to people in churches, what kind of leaders can be in the churches, how you should conduct self in Christian community. What to do in the community to get these leaders to elect the right people and run the church as a tight ship. Whoever wrote them wrote all three, as
stylistically they are same. If you read all three, they sound alike, but unfortunately not very much like Paul. To most scholars they were not written by Paul, not a new theory – this is not a new theory by a liberal Chapel Hill professor but standard stuff in nearly all seminaries.

There are compelling reasons to think they are not Paul:

**Vocabulary:** A sample of how scholars think, 848 words used in I-II Tim and Titus. Of those 848, 306 never occur in the 7 undisputed Pauline, 1/3 words, but most of these do occur in 2\(^{nd}\) century church fathers. It sounds like later vocabulary.

**Words the same but meaning different:** Not only that, author will use a word Paul used but will mean something different by it. An example, when Paul talks about faith, he had something very concrete in mind. Hard to put it in English, faith meant trusting that Christ’s death and resurrection will put you in right standing from God. You are alienated from God and if you trust this, your relationship with JC can be trusted to save you. It is trusting in Christ puts you in right standing, *faith is a relational term.*

Pastoral epistles don’t mean the same thing with use of the word, faith, they refer to **content** of Christian teaching. Christian teaching is this and that, is the faith what you subscribe to. *Not a relational term but subscribing to specific content.* Paul v. Pastoral definition of faith, same word with different meanings.

**Presupposed church situation is different:** Paul’s churches filled with problems, in Corinth, schisms fragmented, at Corinth some so upset that they were taking each other to court. Flagrant immorality going on such as one guy sleeping with stepmother, others visiting prostitutes and bragging about it in church, problem with immorality, worship services were chaos. Everybody has spiritually gifts, then you speak in tongues if you are really spiritual. So some services and everybody speak in tongues and nobody can understand anyone -- chaos breaking out. They are coming together for like a pot luck dinner, actually sharing a meal. The rich come early get drunk on the wine and eat, while the slaves and day laborers come late and there is nothing left to eat or drink.

The real Paul says get their act together. Why doesn’t Paul write to the pastor of the church to get them in line? The answer is there were no church leaders, they didn’t have bishops in charge of everything, pastors. Paul’s churches were not that organized because they thought end coming very soon.

Get to Pastoral epistles then men in charge, bishops, deacons, how they are qualified, how to relate to the community, an organized church structure with hierarchy in 2\(^{nd}\) century. Paul’s churches led by spirit -- chaotic and over time developed a structure.
Ephesians and Colossians probably not written by Paul. One way scholars explain why they are so different from Paul. The Secretary Hypothesis: I get asked this, we know Paul dictated his letters to someone who wrote them down. Is it possible he used different secretaries and each wrote it down in their own way? Ephesians is not like Colossians. NT scholars use this argument all the time, Ephesians goes back to Paul even though ....

Problem with Secretary Hypotheses: If it is true that we have 2-3 times temporaries who wrote it down but when we have those instances, it is stereotyped. Substantive letters. Most letters have very brief greetings, prayer, what they are writing about, then the end. Only thing that changed was please send $50. You have a couple like that possibly written by secretaries.

Letters to Ephesians: 6 chapters stuffed with content. So much so people who argue for it have to argue...

Randall Richards ??: The secretary to the letters of Paul. Argues different secretaries, but does not give any evidence. Look at every reference to secretaries, everything but didn’t find out any for the piece he was writing. I don’t see any evidence. In WWII, there isn’t any evidence for it. People teach, would they have been taught this, but no evidence for it?

Outside the NT claims of books by Paul that were not in the NT

Inside the NT 1-2 Timothy, Titus, Colossians, Ephesians: the majority would say Paul did not write. Evangelical Christians have theological reasons for saying otherwise, whoever wrote was lying about who he was, and there are people in this room who have theological reasons for saying that didn’t happen. But we have lots of forgeries inside as well as outside

Ironies: Christians and the claims of truth, e.g. Ephesians. They should seek the truth and truth is armor of God, battling with forces of evil. If Paul didn’t write it, you should speak the truth. One solution is the Noble Lie, I incline toward. Whoever wrote Ephesians thought his agenda so important it was necessary to lie about his identity to get his point across. Nobody would take him seriously to convince and so he chose Paul, claimed what he wrote was what Paul would have written so to justify his practice in his own mind, better to lie to achieve a greater good than for it to be in my own name and then nobody listens.\n
How long did they live, how old would they have been when writing, how old in relation to JC and MMLJ lifespans? We can say something about Paul, but not
the others. If they really were, if Matthew was really Matthew, probably about JC age. Scholars say Matthew written about 80-85 CE, if JC born about 4 BC died 30 CE, then 50 years after, then GM written, a broad span.

Paul actually did live and we can say some chronological things. My guess is he was about same age as JC. He would have been adult when he converted within 1-3 years after JC death. His letters dated in 50’s, JC died 30 CE, the letters same age 20-30 years after JC death. He probably wrote some before these, but we do not have those.

So the tradition is that Paul was martyred in Rome under Nero in 64 after the fires. Paul was the most active Christian and was beheaded, a later legend, Acts of Paul is the first account but do not know if it can be trusted. He is Roman citizen so give him a quick merciful death. Account in Acts of Paul, his head on block executioner lops off his head and milk comes out of his neck instead of blood. Must have been something about nourishing value of milk, his death not a tragedy because it nourishes the community or something like that. So it is plausible he died in 64.

He is the first writer in NT, 1 Thes. MMLJ are placed first in NT because about JC, but they were written years after Paul was dead.

JC talked about kingdom of God, Paul about Christ, gospels came along later, if these Christians would think about biographical details but Paul says very few details about JC, so what is the explanation?”

A real interesting issue in my NT course for some years I have my students have a public debate, resolved: Paul knew nothing about historical JC vs. knew a lot. A real interesting article, you can list everything he says about JC. From between time born to death, you don’t need a 3-5 card. Did Paul know more than he said? If he did not know more, why, if he did know more, why did he not say more? Paul’s letters written to churches having problems and intent on solving those problems. He is not writing a Gospel, maybe he didn’t think a reason to write something they already knew. Another explanation didn’t know and didn’t care, what mattered was resurrection, not that he walked on water. So that is what he talked to. ‘I knew nothing among you except Christ and him crucified,’ what matters was his death, then Paul’s interest was very different from MMLJ.

With Paul’s writing in 50’s converted 1-3 years after JC, where did he get his idea coming kingdom coming 20-30 years later? Scholars date it to 49-50 years, why suddenly anxious about an imminent end? The way I worked it out, I think JC preached it was coming within his generation. ‘This generation will not pass away, some of you will not taste death before coming in power.’ Early converts believed that he was early
convert. I don’t think he developed that when he wrote but thought that all along, think he expected to be alive then realized he might die first, then he had to modify.

Met with Peter, and he and Paul had some kind of falling out, and there’s mainly speculation when they fought? Maybe Paul says, ‘This is what is important, death and resurrection’ vs Peter saying, ‘No, you just saw a vision and it didn’t happen anything like that.’ An interesting set of forgeries from 2nd century, Paul and Peter disagreeing Peter telling Paul, ‘You didn’t have more than 90” visit and I was with him 3 years.’ Did they have that disagreement?

**Galatians 2,** Paul says they saw eye to eye that JC was significant to salvation, but disagreed on implications. For Paul death brings out salvation, he thinks Jewish law is irrelevant, since Christ died you are made right. So it doesn’t matter to keep the law. But gentiles invite you and you can’t eat. Peter says ‘I am a Jew, he is a Jewish Messiah, we are Jews.’ Gentiles might be over for dinner but I don’t eat ham. Might sound petty but a huge deal, it split the community. Some thought it really mattered to keep Jewish law, then that means gentiles have to become Jewish to be Christians. Paul took that line and won that argument, most of the converts were gentiles.

**Forgeries Attacking Heretics and Other Christian Miscreants**

I made a big mistake of turning off the game in the 5th ending! Yankees won in the 8th ending, they rallied, 6-5. I needed to go to bed, wrong, wrong, wrong! All right, I have switched sequences, I think it was supposed to be on defending the faith. But I thought I’d give the shorter one last, to give more time for questions. This will be on forgeries to attack

**Forgeries to Attack the Christian Enemies:**

**My current project:** My scholarly work. 20 years ago I got interested in the broader phenomenon of falsifications, fabrications and forgeries in early Christianity, so much deception going on in early Christianity. One reason I have been in a field of textual criticism, specializing in studying ancient manuscripts, in Greek in order to figure out what the original NT said, given the fact that we don’t have the original, and copies of copies. What you have are copies all different done hundred's of years later. This is what I trained in. But after my PhD, I got interested in the changes: why did scribes change their texts? Sometimes just an accident and sometimes did it on purpose? Why change the text, why make up text, make up stories, invent stories that became legend, and forge things, claiming to be people they weren’t? So for my entire scholarly career worked on falsifications. I am one of few people who is expert in the ancient Greek text. Chapel Hill the only place where a student could study Greek texts. I was it in
North America. Learning and reconstructing -- figuring out why there were changes. I was the only one in a PhD program, except the fundamentalists.

About 5-6 years ago, I decided to make a career change. I wanted to get out of Greek manuscripts and start focusing on falsification to forgery. So I moved into this research on forgery in early Christianity, a big field but not well populated. 27 books have names attached, through the 21st century, scholars sure that only 8 of them are written by the people claiming to have done so. Some falsely attributed, but only 8 that actually go back to the people attributed to them.

After the NT, you get gospels claimed to be written by Phillip, Mary, Peter. You get stuff supposedly written by Isaiah, tons of literature but the striking thing is, not a single scholarly monograph in the English language. There are studies on the relationship of forgery of NT, but broader in the first 4 centuries, not a single book in English. The number in German you can count on one hand, only one with studies, 1971 in Austria, the only thing there. Such an interesting and important field that it is beyond belief there is nothing out there. My idea was to write a scholarly monograph. But several years ago, I threw myself into forgery, and last year had a sabbatical leave and a fellowship, a Humanities Fellowship in the Research Triangle, 35 people given them snf a few requirements -- you have to have lunch for half hour talking to 35 really smart people in all different fields, the other is to do your work day and night. I did nothing but read the sources on forgery for a year. The idea a scholarly monograph, then spin off a trade book for normal human beings vs. monograph for abnormal scholars. I thought I’d do the scholarly then do the trade book. I published with Oxford University Press, but the Harper Collins to do the trade book. They wanted the trade book first, so reluctantly agreed, will come out in March.

Forge: Writing in the name of God: Why the biblical authors are not who we say they are. Not my title, I have no choice in it, they want it to be controversial.


It will deal specifically with the phenomenon of how forgery occurred within the controversies within Christianity. The nutshell of this lecture and the book: Christians had controversies over what to believe, who God is, who Jesus is. People wanted to know what is your authority of saying this or that? The authorities were written texts, in order to promote their views. The ultimate authorities were the Apostles, and written in their names to promote their views. Christians wanted you to think their views were those of the Apostles. I am especially interested in early Christian polemics.
Polemics in early Christianity: controversies, disputes in early Christianity.

There was a lot, and there still is today. Not Christians v. Muslims but fights between fundamentalists and moderates, internal debates.

Our earliest author is Paul. No writings earlier than Paul. So if you want to know what earliest Christianity is look at Paul. He is always in conflict with people. When you read his letters, you hear him arguing, a couple scoundrels out there he is putting in their place, like he is writing what most people think vs. the scoundrels. But they are in fact persuasive to a large portion of people they talk to. He had serious enemies argued vehemently against them because they are in danger precisely of winning the argument.

For example, Galatians was written to try to convince gentiles they don’t have to become Jews to be Christians. His opponents took the other side and they were winning, convincing them they had to eat kosher, get circumcised. And Paul is so incensed, it is the one letter that does not begin with Paul thanking God for the congregation. In chapter 5 he says the people who want you to get circumcised he hoped that when they get circumcised, the knife slips and they get cut off. He is sarcastic and goes after them because they were not just a few people on the margin.

In Corinth some super apostles saying he was foolish, they do miracles to prove it and he is weak. We think he’s super apostle because it made it in. The opponents’ books did not make it in. In Romans, the church in his Rome had the wrong idea of what he stands for, because they heard rumors about what he preaches. He preaches the Jewish Law did not put you in right standing so you don’t have to follow the Law. The opponents say it says don’t murder or commit adultery. That seemed to be a logical conclusion so he had to write to counter this. This should teach us about early Christianity. It was not a single monolith, and there was a wide range of opinion as far back as we have sources.

Ubiquity of Polemics (Galatians, Corinthians, Romans)

The Alternative (Christian!) Perspectives.

They all claimed they were the voice of Jesus. Alternative perspectives, the lesson to be learned is early Christianity was extremely diverse.

Move the clock a hundred years, Paul in the 50’s, now move to 150 CE. Had Christianity become a monolith? No, and the diversity is mind-boggling, advocating wildly different things. Only one God created the world vs those who said one who is true God and
another one. Some said 12 or 36 gods. One said 365 gods, convenient, be god for the
day. Claimed they were Christian and representing the views of Jesus and the NT.
There was no NT, different books floating around with these different points of view.

In 2nd century, Jesus was seen as both human and divine. Others saying if he’s human
he can’t be God. They are different things, he’s obviously a human, and others saying
he’s obviously God and therefore not human. A man, Jesus, and a divine man, Christ,
who came into him at baptism, and then he left Jesus on the cross. ‘My God, why have
you forsaken me?’ Is the world created by a good god or an evil deity? Is the Jewish
scripture part of scripture inspired by a true God or a lower divinity? Which is it? All of
these views by people claiming to be Christian and needing authority. They could not
say it is just what I think.

The Need for Authority: Early on, a very textual religion making it different than
Jewish, the texts became even more authoritative than for Jews, had to be written by
Apostles from the days of Jesus so forged documents started appearing very early. I
want to talk about some forgeries.

Some Early Christian Polemical Forgeries:

Start with Jude, that is traditionally attributed to one of Jesus’ brothers, one is James
who led Jerusalem and one Jude, a letter allegedly written by Jude, written specifically
to oppose unknown opponents. They have infiltrated and are false believers.

A few verses, a servant of JC and a brother of James. I am saying I am brother of JC. I
found it necessary to contend for the faith. Admission has been secretly attained by
those who are to be condemned, ungodly, perverted, deny our master Lord JC,
profligate, sexually immoral. It is hard to believe they snuck in unaware and nobody
was aware. If there is a community, it is hard to believe they are denying JC. But by my
standards but they think they are genuine Christian. In like manner they reject
authority and revile the glorious ones. They behave like animals, blemishes in your love
meal, carousing, carried by wind, twice dead, uprooted, casting up foam of their own
shame. He blasts them without telling you who they are. You can read this entire letter
and not have a clue what they stand for, all you know is they are the enemy, sexually
immoral and opposed to the truth. This is written against a group of unknown
opponents.

The author is writing to a church that knows who he is talking about. Another option he
is not writing to a specific church but writing to oppose people that should be opposed,
you can apply it to anybody you want to. It is so vague in its opposition.
Question is it a forgery? I will contend not written by Jude the brother of JC. A widely held opinion but one reason to think this, the main reason for me is that I do not think the brother of Jesus, Jude, could write. Here’s my reason, in ancient world most people were illiterate. In North America our literacy rate is 99%. You can read the sports page if you choose to. Almost everybody does. In the ancient world, society had no reason to go to expense of educating children to read because it did not give them anything. Only with industrialization did they realize it would help their economy. In ancient agrarian economies, it didn’t occur to them, and very few learned to read. The best of times maybe 10% of the population in Athens in the time of Plato.

Doesn’t that conflict with Christian texts, you had somebody read it to you, it meant being in a group where one can read and the others listened. Most people did not read. In ancient Palestine, the latest estimates, probably 3% of the population could read. They were in the urban area, the upper crust elite, wealthy families who could afford and had reasons to learn to read. Fewer people could write. Reading and writing two different skills. We teach them together but in the ancient world, writing meant copying a page or writing your name. Fewer than 3% could read, and far fewer could compose a sentence. Being able to compose a sentence or a letter, very few people in ancient Palestine could compose a letter.

So where is Jude? From a rural family in a hamlet named Nazareth, probably no possibility of education, father was a carpenter, or Joseph a tekton, which means a manual laborer, a construction worker. Might be working with wood, stone, or metal, could be a blacksmith but we don’t know but a lower class occupation.

Maybe Jesus learned to read, some indications he became expert in ancient tradition but nothing to suggest that JC could write and the odds are really against it. Maybe after JC died they thought I think I need to go back to school, and learned to read. The book is complicated, in high-level Greek. He would have spoken in Aramaic, but would have learned to compose in Greek. It is theoretically possible but no programs in the humanities so it is almost beyond calculation that Jude could have written this letter.

Somebody later who was an educated Christian in Greek so he appeals to the authority of Jude.

**The Letter of James:** We have opposition to other Christians but in this case we might know who the opponents are. James is a 5 chapter letter, written in very good Greek, gives a lot of advice about how to live, but opposes a certain point of view it finds to be wrong about the Christian faith.
What can we say? Its polemic can especially be seen in James 2:14-26: ‘What does it profit if he has faith but not works?’ He is opposing somebody saying faith is what saves you, not works. Faith by itself without works is dead. Someone saying you have faith and I have works, by my works I will show you my faith? You shallow man, faith apart from works is barren. Abraham was justified by works when he offered his son on the altar, faith completed by works, scripture fulfilled because he believed God and it was reckoned as righteousness. Faith apart from works is dead. You can’t be saved by faith, you have to have works too.

Abraham proved this because Genesis 15:6 reckoned to him as righteousness only because he did works.

**Numerous (unparalleled) Parallels to Romans and Galatians:** Paul indicates a person is made right by God, not by works of the law but by having faith, and faith alone puts one in right standing.

**Paul in Galatians:** A person not justified through works of the law, but justified in Christ, but by works no one will be justified. Who is James opposing here? Passages in Paul and James are the only places where you have a discussion of being justified - being made right with God by faith or works using Abraham, quoting Genesis 15:6. I think it is clear. Martin Luther started the Reformation and concluded that James is opposing Paul so he is wrong. Luther, when he translated the Bible, put James in an Appendix.

**My view is James is not exactly opposing Paul:** *What James said about works is not what Paul is talking about.*

**Works of the Law:** This meant people not having to do what Jewish law demands that Jews do, not having to be circumcised, keep kosher, observe Sabbath, that make Jews Jewish -- this is what Paul is talking about.

**James is not talking about works of the law but good deeds.** James says if you have faith you will do good things and if you don’t, you obviously do not have faith. *Both using same words but meaning different things.*

Same is true with ‘faith’: Paul = faith in Christ. James = intellectual assent to a proposition. Because James says I skipped over this -- you believe God is one, well, the demons believe that too and shudder. You believe only one God, they are still in trouble. They intellectually assent to one God but an intellectual assent but if there’s no life that shows it, then you do not have faith – James.
James uses the language of Paul but argues something that Paul is not talking about. Paul says you don’t have to be a Jew, and James says if you have true faith, your life will show it. They don’t really disagree. James using Genesis 15:6 and why? Paul taught faith but later followers of Paul claimed if faith saved you, faith that matters, not works, what counts is what you believe not what you do, his later followers.

James is attacking that later form of Pauline thought. What is very interesting is that understanding that matters what you believe in what you do.

Ephesians 2:1-10: A letter attributed to Paul: You are saved by grace, not by good works, which don’t matter for salvation. It seems to be the version that James is opposing, a later form of Pauline writings which Paul did not write.

Counter-forgeries: James is a forgery countering a view found in another forgery. I don’t think Paul wrote Ephesians. James is responding to the forgery, but he is a forgery.

I think James was not written by brother of JC because he couldn’t write either. He was an Aramaic speaking peasant from Galilee.

Debates over the Status of the Flesh:

Terms of the Debate: Christians in early Christianity thought our flesh does not matter, flesh will disappear and we will live eternally as spiritual beings. God did not create the world, we will escape.

Others said God made it, so our flesh matters, it will be redeemed; we will live eternally in the flesh. It came down to who created this world, is the creator good or rotten? We might have different opinions but in the early church this was the debate. Forgeries were written to say flesh did not matter. They thought God was not the true God and JC not a flesh and blood human.

Forgeries Against the Flesh: The Coptic Apocalypse of Peter: He was a spirit entrapped in a body who escaped his body, you will escape trappings of physical being. You will not be in your body forever. Stuck with this thing forever? No, will live a spiritual existence like JC did. One of the questions if he did not have a body, how did he get crucified, bleed and die?

There were explanations. Coptic Apocalypse of Peter was discovered in Egypt in 1945. In this account Peter talking in first person, talking to JC on a mount overlooking the crucifixion, looking down at the crucifixion, sees JC being arrested and crucified. What
am I seeing? He is nailed, then he sees another figure above laughing at what is happening? Peter says I don’t understand. JC replies the one being nailed is the external shell, the one above is the living JC, the reason he is laughing is they think they are hurting him but cannot harm the real JC but only his shell.

Disturbing about the laughing but several of these kinds of gospels that JC is laughing, he has fooled them. It is trying to say his real being was not tied to his flesh, just a temporary dwelling place so he can deliver his message. Your body might suffer and die but eternal life is outside the body. This is 2nd century, so Peter had been dead for a 100 years.

**Other Christians Say Flesh Does Matter:** 3 Corinthians (already seen): born of Mary, you will be raised in the flesh it is all about flesh, written in the name of Paul.

**The Greek Apocalypse of Peter:** Discovered in 1880’s, written in Greek, not a vision of crucifixion but a guided tour of heaven and hell by JC in the realms of flesh and the damned, eternal bliss in their bodies they could recognize vs. the damned having eternal torment, in very graphic terms. Very lurid set of descriptions how the damned are being punished and it is all physical. For this author, flesh really matters, God created you as fleshly being, the God who created you is a good God and you better be on his side.

**One side won and the other lost:**

Diversity was everywhere, for and against arguments about everything. Controversies down through the centuries. Didn’t end with Council of Nicea.

Everybody needed authority for their points of view. Apostles were dead, so you could quote or invent their writings.

**Reason why you don’t read that story of the woman taken in adultery as he could write, or authorities added later?** Whether or not he could write, there is the story of the women taken in adultery and him writing in the sand. This was not part of the early text. I am reminded of a story JC talking to a crowd and writing in the sand.

Evidence for whether he could read, based on this story:

**Whether JC could read or write:** What evidence for this? Bible passages that complicate he is said to write when woman brought in adultery and he writes in the sand. Setting a trap, stone her vs. no, forgive her, he’s in trouble either way. He stoops down and writes on the ground. *The Greek verb is not doodling or drawing but*
Over the years, scholars have come up with hypotheses. He looks up and says let the one without sin cast the first stone, then goes back to writing. One theory is he is writing out their sins. Joshua cheated on income tax ‘Aggh, he knows!’ Why is this not evidence he could write? It was not in the original gospel of John, but was written much later.

I edited a book, devoted to this passage, which argues the reason that scribes put it in was to show that he could write -- the entire purpose -- but I think is a stretch.

In Luke 2, does not say he was reading but arguing about interpretation of Law could have gotten by hearing. Only explicitly is Luke 4: goes into the synagogue and he rolls out Isaiah and reads ‘The spirit of the Lord is upon me,’ and everybody gets ticked off because he says it is being fulfilled. Not found in any other gospels. I think majority scholars say he could probably read but not write.

One reason Jude had trouble getting into the NT canon was mention of 1st Enoch which did not make it in, but Jude quotes it as scripture. A Non-canonical source so therefore he can’t be an Apostle or he would know better. Enoch, the figure who is a descendant of Adam but who never died, God took him, he walked with God then taken up to heaven without dying. A lot of later Jews wrote as Enoch. He was so righteous that he did not die. A forgery talking about a forgery.

How widely is it accepted JC had brothers? When I taught at Rutgers, ¾ were RCC. I assume you are RCC? No, I am Lutheran.

Here’s the deal - at Rutgers no matter what I said, the most wild things I said they did not get upset because they don’t read the Bible. But if I made comment about JC having brothers, in my teaching evaluations I got angry comments about JC having brothers. Here in the south, it is not an issue! They get upset about other things here!

Here’s the deal - Mark 4, John 7 says JC had brothers. In Mark, brothers and sisters with his mother. The problem id in RCC circles they developed the idea that not only JC was miraculously born -- she was not born of a virgin but God prepared Mary in a special way, Mary born without a sin nature, because if she had nature of sin, then JC would have inherited it, so Mary also never sinned. That meant she never had sex, because sex was thought of as a sin even if you were married, the perpetual virginity of Mary. So she was not only a virgin when she gave birth to JC and she never had sex with Joseph after, so at end of her life she didn’t have to die so she was assumed into heaven. That is RCC doctrine, the NT says he had brothers so how do you deal with it? Two common RCC solutions: Brothers were said to be cousins or generic relatives. The
problem with that: the word used for brothers means brother. Another word for cousins, and they use the word for brother.

The more common solution is brothers of JC are half brothers because sons of Joseph from a previous marriage. Joseph married had children then his wife died, as a widower married Mary he was an old man who didn’t wanna have sex anyway. These brothers, so James is a half brother, the common view they developed. When you see medieval art about Joseph and Mary going to Bethlehem, he is depicted as an old man.

**Some Christians seem schizophrenic - after life, a physical resurrection and others do not, sort of ties back to Judaism with physical resurrection. Does it tie into the forgeries?**

I can try, the situation is Christianity OK, goes back to JC, and JC himself teaching within an inherited Jewish world, a common point of view was in Palestine apocalypticism. A view that even though the world an awful place, God created it and will redeem it, powers got loose and demons floating around. Why there is so much misery, forces unleashed, but God will destroy the evil and bring in the good team, everything destroyed or saved including humans. Those who are alive siding with God get eternal reward and also applies to those who are dead, they will face judgment if they were evil: you didn’t get away with it, he will raise you from the dead and you face judgment. Your death not in vain if you were believer, at the end of this age, taught by Jewish apocalypses and this is what JC taught also. It will happen within this generation.

Christians picked up on this view, that the end will come right away, they thought JC coming right back, then a resurrection of the dead, those who sided with JC an eternal kingdom on earth. Paul thought it would come in his lifetime but it didn’t. So how do we explain this?

First set, if you die, there were different explanations, you went into the ground until next Thursday until the resurrection and you come back to life. Then they felt an interim where you go to heaven in a temporary body, but then the resurrection you come back in your own body. Most people gave that up, eternal life happens apart from the body, your soul goes one place or the other but a later development.

I can’t resist telling a story. What is it like to be on the Daily Show with John Stewart? We don’t have the original NT so published the book, doing some interviews here and there. My publicist got a spot on the Daily Show. You don’t sell books by advertising, you sell in media. He called me up, and they thought I needed media training. Why? I give interviews every week. They flew me to DC with this fellow who trains politicians to
go on TV. He was George Stephanopoulos’ media person. I learned a lot. He said politicians will spend an hour prep time for every minute of interview. For 4 minutes, you do 4 hours preparation. I spent 5 hours and learned a ton. A physical set up where you walk in, how you walk in, how you sit. JS will be here, the whole deal. The main thing is to figure out the interview itself. He trained politician so his view was don’t answer the question!

Whatever they ask you wanna get your message out. I thought, ‘No, I am not a politician so I will answer the question.’ Then you have to figure out how to get your message within the question, 25 ways JS might begin questioning, if he begins here, you go here. Start here - go there. All these ways to get to my message. A 30-40” message, explaining the message. A graphic example – I was gonna end with woman taken in adultery not in the original text -- everybody knows the story and rightly a good story. So that was my final bid, and all these ways to get there, no matter how JS asks: He made fun of my title, Misquoting Jesus, or if he starts off with the self-deprecating Jew joke, go here. The one thing the media guy had not planned that JS would read the book!

He says, ‘I can’t believe that story was not in the Bible,’ so he stole my line, so now what am I gonna talk about? I was not prepared for that.

Our final time together. I am hoping this will be a little shorter, I took out the most boring parts.

**Forgeries to Defend Christianity**

**Pagan Assaul ts on Christianity?** They were not only fighting among themselves but fighting with pagans, which is not a derogatory term but someone who follows polytheistic gods. Everyone was pagan - 93% of the Roman Empire. Everyone believed in many gods, except the Jews who comprised only 7%. No sense you had to worship one or the other, if you worshipped a new one, just add that one to the list. The idea of only one god was non-sense, like having only one friend. Lots of people out there. You have a mighty God that made the state great, Jupiter, Juno, gods of war and love, god as a city or town, god of the home, god to take care of every function in life, in rives, meadows, god of the threshold, of the bedroom, taking care of health, rain, anything you can’t take care of.

There was no sense that you had to worship one God and only one, everyone expected to worship the god of the state, which made it great, so of course you’re glad this is a great place, the economy is good, peace and prosperity. Not to worship the god of the state is to say something about the state, this was how it was until Christianity came
along. Jews worshipped only one god but not seen to be a problem. Many pagans thought they were weird, they had these customs, not eating pork, shellfish, not working one day a week? This was lazy! Jews were distinctive but not a bother. Ancient world revered antiquity, if something new it is suspect, if old it is venerable and Jews had an old religion way before Homer and Plato, a very old set of traditions. They are not causing a problem so they worship their own God. Jews cooperated with authority.

Social threat of Christianity: Christians came along and then believers were a problem.

Insisted on only one God and you have to worship only this one or you will roast in hell. Completely foreign as to how pagans thought. Christians said these other gods are demons, they vilified the gods you worshiped, completely exclusivistic. So Christians did not worship these others and other people thought they made life livable – we wouldn’t survive. Beyond that, gods were good, you get to eat good food, drink good wine, this is good so to call them demons, this is offensive. And the gods will get angry if you don’t worship them. The pagan gods didn’t have ethical demands, didn’t care if you slept with your neighbor’s wife, they just wanted to be worshiped.

Ethics was not a part of worship in the ancient world. You could be ethical for philosophical reasons but it was not part of the religion. If you don’t worship them, they only ask you to go to a temple and offer a sacrifice, then the gods get angry. Trust me, you don’t want them to get angry. There might be a war, a drought, famine. Christians come along and refuse to worship, so when there is a disaster, guess who got blamed for it? The Christians: So if you were in the city, say a thousand people maybe twelve-fifteen Christians in the town, if a drought you go after them. So persecution because a social threat. Not because anybody thought they would take over the Empire. Like saying that the Branch Davidians would become the dominant religion – it ain’t gonna happen.

Pagan Reactions: Negative to Christians because this was exclusivistic in its claim, sometimes persecutions, sometimes intellectuals attacked by making fun of Christianity for worshiping a crucified man? He is a criminal! That is who you worship? So weird, he is the Lord of the universe? Seemed like nonsense to the pagans.

Christians had to respond and over time grew, became more of a threat, eventually some intellectuals converted.

Christian Apologetics: Why did Christianity Succeed? I wanna work on that after awhile. One thing that has been done is calculation of rate of growth of early Christianity. Maybe 20 people in Jerusalem, by time Constantine converts in 312,
probably some think 5% of Roman Empire, 3 million people. How did you get there in 300 years? People thought you needed Billy Graham rallies and thousands of people coming, but sociologists came along and crunched the numbers.

Rodney Star, *Rise of Christianity*: showed starting off with small group, get to 3 million by a 40% increase every decade. It gets bigger and bigger will take you to 3 million. One reason that 40% is interesting is because it is also the rate of growth of Mormon Church since it was founded, so in 200 years we’ll all be Mormon!

Eventually intellectuals known as apologists, which is not saying I’m sorry. It means a defense. An intellectual defense of something, they gave one for Christianity. A reasoned defense of the faith in face of opposition. The opposition was at all levels, local, sometimes at an official level with pagan governors, at scholarly level so they responded to various contexts.

**Forgeries Attacking Jews:** serving an apologetic function: They opposed Jews, and were forgeries. Why would this be an apologetic movement?

**The Apologetic Logic of Anti-Judasim:** Pagans were charging Christians with worshipping an enemy of the state, JC was crucified by Rome, after he was declared an enemy of the state.

Christians did not adhere to an ancient religion like the Jews so they were different from pagans without having any antiquity to their religion, worshipping a guy killed 100 years ago. Not Jews, have a new religion and the reason to oppose Jews, you are worshipping someone declared against the state, apologetic response: he killed JC because the Jews made him. The Roman governor said JC was who he said he was, it was these damned Jews, you take the blame off Rome and JC declared innocent and therefore we are innocent. Save your own skin you oppose the Jews.

Another reason was that Christians could not say they were ancient so they co-opted Judaism. JC was rejected, since Jews rejected the Messiah, therefore God rejected them and now we are in their place. Christians, the true Jews. Moses hundreds of years before Homer is a pre-Christian Christian and predicting Christianity. Our religion is older and the only way to get there is to reject the Jews. We got Jews in synagogue, but who are you? We are true Jews, they have been rejected by God.

So you have apologists arguing these things and some people writing forgeries for an apologetic point of view. So look at anti-Jewish forgeries:
The Gospel of Peter: discovered in 1886 in a cemetery in Egypt; some French archeologists uncovered a tomb; they thought of a monk because buried with a book, tomb seems 8th century what person would have been buried so they thought a monk. It was 66 pages long, 4 texts in it: Including Apocolypse of Peter in Greek, the tour of heaven and hell. Another thing, the Gospel claimed to be written by Peter. The 4G were anonymous this one claims Peter, but written 60 years after he was dead. He is writing a forgery.

Unfortunately this GP is not preserved intact, only a fragment, the person who copied only copied a fragment, begins in middle of a sentence ‘but of the Jews, none washed their hands neither Herod nor any of …’ And right before this Pilate washed his hands declared himself innocent of his blood only in Matthew. GM does not say anything, here none of the Jews washed their hands. Pilate declares himself innocent but Jews refused to declare themselves innocent. Herod sends him off for crucifixion the Jewish King, not Pilate. So they crucify JC, hangs on the cross, darkness over the land, verse 17, thus they fulfilled all things and accumulated their sins on their head.

V. 21 then the Jews threw the spikes out, the earth shook, Jews rejoiced, gave his body to Joseph.

V 25 perceiving what evil they had done began to lament, woah, end of Jerusalem. Early Christian apologists wanted to argue God had rejected Jews, their evidence Jerusalem destroyed by the Romans. 40 years after JC, Jewish uprising against Rome, a 3 1/3 year war they destroyed Jerusalem. Slaughtered the opposition and the temple never was rebuilt an enormous disaster.

Christians used that to say God judged the Jews, destroyed the temple and their sacred city. This book after destruction of Jerusalem, they killed JC -- woe to us, they are confessing Jerusalem will be destroyed because they killed the Messiah. Not destroyed because of political uprising but because Jews killed Jesus. A later form which most scholars date about 120 which is 30 years after 4G’, passages say I, Peter.’ Luckily, it ends, gets raised from the dead, v 60, ‘I, Simon Peter, Andrew…Levi and the Lord…’ and it stops. This is the verse he says ‘I, Simon Peter, the first disciple.’ So an anti-Jewish sentiment, but also other things going on. It attacked Jews in order to declare Romans are innocent.

A Whole Set of Writings Associated with Pontius Pilate: One of them allegedly written from Pilate to Claudius. When Pilate, Governor of Judea, the emperor was not Claudius, it was written 200+ years later by someone who named the wrong emperor. Pilate is writing why he killed JC. ‘You killed the Son of God here,’ Pilate writes to explain. Not really Pilate somebody claiming to be Pilate. To Claudius, the Jews through
envy have punished themselves. Their fathers had a promise...he talks about the Virgin birth. He came to Judea and they saw him cleanse lepers, expel evil spirits, walked on the sea, raised the dead, nonetheless they crucified him. All these miracles in fulfilling God’s promise so hard hearted they crucified him, not me.

This is the kind of early Anti-Jewishness and it heightens -- gets worse over time, especially bad when Christians attained power. When these things were written, they were a mosquito but they became a tiger. The Emperor was converted and bought into this, then all sorts of Anti-Jewish leading down to modern Anti-Semitism. Defending self by attacking Jews, before they had any power, and only after they got power thinking God really did reject them so we better do so also.

**Forgeries defending the faith:**

**The Acts of Pilate:** an account of JC ‘s trial, death, resurrection from perspective of Pontius Pilate about whom we know little. In 26-36 CE, he was governor, responsible for ordering JC’s death, like the other 2 killed at same time, probably part of his daily routine. He was kind of ruthless, Romans took him out in 36 CE, we don’t know what happened.

Acts of Pilate was not written by him, but we have some reason to think we know why it was written and when it was written. Another version appeared earlier.

Eusebius in the early 4th century Maximus the Emperor, a pagan wrote a book saying JC fully deserved what he got, a pagan account that he deserved being crucified. Maximus liked this book so much made it required reading for school boys throughout the empire, it was required reading. It doesn’t exist now, unfortunately when Christians took over they were destroyed. When Constantine appeared, another appeared -- the Christian version -- a response to the pagan version, trying to set the record straight a forgery countering the views of the forgery. Declared JC innocent, more than human, and in fact son of god and Pilate recognizes it.

Pilate ,in his courtroom, ready to judge JC, these roman solders standing holding the standard with an image on top. JC brought in, they bow down and worship him and Pilate I what is that? They bowed down by self, Jewish leaders upset, Pilate sias Jewish leaders get your own peson to hold the standard, they put 6 guys on each standard, JC comes back in he bows down therefore recognizes JC.
The Bowing Standards ???

The Proto- Gospel of James: called Proto-Gospel, including events before the Gospels of the JC life and birth. What I was referring before about the miraculous birth of Mary, one thing driving this account why she was chosen to bear JC. Why was she so special, it tries to answer that question precisely because pagan opponents claiming JC was nobody special, parents not special, lower class peasant not the son of God. Written to explain Mary and Joseph’s background to show he did come from special family. I should tell you, in the middle ages it was very popular, more widely read and believed in Christianity where a lot of legends and art come from inspired from his birth, ultimately it is the book that started off Mary as a virgin not just when conceiving JC but after his birth this is a miracle.

Wealthy Jewish Aristocrats, Joachim and Anna: the wealthiest in Israel but she is barren cannot bear a child. God gives her a child, she agrees he will be brought up in Jewish temple, turns out to be a girl, named her Mary, a special being from time of birth, mother build a sanctuary, at 3 goes to temple and an angel comes and feeds her every day

Miraculous Conception and Holy Upbringing:

When Mary turns 14, the priests decide she can’t stay in the temple, gonna start having her periods and she is ceremonially unclean, not sinful but can’t be in the temple, so need to relocate her, so find a husband for her, a call to single men.

Engagement to Joseph: everyone brings a branch of wood, God will do a sign which is the favored to be Mary’s husband. Left overnight, given back to them, until Joseph an elderly man gets a branch a dove comes out, so he is selected.¹ He does not want to marry her, she is 14, he has sons older than her everyone will make him a laughing stock, remember what happens if you disobey God so Joseph is coerced to take her. He leaves her home to go off and supervise a building project. Not working as carpenter but major construction guy. While he is gone, she is commissioned to weave a curtain to separate holy of holies a special honor, she spends time weaving the curtain. Joseph comes back, things have happened, given annunciation by Gabriel.

He comes back she is obviously pregnant, he is quite upset somebody else got her pregnant and wants to divorce her but the Holy Spirit... they have to register for Census

¹ Martha’s note: If you look at icons of Joseph, often he is seen holding a lilly in his hand, which according to legend, grew from the wood branch, showing that he was designated by God to be the favored one to be Mary’s husband. And he is not necessarily depicted as an old man.
and before they get into Bethlehem, starts having labor, left in the cave with older son to find a midwife, brings her back but when they come back child is already born. Baby takes his mother’s breast, midwife and Joseph goes off declaring a miracle has happened Midwife Salome, a virgin has given birth, I won’t believe it unless I give her inspection to see if hymen still intact. Goes to the cave, raise yourself, gives her internal inspection, she is intact, still a virgin because she doubted god her hand starts burning off, God tells her an angel pick up the child her hand is healed, so a happy ending. Mary virgin birth not just conceive but the birth she is virginal.

**One of the functions is apologetics answering objections against a belief**

**Pagan attacks on Mary and Jesus:** Pagan critic Celsus, about 175 CE. A pagan intellectual attacking Christianity for all sorts of things such as for worship of JC who was understood to be a low class peasant. JC came from lower class, surely he will be born a king or somebody important! His parents were poor, not of royal blood, father a common laborer (carpenter), mother had to spin for a living, seduced by a Roman soldier and given birth out of wedlock, made it into the Talmud.

She was seduced by a soldier and later Christians made up the Holy spirit got pregnant made up to cover up what happened.

**Response:** It gives a response. Mother Mary from upper class, Jsephe wealthy business man, and in fact royal blood, traced line to David, father not a common laborer, she did not have to spin, she made temple curtains an honor. She was made pregnant by Holy spirit answering the charge against Christians.

**Conclusions:**

The early Christians’ need for authority in early Christianity: whether fighting among selves, or defending against pagans or Jews,

Religion made truth claims for itself, claiming exclusive, they were true their views true and everybody else was false. The context when it spread, we are right and you are wrong, didn’t otherwise happen in other religions. You could all be right except for Christians.

**Problems with diversity:** Different groups claimed different truths, did not agree concerning the truth, created a problem

**Christian Passion for Truth:** reason for NT truth a very important issue. They thought truth necessary for salvation a matter of eternal destiny, it is all-important.
How promote? Lies that promote truth. What if you don’t have authority? Christians need apostolic truth to back up your point of view, we don’t have it. So invent it, write a forgery claim to be Paul, James, promote truth by telling a lie. It was widely seen as lying and deception, but some Christians thought worth it to achieve a greater good, then OK to lie to tell it. Some were a noble cause.

**Have you ever received a death threat?** Two weeks ago in Gainsville FL, I was speaking at a liberal Episcopal Church which did hire security for me, and the time before a body guard, dunno what it is about FL. Have I ever been on 700 Club? No. One thing I do often have a public debate with evangelical or fundamentalist, usually in front of evangelicals and sometimes large audience 500-1000 people debating an evangelical. I might have 3 friends there. Everybody is completely gracious and kind -- no hecklers, people are respectful, they applaud.

**Gospel of Thomas** a collection 114 sayings allegedly written by Didymus Judas Thomas. It was discovered in 1945, has no account of death and resurrection. Scholars debate when it was written a vocal minority before MMLJ, you hear it but a minority which is vocal. One reason for thinking it is that early, it is like the Q source gave GM and GMk and Q does not have death and resurrection narrative.

In 19th century German and English scholars debated whether there was a Q, because it was unimaginable that in early church they would use it without death and resurrection until they discovered Thomas, because it also has no death and resurrection but a complete Gospel. So maybe before the time of Q, maybe 50 or 60. That is possible.

Half the sayings in it are found in some form in the NT but others are strange, and sound more like things in Gnostic gospels which is mid 2nd century. The more strange saying sound like 2nd century, so most think it is probably early 2nd century majority of opinion about 120 CE, some of the sayings are earlier but the collection put together around 120 CE.

**Is it appropriate to call it ‘Gnostic’?** Too much to go in here.

**How would you describe the NT and the OT.** On the NT, what are they? NT contains 27 books representing earliest writings of JC followers, account of his life and the Gospels and the spread of Christianity in Acts, and doctrines in the Epistles and how the world will come to a crashing end in book of Revelation.

OT contains 39 books in English translation scriptures of the Jews, they contain books that describe history of ancient Israel, starting with Adam and Eve to the Father of
Abraham, Moses up to conquest of King of Israel, prophetic books, written by prophets declaring God in their day and books of poetry and wisdom by the sages of Israel.

**Why were Jews so resistant to accepting Christianity?** A lot of students ask, they just don’t get it. You have all these prophecies he fulfilled them so obviously they should accept it, can’t they read? Are they stupid? It is right there! The deal is this: there were Jews in time of JC and before expecting some kind of Messiah, different expectations for what it would be, some thought a future king of Israel a great warrior overthrow enemies establish sovereign state. What Messiah is, this anticipation can be found in Hebrew bible. Others at time of JC the Savior of Jews would be a divine heavenly figure set up God’s Kingdom on earth. Others thought he’d be a powerful priest gave law of God interpretation. All were somebody powerful and grandeur and might with a rod of iron and overthrow the enemy. No Jews who thought somebody gonna be killed and raised from the dead, none of them talk about a Messiah like that and neither does the OT. **Isaiah 53?** Wounded for our transgressions, by his wounds we were healed? Isn’t that predicting or **Psalm 42** why have you forsaken me, so there are predictions.

Wrong, read those passages not talking about the messiah, the word is not there. Psalm 22, Psalm 69, term messiah never occurs, JC was a crucified criminal. I am not saying if he is Messiah or not, but why didn’t they accept him -- because he was nothing like they thought a Messiah would be. When Christians tried to convince Jews, they thought it was ridiculous. I get in trouble every year with my students, it would be like me convincing you David Koresh the Dranch Davidian is king of the universe? Are you crazy? My student evaluations (I can’t believe he thinks David Koresh the Lord of the universe!)

---

2 **Martha’s Note:** The *Tanakh* (Jewish Study Bible) offers a different take. They note that the meaning is vigorously debated but they argue that the suffering servant symbolizes the entire Jewish people. “The passage, then, describes the nation’s unjust tribulations at the hands of the Babylonians (and later oppressors) as well as the nation’s salvific role for the world at large. Others maintain that the passage describes a pious minority within the Jewish people; this minority suffers as a result of the sins committed by the nation at large.” (Page 891). The term, ‘servant’ in Deutero-Isaiah “generally refers to the nation as a whole or an idealized representation of the nation.” Other scholars argue that the servant is a specific individual. Targum and various midrashim identify the servant as the Messiah, “but this suggestion is unlikely; since nowhere else does Deutero-Isaiah refer to the Messiah, and the absence of a belief in an individual Messiah is one of the hallmarks of Deutero-Isaiah’s outlook (in contrast to that of First Isaiah.” Its language is similar to Jeremiah’s description of himself (Jer 10:18-24; 11:19). It has been argued also that it could represent Moses. The prophet Jeremiah is a model for the nation as a whole, without equating the nation and that prophet. Medieval rabbinic commentators devoted considerable attention to refuting the Christian interpretation. It is worth your while to study Jewish sources. [*The Jewish Study Bible*]. Adele Berlin and Marc Svi Brettler (Editors). Oxford U. Press, 1999).
Christians believed he was Messiah because they think he got raised from the dead. Before he died, they thought he would be Messiah but it was disconfirmed when he got killed, then they believe he got raised from dead, so therefore he is under God’s special favor, had to rethink what it meant, suffered and died concluded Messiah must suffer and die. Then they reread the scripture and it talks about suffering and dying. No it is not about the Messiah, most didn’t accept and still don’t.

You said yesterday the canon was set in 370, was that then the basis for the liturgy Catholic Church until the reformation? You mention up to middle ages some of these other books were prevalently used or believed within middle ages. My question is first within that Christian community, Catholics, the Vulgate set as canon, + these other books?

2nd part of my question is in KJV who decided what would be included or not?

True that throughout middle ages catholics had as canon, the Latin Vulgate, originated with St. Jerome in 5th century. That didn’t stop other books from being heavily influential. A lot of groups over last few years, acquired their knowledge of Mary Magdalene and JC from Da Vinci Code. They read it more often than the bible, so Proto-gospel of James was read more often than the Bible but theologians might use it and read it in popular society but not official. KJV, no one decided what was included right for that time frame. A council decided, Council of Trent in the 16th century a RCC Council included the Apocrypha to oppose Reformation against Luther who said they should not be in, so KJV was a Church of England, a new translation. There were earlier ones in English. Tyndale translation widely accepted OT 39 books, and those were the ones. In the Reformation they were dead set against Jewish Apocrypha, so just the 66 in recognized canon.
Other Available Seminar Notes Compiled by Martha

If this set of notes has been helpful to you, I have attended several of Bart’s previous seminars, as well as others in religious/philosophical topics in Chapel Hill, and my notes are freely available to anyone who wants them. Please note that none of the presenters has reviewed/approved my notes. I try to be careful and indicate where I did not understand what was said, but if you find any errors, please notify me!

Here is a list of what is available:

Ehrman (2008) – God’s Problem (the problem of evil in the world).


Professor Nord’s UNC seminar (2008) on the New Atheists and the Question of God’s Existence. Professor Nord used extensive readings which were integrated and discussed across the seminar. I went back and inserted the relevant passages from all these sources so that this document will make complete sense to follow his logical development. As a result, this pdf file runs 200 pages.

Wisdom Seminar UNC (2008). This seminar involved several professors from UNC as well as Jewish scholars from Duke Divinity School and was well done. You might also like the notes from noted Hebrew scholar, Robert Alter (2009) who presented a seminar here in California on Job and Ecclesiastes.

To access any of these, go to my website, www.Stjuniahouse.com and on the first page on the lower left side, you will see a list of links to other pages. Click on the one that says Books, Seminars, Articles and it will take you to the pdf files of the above seminars.

We’d love it if you’d leave comments on our blog, Meanderings, which can be accessed from the webpage. We’d love some good controversy! Come on, give us a workout! (Just so you know, we are not into proselytizing.)

Martha’s Recommended Reading

There is research to suggest that Jesus becoming regarded as God was an earlier development than suggested by Pauline sources or based on some theologians who think it was a later evolution. Some of these sources suggest that this was not a later
“high Christological theology” that developed later, as has often been assumed, but that it was in fact kind of a “mutation” among Jewish adherents and was a rather quick development, possibly within the first 10-20 years after the Crucifixion. This, if true, would be beliefs that Paul inherited, not that he originated. Hurtado’s books reflect very important research in this regard.


They argue that there are actually “Three Pauls” in the NT. The Radical Paul of the seven genuine letters, the Conservative Paul of the three disputed epistles, and the Reactionary Paul of the 3 inauthentic letters.


Based on the Romans 16:7 passage, Romans being one of the seven books considered authentically Paul, Epp demonstrates how this passage which has been distorted and perverted by those who felt that Junia couldn’t possible be a woman if she were an Apostle, and could not be an Apostle if she were a woman. This was an example of mistranslation, beginning from Luther. Hence, Borg’s hypothesis of the Radical Paul holds up here. Where Paul seems to contradict himself about women’s place, as seen in I Corinthians 14:34-35, most scholars believe it was a later insertion into his original letter.


I include this book here not because of the arguments about divinity but because it documents the inclusion of ancient hymns and liturgy that were likely passed down orally and clearly were inserted in Paul’s writings, originating from an earlier timeframe,
which again suggests that the development of “high Christology” was not a slow evolution, but occurred very early.


Ed Wilshire used the *TLG*, a computerized data base of all known ancient Greek documents, to prove that the interpretation of this passage has been based on mistranslation if you look at how the key word, *authentein*, was translated between 200 BCE to 200 CD. Ed had to retire from Biola University, an evangelical school, before he dared to publish his book.