

I

PRESENT POSITION AND PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN PAULINE RESEARCH

Introduction

THE apostle Paul is a truly great figure. His greatness is shown in the very fact that he has found no congenial interpreter and probably never will. From Marcion to Karl Barth, from Augustine to Luther, Schweitzer or Bultmann, he has ever been misunderstood or partially understood, one aspect of his work being thrown into relief while others have been misunderstood and neglected. But if Paul offers so many possibilities of misunderstanding, is so capable of varied interpretations and modes of approach, the suspicion of ambiguity and confusion at once arises. This suspicion is not without foundation. For Paul, who sprang from the heart of Pharisaic Judaism and became the pioneer in propagating the Christian gospel among the heathen, had a self-contradictory nature, and by his background and course of mental and spiritual development was a product of diverse cultural *milieux*. Thrown by the pressures of his fate into a many-sided situation in life, in many respects aggressive, in others the victim of aggression, he finally became the first and the greatest Christian theologian. But his theology was that of a completely unique situation which will never recur. Compelled to be a theologian only by the exigencies of this historical situation, he has fallen into the hands of the professional theologians of all times, who have thought to see and honour in him their ancestor and colleague. Nevertheless, the missionary apostle of Jesus Christ was no professor of theology—neither systematic nor exegetical—and there awaited him in the eventide of his life the very suitable and distinguished fate of martyrdom, just as the modern professor is rewarded with the distinction of the title “emeritus”.

The generic difference between the existence of an apostle of Jesus Christ and that of a university professor has been acutely realized by

the public consciousness since the time of Søren Kierkegaard's "insights" and implicitly delimits the scope of a professor's systems of thought. Within such limits, however, it is entirely his duty to make statements as to how Paul and his teaching may be most suitably understood. For not only the specialist exegete but every attentive reader of the Bible is constantly being provoked by the personality of Paul and the theology of his letters, and will always face them with a mind full of questionings. In the last hundred years erudite criticism and research into the origins of Christianity has contributed greatly to the task of enabling us to see Paul in truer perspective than was possible to earlier times. For, with a view to recognizing the "true shape of things", it has set out to reconstruct the historical situation of primitive Christianity, which is at least as multi-coloured, complex, self-contradictory, and confusing as is the political, cultural, and intellectual situation of our own times. Learned research is able to determine, and sees its appointed task in determining with approximate correctness, the position of the apostle Paul within the currents of cultural development characteristic of his age, within those situations of struggle into which he was cast by fate, in sketching an historically accurate picture of his doctrines and religious convictions, even though it has ever to bear in mind the dictum of Franz Overbeck: ¹ "Nowadays no one has understood Paul if he still thinks he can agree with him. The opponents of this assertion involuntarily confirm it by the way in which they distort his words in order to wrest from them a satisfactory meaning."

Since Ferdinand Christian Baur's book on Paul (1866), which is still worth reading and which founded the "positive" criticism of the Tübingen school, a Hellenistic, a Judaic-Hellenistic, and a Rabbinical method of interpretation have appeared in turn. In consequence Paul has been understood and described as a chiliast, a mystic, a gnostic, an adept of the mystery religions, a Hellenist, and a Rabbi, and in the light of the numerous combinations which these make possible. Many of the differences between the critics, who have struggled fiercely with each other, have, however, been apparent differences only, since these conflicts have often arisen from the varying use of significant terms (Hellenism, gnosis, mysticism, eschatology, and so on). Much harm has been done in particular by unjust comparisons, by the fact that where genealogy failed or was difficult to establish, critics have shown a mania for collecting analogies, from which nothing can seriously be demonstrated. If, on the other hand,

¹ *Christentum und Kultur*, Basel, 1919, 54.

we take the point of view of life-history, and hence look to the apostle's background and course of life, then the three principal methods of approach just indicated are seen to have their inner justification because they refer to the main intellectual forces in the climate of his age, and come into question as possible sources or influential factors. Hence, with a view to elucidating the series of historical problems which beset this attempt to interpret the great apostle on the basis of the history of religion and civilization, let us sketch the bases and the main motives of the various ramifications of research, although for this purpose Albert Schweitzer's *Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung*, Tübingen, 1911 (E.T. *Paul and His Interpreters*) has not been referenced nor—what would be very desirable—continued,¹ neither do we at this stage propose to enter into the discussion of detailed problems and the controversies of investigators.

I. THE HELLENISTIC APPROACH TO THE INTERPRETATION OF PAUL

(a) *Being in the mystery religions*

The Hellenistic approach to the interpretation of Paul is a product of the so-called "History of Religion" school (Usener, Dieterich, Anrich, Bousset, Cumont, Reitzenstein, etc.) which could appeal to the fact that Paul, apart from the few years of his stay in Jerusalem, lived constantly in a purely heathen environment and must have been accessible to its influences. In particular, Richard Reitzenstein² wished to show systematically that in the work of Paul we are confronted by a consistent amalgamation of pagan Hellenistic mystery conceptions with a Judaic stock of ideas. It was suggested that with him the faith of the Hellenistic mystery religions was interwoven with the prophetic faith of ancient Israel to form quite a new product. Reitzenstein rightly saw the non-Jewish character of many a Pauline antithesis, such as *πνεῦμα—ψυχή*, *πνεῦμα—σάρξ*, *ἔργα—πίστις* etc., which, on the other hand, we do find in the sphere of gnosticism. He went on to point out further that Paul "imitates the technical use of the term *γνώσις*, which is characteristic of Hellenism" (43) and accordingly he wished to "place him in this line of development, not as the first, but as the greatest of the gnostics" (56).

¹ A summary is given in ch. 2 of his later work: *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus*, Tübingen, 1930, E.T. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. (Cited as Schweitzer: *Mystik*.)

² *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, Leipzig, 1927; for Hellenistic elements in the cultural development of the apostle, cf. S. M. Gilmour, "Paul and the Primitive Church", *JR*, 1945, 119 ff.

He adduced conceptions of deification and rebirth proper to the Hellenistic mystery religions as providing analogies to Pauline soteriology, and as capable of illuminating even if not of explaining the latter. For Paul never speaks of rebirth or deification, but of resurrection and "life in Christ", by which he implies a Spirit-filled type of existence flowing from faith.

Further, Reitzenstein, rightly proceeding from the fact that there are to be found in the vocabulary of the apostle terms and concepts which demonstrably play a part in the language of mystery theology as well, has made impressive reference to the Hermetic writings in particular, which in many places bring together *γνώσις* and *φῶς* just as Paul likewise speaks of the *φωτισμὸς τῆς γνώσεως* (2 Cor. 4:6). Hellenistic mystery religion understands stages of gnosis and illumination as implying transformation of being; the adept as a result of his initiation becomes a *renatus in aeternum*. The vision of the divine glory changes the beholder into the bearer of this glory. A mystery prayer of the *Corpus Hermeticum* (XIII, 19) runs: τὸ πᾶν ἀπὸ σοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ σέ τό πᾶν τὸν νοῦν τὸν ἐν ἡμῖν σῶζε, ζωή, φώτιζε, φῶς τὴν ψυχὴν... σῶζε ζωὴ πνεῦμα θεέ (Scott 252). Reitzenstein comments: "God, who is πνεῦμα, gives to the initiate pneumatic character by imparting ἀθανασία and γνώσις" (120). But the hermetic mystery of rebirth is not the same thing as the Pauline mystery of resurrection; so much is clear, yet the latter stands close to the former.

For Reitzenstein, apocalyptic and rabbinical writings do not enter into the question. He feels that Oriental spirituality—the mystery religions, the hermetic literature, and Mandaicism offer closer points of contact. For him analogies from Greek and Oriental syncretism over a broad field furnish a means of explaining Pauline theology on the basis of the "History of Religion" school. He starts from the presupposition that Paul the "syncretist" had concerned himself with the literary documents of all these religions and cults when equipping himself for the task of preaching among the Hellenists. Schweitzer (*Mystik*, 29) is right when he scoffs at Reitzenstein's picture of Paul in the following terms: "This Paul who prepared himself by suitable reading for his vocation as a missionary has been so distorted into a professorial figure that he no longer bears any resemblance to the character who meets us in the letters." This witticism would have been still more appropriate if directed against Karl v. Hase, since the latter in his *Kirchengeschichte* (Leipzig, 1885) did in fact say of Paul: "He is a scholar like one of us, only more highly gifted" (152).

(b) *City and public mystery cults*

The question of the influence of the mystery religions on the apostle, which Reitzenstein supported simply as a fact, gains in plausibility when, looking at the life of the apostle, we ask the question what kind of mystery cult could have been known to him with homely familiarity in his youth. It is well known that Paul was born in the Cilician port of Tarsus in the south of modern Turkey, the "Athens of Asia Minor", which was not only a large emporium for trade and commerce but also a focal point for cultural influences, for religious and mystery cults of all kinds. According to Acts 7: 57 he first left Tarsus for Jerusalem as a *νεανίας*, probably when sixteen or seventeen years old. We have evidence that Tarsus was the centre of the cult of the vegetation deity Sandan, which resembled the mystery cults proper. Dio Chrysostom indicates that this city god was also venerated under the Greek name of Heracles. In honour of Sandan-Heracles there was celebrated every year in Tarsus a funeral pyre festival, at the climax of which the image of the god was burned. The dying of nature under the withering heat of the summer sun and its resurrection to new life was the content of this mystery, which at once suggests its kinship with the cults of the Syrian Adonis, the Phrygian Attis, the Egyptian Osiris, and the Babylonian Tammuz. For the dying and the rising again of vegetation gods was the essence of them all.

H. Böhlig,¹ to whom we owe an exhaustive monograph on Tarsus, thought it possible to prove the soteriological character of the feast, since numerous inscriptions refer to the *θεοὶ σωτηρίας*. That the young Saul had seen processions in honour of this deity in the market-place or the streets of Tarsus is something which, of course, cannot be demonstrated, but appears highly probable. He would have known them as to-day every citizen of Britain knows his Bank Holidays. It is certainly not possible to postulate that this *milieu* influenced with an "inner rigid necessity" the development of Paul's later Christo-centric soteriology,² but none the less many traits of his world of ideas are more easily understandable if we may assume the associative influence of the apostle's youthful memories, which

¹ *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsus im augusteischen Zeitalter mit Beurteilung der paulinischen Schriften*, Heidelberg, 1913; cf. further A. Steinmann, *Zum Werdegang des Paulus, die Jugendzeit in Tarsus*, Freiburg, 1928, and now W. C. van Unnik, *Tarsos of Jerusalem, de Stad van Paulus Jeugd*, Medel. d. Kon. Nederl. Akad. van Wetensch., Afd. Letterkunde N. R. Deel 15, 5, Amsterdam, 1952.

² E. Barnikol (*Die vorchristliche und frühchristliche Zeit des Paulus*, Kiel, 1929) had already protested against these exaggerations.

will have gained a new colouring from similar travel impressions received later.

Further, we may mention here the ancient imperial cult with its solemn apotheoses which was strictly observed in the whole Imperium Romanum, and therefore also in Tarsus.¹ It is in consequence of the traditional devotional material of the Orient that the *Divus Augustus* was also described as κύριος and σωτήρ. In Phil. 3: 20 Paul seems to have used the imperial titles of this official religion when he here describes Christ as the "emperor" of Christians awaited from above. According to Josephus at least (*Ant.* 12, 3, 1 f.) the Jews were officially exempted from compulsory participation in this cult. As a public institution it was, of course, known everywhere; but the veneration of the emperor did not exercise any greater influence either on Christian thought in general or on the formation of Paul's world of ideas in particular, and this consideration reduced many a bold hypothesis to its true proportions.²

(c) *The "kyrios" cult*

Wilhelm Bousset³ proceeded more cautiously. In consequence of his uncommon knowledge of the history of religions, he approached the problem from a much more comprehensive point of view. He, too, was of the opinion that syncretistic influences were very strong in the formation of early Christianity and were responsible for the fact that, from the original and simple gospel of Jesus, there developed a religion of redemption centred in the mystery cult of the Christ. He saw the axis of this development in the Kyrios cult, which the early Christians coming from Hellenistic circles already brought with them. On the analogy of the many divine "lords" in the Orient, in Hellas and in Rome, the first Hellenistic Christian communities had in fact given their cult hero the title which was intended to describe the sovereign position of Jesus in the practice of divine worship. It was supposed that "the name above every name" of Phil. 2: 9, the holy cult-name of the Old Testament Yahweh, the almighty God, had been transferred to His chosen and anointed one.

¹ Cf. Art. "Herrscherkult", *PWK*, Suppl. IV, 826 ff.; E. Lohmeyer: *Christuskult und Kaiserkult*, Tübingen, 1919; H. Frankfort: *The Kingship and the Gods*, Chicago, 1948.

² According to St. Lösch: *Deitas Jesu und antike Apotheose*, Rottenburg, 1933 (65), the apotheosis of the early Roman emperors was a mere titular ceremonial, since there was no real belief in the divinity of the wearer of the crown.

³ *Kyrios Christos, Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenäus*, Göttingen, 1921.

Paul had been confronted by this fundamental conviction of the primitive Christian Hellenistic communities with regard to Jesus, the "cult hero, present to His church and revered by it as Kyrios" (90). This conviction had emerged "in the region of the unconscious, in the uncontrollable depths of the collective psyche of a community" (99). No doubt those central ideas of Pauline Christology, *κύριος* and *υἱὸς θεοῦ*, have points of contact with Judaism as well as with heathen religions, but it is simpler to understand Paulinism in the light of Hellenistic cult piety with its ideas of the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* (117 ff.).

The "Hellenization" of Christianity was prepared for by the sacramental cult of Jesus as Kyrios, a cult of which Paul was the leader. He then completed the process of Hellenization by his spread of the gospel from Palestinian to Hellenistic territory. Thus it was suggested that Paul introduced a cult of the Risen Christ, stemming from the mystery religions. Even if Paul himself avoided the use of a divine predicate for the Kyrios Christos, the massive faith of the community must, in short, have gone further (154).

Schweitzer (*Mystik* 31) has characterized Bousset's standpoint as follows:

Paul is not so much the Hellenizer of Christianity as a purifying influence through which pass the waters of the Christian faith, muddied by Hellenization. Bousset's theory however is ruined by the fact that it is not really possible to prove the existence, in Hellenistic communities (e.g. that of Antioch) of a sacramental Kyrios cult, supposedly disclosing the roots of Pauline mysticism, alongside the faith in Christ the Messiah.

That there is no objective basis in Pauline thought for the problem of Hellenization or syncretization, was therefore the judgment of another interpreter of Paul¹ who, however, too lightly eluded the whole complex of problems facing us here.

In any event, what the investigations of the "History of Religion" school have made perfectly clear is the intellectual and religious climate in which Paul and his communities lived. And this climate was undeniably heavy with conceptions proper to the ancient mystery religions.² Thus the idea of a sacramental participation in the

¹ Ernst Lohmeyer, *Grundlagen paulinischer Theologie*, Tübingen, 1929, 231.

² Thus, for instance, Hans Windisch, *Paulus und das Judentum*, Stuttgart, 1935 (38) comes to the conclusion: "The question of Paul's relation to the mystery religions has by no means yet been settled and it is not yet certain that we should reject the idea of any connexion. What is indisputable is that Pauline religion, historically considered, shows the 'type' of a mystery religion."

PROBLEMS OF PAULINE RESEARCH

death of a deity, which seems to us to-day so difficult to conceive, was thoroughly familiar to ancient ways of thought, and Paul had before him many analogies to his doctrines which, as we shall see, stem from other sources. As we have been told, Attis, Osiris, and Dionysos were also gods which died and rose again. Union with them, mediated by ritual acts, likewise secured *σωτηρία* against cruel fate or death, and often led to the deification of the initiate. But we know too little about the character of these mysteries¹ to be in a position to make a material comparison between them and the Christian ones. We realize, of course—and it is remarkable that Reitzenstein had no perception of this distinction—that the pagan mysteries were timeless, individualistic ways of salvation, whereas Paul, following the Jerusalem kerygma, understood the sharing in the death of Christ on the cross to be an historical event, and to imply a communal incorporation of believers in a saving body. Furthermore, the Jesus who came in the flesh (*ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκός*) was no mythical figure, no “projection of religious experience”, while His resurrection was for faith much rather a fact of the quite recent past. The terms used by both parties in this connexion—for instance *γνώσις*, *σωτηρία*, *σοφία*, *μυστήριον*, *τέλειος*—have on account of this difference quite another content for the mind of Paul than that which they possess in the mystery religions.

(d) *Gnosis*

Nevertheless, the terms just mentioned remain suspect, for they show plainly that here transitions become possible into the spiritual sphere of gnosis, whose doctrines of redemption had their place in the syncretism of declining antiquity. Rudolf Bultmann and his pupils have laid great stress on these points of contact and continuity. And in point of fact, gnostics penetrated into the Pauline communities; thus it was in Corinth, where they spiritualized the resurrection (1 Cor. 15) and preached a different Jesus from that of Paul (2 Cor. 11: 4), as also in Colossae, where misguided teachers held the veneration of the primal elements of the universe (*στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*) to be an integral part of the Christian faith.

Even as regards the apostle's own terminology gnostic mythological symbols have insidiously crept in, as when he speaks of

¹ The relevant material has been surveyed and discussed by Hepding, Baudissin, Cumont, Deissner, Leipoldt, Kern, etc. A review of these researches has been given by Joh. Leipoldt in the *Handbuch der Religionswissenschaft*, ed. G. Mensching, 1, 4, Berlin, 1948.

the daemonic world-rulers (ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου) which brought the Kyrios to the cross (1 Cor. 2: 8), or of enslavement under the rule of στοιχεῖα (Gal. 4: 3, 9), or again in his discourse on the fall of creation (Rom. 8: 20 ff.), where there emerges the dualism between the ψυχικός and the πνευματικός (1 Cor. 2: 14 f.; 15: 44), and much else. He himself feels that he is a πνευματικός who has pierced the mysteries of divine wisdom, the βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ¹ (1 Cor. 2: 10). The God who created light has also made light to shine within his own life: the γνῶσις of the δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ in the face of Jesus Christ (2 Cor. 4: 6). It is undeniable that this gnosis, considered as irrational awareness, is very close to the cultic mystic consciousness of the mystery religions. "Vision effects a transformation of the soul."² It is certain that there are cross currents between the thought of Paul and the world of gnosis, for the specific soteriology of the apostle which clad the figure of Jesus of Nazareth in the garment of a cosmological redeemer myth must have had—as Bousset³ rightly pointed out—a magnetic influence on gnostic circles. Nevertheless, Bousset (and in this matter he was more reserved than Bultmann) justly emphasized that the gnostic trends of thought in the mind of the apostle (or, as it would be better to say, those approximating to gnosis) remained in the background of his total outlook, and did not play a primary part.⁴

This state of affairs is not changed until we reach the Deutero-Pauline writings, and Käsemann and Schlier were able to show that the letters of this group—whoever their author might be—speak the language of specific gnostic circles. In particular, the use of the concept σῶμα Χριστοῦ which identifies the church with Christ—this, Schlier thinks, occurs only in the Deutero-Pauline, Käsemann in the great letters also—would seem to be of a highly gnostic character.⁵ Motives in the Letter to the Ephesians, such as the

¹ Cf. R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen, 1948, 180. (E. T. *Theology of the New Testament*.)

² M. Dibelius, *Paulus und die Mystik*, Munich, 1941, 7 (now *Botschaft und Geschichte*, II, Tübingen, 1956, 142) interprets it thus: "This is felt to be a real event, not merely something practised in the cult as is the case with the mystery religions; it is an event taking place in the life of Paul. History instead of cultus (or instead of myth) as the locus of the mystical experience—it is a phenomenon typical of Paul's mysticism which we see here."

³ Cf. *Kyrios Christos*, 191.

⁴ R. McL. Wilson has well defined the relation in *The Gnostic Problem*, London, 1958, 76. "The whole distinction between Paul and the Gnostics is that he accepts the contemporary *Weltanschauung* but rejects the gnosticizing interpretation."

⁵ H. Schlier, *Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief*, Tübingen, 1930; E. Käsemann: *Leib und Leib Christi*, Tübingen, 1932. Cf. also A. Schweitzer, *Mystik*, 117: "In the whole literature of mysticism there is no riddle comparable with that of the mystical body of Christ."

Redeemer's journey through earth and heaven (4: 7-11), the heavenly wall (*φραγμός*) which divides souls imprisoned in the underworld from the world of light (2: 14-18) the *σζζγγγ* in heaven (5: 22-32) take us into the world of gnostic language and ideas, which also controls Mandaean literature. In fact, as Käsemann puts it (*op. cit.*, p. 155) Ephesians and Colossians are intelligible "only from a mode of interpretation which takes gnosticism fully into account".

(e) *Assessment*

The "History of Religion"¹ school, as exemplified by Reitzenstein and Bousset, was occupied with a truly legitimate concern, and therefore found a considerable following in Germany, France, and the Anglo-Saxon world, for it rightly perceived and demonstrated in the thought-world of Paul much that was non-Jewish. Accordingly, Alfred Loisy and Kirsopp Lake considered that under the influence of "Pauline mysticism" Christianity was transmuted into a mystery religion. Yet the researches of other scholars (cf. section 4) have arrived at quite other and perhaps more accurate explanations of the so-called Christ-mysticism of Paul. And it is difficult to explain away the point that Paul had no demonstrable contacts with Hellenistic paganism.²

The situation appears different if we take account of the fact that rabbinic Judaism, at least that of the Diaspora, had itself received the impress of Hellenistic mystery cults or at least made use of them for missionary purposes: "that Paul undoubtedly would therefore be open to their influence, and that many of the terms he used would have an undertone of meaning which would strengthen the appeal of the gospel to the Hellenistic world".³ And Bousset himself has shown in his great and unsurpassed work *Die Religion des Judentums im hellenistischen Zeitalter* (3rd ed., H. Gressmann, Tübingen, 1926) that the Judaism of the New Testament period was not identical with that of the rabbinic schools of Palestine which were engaged in the codification of the Mishna, but that in this period there were many other unorthodox groups and circles, and especially in relation to the

¹ There is the dissertation of one of my pupils on this point: G. W. Ittel, *Urchristentum und Fremdreigionen im Urteil der religionsgeschichtl. Schule*, Erlangen, 1956.

² Cf. W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, London, 1949, 93: "It cannot be over-emphasized that while his direct contacts with Hellenistic paganism would be few, his relations with Hellenistic Judaism would be peculiarly close throughout his life."

³ W. D. Davies, *op. cit.*, 98.

PROBLEMS OF PAULINE RESEARCH

Hellenistic *koine*. This state of affairs, which was, of course, known before the time of Bousset, has led to various attempts to interpret Paul in the light of the Jewish Diaspora.

Essentially one must rather say—and this consideration qualifies all pagan-Hellenistic interpretations of Paul—that a considered assessment of the spiritual forces of his environment as possible sources or influential factors in his theology must exclude pure Hellenism, however certain it may be that he was directly acquainted with it as a reality of his age. The “Hellenistic” trait in his thought which undeniably exists is not to be explained by direct influence, was obviously not an independent formative factor stemming from his youth in Tarsus, but rather the result of a process of assimilation, since Hellenism had long before been penetrated by the spirit of the Jewish Diaspora.¹ For according to all the data which can be collected from Jewish history up to the modern period of emancipation, environmental influences have always been effective only in the form of a process of infiltration, whether it be a question of Parsee or Hellenistic, neoplatonist or gnostic, Aristotelian or mutazilitic influences. The heterogeneous elements of thought and teaching were every time assimilated, i.e., integrated to Judaism, and the evidences of this process were plainly perceptible in the face of the Judaism of the place and time in question.

Hence it is of the highest importance for the genealogy of Pauline thought to take into account information about the Hellenized Judaism of the Diaspora of his time, even though primary sources are lacking for the Jewish community of Tarsus in this critical epoch. Those monographs which bear on Pauline investigation must be considered. We must give broader scope to this debate on account of its fundamental importance. For if we succeeded in reconstructing the picture of the Judaism in which the young Saul of Damascus lived, then we should have in our hands an important clue to the understanding of Pauline theology. For after all, Paul by his origins was a Jew of Tarsus and not a Syrian, Persian, or Egyptian; a native of that great town, situated in the modern Gulf of Alexandretta, where the Syrian and Turkish coasts touch almost at right angles.

¹ Cf. on this also Rudolf Meyer, *Hellenistisches in der rabbinischen Anthropologie*, Stuttgart, 1937; S. Liebermann, *Greek in Jewish Palestine*, New York, 1942.