

Oedipal Paul

José Faur
Netanya Academic College

Out of Series Monograph Series

No.1 2018

Copyright in the name of the author José Faur and the publisher
Mentalities/Mentalités © 2018

This monograph may be freely circulated so long as the name of the author
and the publisher are clearly evident.

The underlying thesis of this two-part essay is that the doctrine “Covenant-Tora-God” is the only functioning alternative to the doctrine “Oedipus-Son-God,” and vice-versa.

PART I

Preliminary Remarks

The God of Israel is monolingual. He only communicates in consonants—no vowels--and reveals Himself, as per the text of the Scripture, -- to the people of Israel.¹ Accordingly, Jews do not believe that He is what pagan philosophers, deists, ancient and modern theologians propose, but what Moses *wrote* and he *explained* orally, to the *nation* of Israel. Thus, unlike pagan deities, the God of the “Hebrews” does not communicate to alphabetic “prophets.” Paul (c.5-c. 68)—not Jesus—sought to eliminate the Jewish people by declaring that the Tora [written in *Hebrew* for the people of Israel] is an “Old”-- in the sense of “void and empty”--*diatheke*—document.² The principal thesis of this essay, as it will be seen in the following chapters, is that Paul interpreted Jesus’ Mission in terms of the oedipal “father/son” model. Therefore, he portrayed Jesus, the *Son*, as displacing God the *Father*; while simultaneously replacing the *Law* (of the God-Father) with the Gospel of *Love* (standing for the God-Son, see below). Essential to Paul’s thesis is the distinction between “Israel after the flesh” (1*Corinthians* 10:18)—who Paul first proposed--and “Israel of God” (*Galatians* 6:17), a title that he contrived and could freely distribute among his followers.³

Paul never met Jesus or his disciples.⁴ Rather, he was proposing a unique system, in a two-fold fashion. It is the first religious system claiming authority to debunk another religious system, on the basis of the very system which is now debunking!⁵ Second, it is

¹ See *Exodus* 9:11, 13, etc.; cf. 5:11; 7:16, etc.

² His authority to issue this sort of abrogation may be compared to a foreigner citizen declaring to an alien people that he had just abrogated the U.S. Constitution. See below pp. 10, 26, 29, etc.

³ See Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel* (Oxford: The Littman Library, 1986), pp.79-80; and my *The Horizontal Society*, 2 vols. (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2008), vol. 2, Appendix 30.

⁴ See my *Gospel According to the Jews* (New York: Moreshet Sepharad, 2012), pp. 157-161. As we hope to show in what follows, Paul’s “theology” is an extension of Greek *metis* (“cunning”) whereby the end justifies the mean.

⁵ Consequently, Paul’s Christianity appeared to behave as a political organization, rather than as a religious entity, like Buddhism; see Pope Pius XII (1876-1958) close association with Hitler, Nazis and Fascists ideologies.

the first religious system unseating another religious system (Judaism) with the assistance of the Roman military and political might.⁶ Paradoxically, the religion which Paul claimed to have debunked served as the justification for his own authority. With this purpose in mind he proposed, not only to *displace*, but also to *fulfill* the Tora. In like manner, the faithful would not only displace, but actually become, “true Israel.”⁷ The argumentation displacement--> substitution can be used either to justify the advantages of the new system, or to denigrate the original system. For reasons that will be apparent in the following chapters, Paul’s chose the second path. Diligently, and over the centuries, *his* vision of Christianity toiled to demonize Jews and Judaism. Thus, the people of Israel were portrayed as a stateless mass, void of virtue; and the Hebrew Scripture and rabbinic tradition as dead and deadly--in contradistinction to Paul’s vision of Christianity and Christian folks.

The principal thesis of this work is that Greek and Roman political ideas were grounded on “cunning” (=Metis/Oedipus/Hero);⁸ while Judaism stands for Tora (=Covenant/Law/Family). Specifically, that in cultures grounded on “cunning” (Greek: *metis*), oedipal consideration are of the essence: survival is the function of *heroic* performance and *heroic* leadership. True, we all were taught that Greek culture is synonymous with ‘rationality’ and personal ‘freedom,’ as well as ‘democracy’ and everything good and wholesome. That, however, may not be wholly true. Classical scholars, although taking on the tone of trustworthy and omniscient observers, consistently omit the brutish aspects of Greek ethos and culture. This point has been elaborated by E. R. Dodds (1893-1979), in *The Greeks and the Irrational* (1968), where he showed the decisive role played by irrational ideologies, orgiastic ecstasy, etc. in Greek culture. The underlying thesis of this section is that this type of ‘oversight’ is fundamental to both the culture and scholarship of *metis*.

Basic Jewish concepts, such as ‘covenant,’ ‘family’ and ‘law,’ challenged heroic ethos and heroic logic, where ‘might’ and ‘cunning’ displace ‘right’ and ‘truth.’ Vico (1668-1744), the father of modern humanism, commented on the conceit of the heroic man. He “was so arrogant that, as we would say nowadays, he [would] not let a fly pass the end of his nose.”⁹ An important element peculiar to “heroic thinking” is the attitude towards those occupying a “lower” social rank. As an example, Vico noted the place of the “plebes” in a heroic culture. Because of their “lower status” in the hierarchic chain, they were the sworn enemies of the Greeks and the Romans. In a heroic culture, ‘Law’ is inconsequential. Anyone attempting to relieve the lot of the “plebes” with legislation, “was accused of treason and sent to his death.”¹⁰ Because of their conceit, the heroic men “had caused themselves to be adored as gods.”¹¹ So, a hero would not hesitate to avenge

⁶ The strategy succeeded with the conversion of Emperor Constantine, c. 312.

⁷ See *Verus Israel*, pp. 169-173.

⁸ The best work on the subject is by Marcel Detienne and Jean-Pierre Vernant, *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society* (Atlantic Island, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1978).

⁹ Giambattista Vico, *New Science* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1968), #667, p. 253. Cf. *Proverbs* 15:25; *MT Berakhot* 10:19, etc.

¹⁰ *New Science*, #668, p. 253.

¹¹ *New Science*, #449, p. 151; cf. #437, pp. 143–144. Cf. ed. R. J. D. Eisenshtein, *Osar Midrashim*, 2 vols. (), vol. 2, p. 418. XXX /s//???

a personal offense, even if it would result in “the ruin of his entire nation.”¹² To understand the hero’s mind and his civilization, it is essential to come to grips with “the supreme arrogance characteristic of barbarous times, which formed their heroic nature,”¹³ as well as the “conceit of nations.”¹⁴ “To this conceit of nations is added that of scholars, who will have it that what they know is as old as the world.”¹⁵ A conceit, we may add, characteristic of savants, old and new, sublimely dedicated to the promotion of heroic wisdom and heroic platitudes.

A direct effect of heroic ethos was the brutal authority exercised by the father. Heroic education involved what had been properly described, as “cyclopean paternal authority”:

...the [heroic] education of the young was severe, harsh, and cruel, as in the case of the unlettered Lacadaemonians, who were the heroes of Greece. These people, in order to teach their sons to fear neither pain nor death would beat them within an inch of their lives in the temple of Diana, so that they often fell dead in agonies of pain beneath their father's blows. This cyclopean paternal authority survived among both the Greeks and Romans, permitting them to kill their innocent born babes.¹⁶

This type of “paternal authority” produced in the children an unshakable feeling of anxiety, symptomatic of strong repression:

The peculiar horror with which the Greeks viewed offenses against the father, and the peculiar religious sanctions to which the offender was thought to be exposed, are in themselves suggestive of strong repressions. So are the many stories in which a father’s curse produces terrible consequences— stories like those of Phoenix, of Hyppolytus, of Pelops and his sons, of Oedipus and his sons—all of them, it would seem, products of a relatively late period, when the position of the father was not entirely secure.¹⁷

The net result of this sort of “horror” was a strong feeling of hostility against the father:

The family situation in ancient Greece, like the family situation today, gave rise to infantile conflicts whose echoes lingered in the unconscious mind of the adult. With the rise of the Sophistic Movement, the conflict became in many households a fully conscious one: young men began to claim that they had a ‘natural right’ to disobey their fathers. But it is a fair guess that such conflicts already existed at the unconscious level from a very much earlier date— that in fact they go back to the earliest unconfessed stirrings of individualism in a society where family solidarity was still universally taken for granted.¹⁸

A similar situation prevailed throughout Roman society, where the power of fathers over sons was absolute. Sons belonged to the ‘have-not’ group and constituted a rebellious class striving to usurp parental authority. Concerning the status of the son in Roman society, Otto Rank (1884-1939) observed:

The right of every citizen to social fatherhood meant no right for the sons except the one to become a father in his turn, that is, a social type prescribed by this first totalitarian state. Since the legal power of the father

¹² *New Science*, #667, p. 252.

¹³ *New Science*, #38, p. 24.

¹⁴ *New Science*, #125, p. 61.

¹⁵ *New Science*, # 126-127, p. 61; cf. *ibid.*, ##123-124, pp. 60-61.

¹⁶ *New Science* #670, p. 254; cf. #256, pp. 80–81.

¹⁷ E.R. Dodds, in *Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), p. 46.

¹⁸ *Greeks and the Irrational*, p. 47. On the conflict between sons and fathers in classical Athens, see Barry S. Strauss, *Fathers & Sons in Athens* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993).

over his sons was equivalent to his power over his slaves,¹⁹ we can justly say that the sons dominated by legal fatherhood actually were the first ‘have-nots.’ Not that the slaves had more, but they had no hope and hence no real desire to demand or take what the ‘haves’ possessed. It was different with the sons, who, despite their lack of legal rights, were brought up with the idea of promotion—provided they behaved—from the ‘have-not’ into the ‘have’ group. Hence, they could easily form the nucleus of a rebellious class striving to overthrow the ruling class of fathers.²⁰

The Roman father was invested with heroic attributes, and he best illustrated the tyrannical dominance over the “herd of brothers”:

At the height of the patriarchal rule in ancient Rome, the father had become invested with a power derived from the magic self of the hero in whose image civic fatherhood was created as a social type. Paradoxically enough, it seems that Freud's “primitive dominance of the father” who ruled tyrannically over the “herd of brothers” only existed politically in the highly organized Roman state at the peak of its power.²¹

The brutal attitude of fathers toward their sons must be viewed in conjunction with the low status of women, in cultures where ‘might’ is the only constitutive of ‘right.’ Accordingly, we should not be surprised to discover that, “Wives were maintained as a necessity of nature for the procreation of children. In other respects they were treated as slaves.”²² In this connection, we must point out to the heroic habit of abandoning the wives that they had taken from the enemies. These ‘brave men’ would “...not marry them, and their actions were held to be heroic,” noted Vico. Adding, “while to us, with our present feelings, they seem, as they indeed are, the deeds of scoundrels.”²³

The Tora is the only system in ancient times intended to serve as an alternative to the culture of *metis*.²⁴ Rather than conceiving of the ‘other’ as a potential prey or predator, the Hebrew Scripture teaches that every human is imprinted with the image of God, and therefore equal to everyone else. Survival, both politically and individually, must be predicated on a freely contracted covenant, ruling supreme. That is, “a single Law and a single judicial procedure, which you must apply to yourself and to the alien sojourning among you” (*Number* 15:16, cf. *ibid.* v. 29). Persecution of Jews was the tool used by cunning humanity, and later promoted by the ecclesiastical bureaucracies—not the Christianity of Jesus, but that of Paul (see below). Maimonides (1135-1204) observed that in their attempt to vanquish Israel, pagan nations merged the military strategy together with the ‘spiritual’ and or ‘religious’ arguments.²⁵ In either case, the purpose was the elimination of ‘Tora/Jews.’ As we will see in what follows, Paul sought to abrogate the Law by eliminating Israel’s *Father*. With this aim in mind, he intended to transform the Scripture from a *diateke* standing (in the Jewish-Greek translation of

¹⁹ Let us note that the term ‘family’ stems from *famulus*—‘servant, slave’; see Émile Benveniste, *Indo-European Languages and Society* (Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press, 1973), pp. 253, 291.

²⁰ Otto Rank, *Beyond Psychology* (New York: Dover, 1958), p. 126.

²¹ *Beyond Psychology*, p. 126.

²² *New Science*, # 671, p. 254.

²³ *New Science* #611, p. 226.

²⁴ This will explain why ‘monotheistic religions’ strive to promote both *ecclesiastical* anti-Judaism and *racial* anti-Semitism.

²⁵ See *Epistle to Yemen*, ed. by Abraham S. Halkin, (New York: the American Academy for Jewish Research, 1952), pp. 10–11.

Scripture) for ‘covenant,’ into a *diatheke* ‘last will’ (as per *late* Hellenistic use). According to this peculiar ‘theological’ argument,²⁶ it would be absolutely necessary for the ‘Father’ to *die* so that He could be *substituted* by the ‘Son’!

Although much research had been made on the relation of religion to the various stages of pre-oedipal development, Paul’s mindset and his attitude towards Judaism is yet to be properly understood. In what follows, I propose that he may be best understood in light of the oedipal model.

²⁶More accurately: “oedipal reasoning.”

1.-Paul, the Man

Paul was the son of proselytes, barely converted to Judaism. He was uncircumcised. Evidence to this is the fact that he could pass himself as a Roman to Romans.²⁷ Let us read a critical passage concerning Paul entering the Temple in Jerusalem. People that knew him from Asia Minor were offended by his presence, and were about to lynch him.²⁸ Roman soldiers standing guards at the Temple intervened and decided to flog him:

And as they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by. Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned? When the centurion heard that, he went and told the chief captain, saying, Take heed what thou doest: for this man is a Roman. Then the chief captain came, and said unto him: Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said: Yea. And the chief captain answered: With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, but I was free born. Then straightway the departed from him which should have examined him: and the chief captain also was afraid, fully knowing (*epignous*) that that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him. (*Acts 22:25-29*; cf. *ibid.* 21: 21; 16:37-38)

And now a question: unless Paul was found to be uncircumcised, how could it be “fully know” (*epignous*) that he was not Jewish? The same question put differently: how could one “learn” (*mathon*) that he was a Roman (see *Acts 23:27*)? The first step taken by the Roman authorities in such an event was to examine whether he was circumcised. “A female can conceal her identity and say ‘I am a gentile,’” remarked the rabbis, “But a male cannot conceal his identity and say ‘I am a gentile.’”²⁹

The rabbis noticed the lack of basic Jewish knowledge among those “converting among the nations.”³⁰ This statement surely applied to a place like Tarsus, Cilice. The reason for Paul’s failure to circumcise may have been due to parental neglect, or because upon his family’s conversion, he refused to be circumcised. At any rate, the fact that he was not circumcised affected his mindset as well as his notions about Jews and Judaism. Let us note, by way of illustration, his diatribe against circumcision, *Galileans 5:1-3*:

Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not engaged again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I, Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law.³¹ (See *Romans 2:25-3:1*, 30)

²⁷ At the time, there were some rabbinic authorities, among them R. Joshua, that admitted proselytes *without* circumcision; see *Yebamot* 46a.

²⁸ In my opinion, the original accusation was not that he brought a ‘Greek’ to the “Hall of the Israelite” at the Temple, but that he himself was ‘Greek’; i.e., gentile. About this episode, see Paul W. Walaskay, ‘... And so we came to Rome’ (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 53-55.

²⁹ *Yerushalmi ‘Aboda Zara* II, 2, 40c. Cf. R. Israel Iserlin, *Terumat ha-Deshen* (Venice, 5306/1546), #197. The case mentioned by Josephus was unusual; see Josephus, *The Life* (Loeb Classical Library), 422-426, pp. 155-157. Generally, Jews would admit someone as a Jew by his saying so; see R. Solomon b. Adrete, *She’elot wu-Tshubot*, vol. 2, #15.

³⁰ About the level of Judaism among proselytes converted in gentiles areas, see *Tosefta Shabbat* 8:5, p. 30 and *Shabbat* 68a-b.

³¹ See *Horizontal Society*, Section III, n. 274.

There is no basis to presuppose that Paul had a Jewish education. Consider his morbid fear of the *Hebrew* Scripture (but not of the Greek, the only language in which he wrote). Only someone unable to read a word of Hebrew could have written, “the letter [of the Tora] killed” (2*Corinthians* 3:6). His tirade against *Hebrew* writing indicates something deeper than mere antipathy to a foreign language. In his tormented mind, *Hebrew* constituted an impenetrable “veil,” rendering the Tora incomprehensible. Speaking about his personal experience, when hearing the Tora read at the Synagogue, he confessed: “But even unto this day, when Moses [i.e., the Tora; cf. *Acts* 15:21] is read, the veil is upon their heart” [i.e., of men not acquainted with the Hebrew letters] (2*Corinthians* 3:15). His aversion to the Hebrew text of Scripture acquired surrealistic dimensions. In his tormented mind, he believed that the purpose of the crucifixion was to remove the “veil,” which “is done away in Christ” (2*Corinthians* 3:14). To accomplish this mission, Jesus had to be nailed on to the cross and his blood was spilled. Thus, “Blotting out the handwriting [=the Hebrew text] of ordinances that were against us [=people who could not read Hebrew], which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross” (*Colossians* 2:14). It is difficult to imagine that someone having this attitude about the original text of the Scripture had any Hebrew schooling. Most probably, Paul belonged to the “illiterate men” (עַם הָאֲרִיץ) discussed by the rabbis.³² They constituted a special class, based not on birth or economic status, but on their hostility to Jewish life and Jewish learning. Having in mind people of the ilk of Paul, the rabbis taught, “Greater is the hatred that illiterate men (עַמֵי הָאֲרִיץ) profess towards the disciples of sages, than what the (pagan) nations profess against Israel.”³³ His assertion that he sat at the feet of R. Gamliel (the elder, d. c. 52), and the alleged missions that he supposed to have accomplished, do not pertain to historic facts.³⁴ (Concerning his ignorance of basic Tora tenets, see below Chapter 2.)

Accordingly, we propose that Paul’s rejection of the Tora, as well as his displacement of the God-Father on behalf of the Son-hero, were the effect of oedipal considerations. In particular, we intend to show that Paul’s “God-Father,” stood for the Roman paterfamilias: cunning and malevolent. That is why, he thought of Jesus in terms of an “oedipal son,” whose principal objective was to rebel against the paterfamilias, and displace and substitute him. Let it be noted, in passing, that his attacks against circumcision and the Tora were intended to delegitimize Jesus’ disciples, all of whom, including Jesus himself, were circumcised and professed allegiance to the Hebrew Scripture, see *Acts* 21:20-25.

2.-Paul’s God--“father in the flesh”

³² The claim made by some critics that Paul’s occasional departure from the text of the Septuagint is because of the ‘Hebrew’ Scripture, it may make sense only to people having no knowledge of either the Hebrew or Greek text of the Bible.

³³ *Pesahim* 49b. See *Horizontal Society*, Appendix 21.

³⁴ He may have known some elementary words in Hebrew that were part of the common vocabulary. Passages such as those attesting that he spoke “in the Hebrew dialect” (*dialekto*) (*Acts* 21:40, cf. 22:2), it meant the ‘Aramaic’ in vogue among both Jews and gentiles. Actual ‘Hebrew’ ceased to be spoken by the general public.

In classic psychoanalytic theory, ‘God’ is thought of as a projection of the father’s image. It has been shown that Greek gods were modeled in the image of the paterfamilias.³⁵ Concerning this pivotal point, Freud (1856-1939) wrote in his *Totem and Taboo* that “personal relation to God depends on [our] relation to [our] father in the flesh.”³⁶ In *Moses and Monotheism*, Freud pointed out that Christianity is a “son” religion, whereas Judaism is a “father” religion:

[T]he Christian ceremony of Holy Communion, in which the believer incorporates the Savior’s blood and flesh, repeats the content of the old totem meal....The ambivalence that dominates the relation to the father was clearly shown, however, in the final outcome of the religious novelty. Ostensibly aimed at propitiating the father god, it ended in his being dethroned and got rid of. Judaism had been a religion of the father; Christianity became a religion of the son. The old God the Father fell back behind Christ; Christ, the Son, took his place, just as every son had hoped to in primeval times.³⁷

In the Hebrew Scripture, too, God is associated with the “father in the flesh.” When God spoke to Moses for the first time, He said to him, “I am the God of your father” (אֱלֹהֵי אָבִיךָ)—in the singular—“the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” (*Exodus* 3:6). Accordingly, the rabbis explained that God “Revealed Himself to Moses in the voice of his father Amram.”³⁸ Similarly, when God revealed Himself for the first time to Israel at the crossing of the Red Sea, the people exclaimed: “This is my God and I shall praise Him, the God of my father and I shall exalt Him” (*Exodus* 15:2)—again using “father” in the singular (אָבִי), thereby pointing to the association “father in the flesh” and God. Given that the model for the God of Israel has to do with the “father in the flesh,” “A bastard cannot enter into God’s assembly” (*Deuteronomy* 23:3); i.e., it would not be viable for him to have an adequate conception of the God of Israel.

For a proper understanding of Paul’s ‘god’ we must first gain a glimpse at the structure of the Greco-Roman family. It was an organization incarnating *heroic* values and *heroic* logic, with the paterfamilias at the center, in function of supreme deity “in the flesh.” This is how Dodds described it:

Its organization, as in all Indo-European societies, was patriarchal; its law was *patria potestas*.³⁹ The head of a household is its king...and his position is still described by Aristotle as analogous to that of a king. Over his children, his authority is in early times unlimited: he is free to expose them in infancy, and in manhood to expel an erring or rebellious son from the community, as Theseus expelled Hyppolytus, as Oeneus expelled Tydeus, as Strophios expelled Pylades, as Zeus himself cast out Hephaestus from Olympus for siding with his mother. In relation to his father, the son had duties but no rights; while his father lived, he was a perpetual minor—a state of affairs which lasted at Athens down to the sixth century, when Solon introduced certain safeguards. And indeed more

³⁵ See *Greeks and the Irrational*, pp. 47-48.

³⁶ Sigmund Freud, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, edited and translated by James Strachey, 24 vols. (London: Hogarth Press, 1953-1974); henceforth *S.E.* followed by volume and pagination. The above quotation proceeds from *S.E.* 13:154.

³⁷ *S.E.* 23:87-88.

³⁸ *Midrash Tanhuma*, ed. S. Buber (Vilna, 5645/1885), *Exodus XVI*, vol. 1, p. 9. Cf. *Shemot Rabba*, (Vilna, Reprinted: Jerusalem, 5735/1975), III, 1, 10d.

³⁹ The “Power of the father,” included that of life and death over every family member.

than two centuries after Solon the tradition of family jurisdiction was still so strong that even Plato—who was certainly no admirer of the family— had to give it a place in his legislation.⁴⁰

The only “god” that Paul ever knew was the “god” incarnating the Greco-Roman paterfamilias. Evidence to this is the term *Kyrios* (“Lord”), used in the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew *Adonai* (“God of Israel”). Here is how Professor Bickerman defined it:

[A] legal term meaning the legitimate master of someone or something, a word which as a substantive was not used in Greek religious language. It is simply a literal translation of the Hebrew appellative *Adonai* (the Lord), which became in the meantime the standard pronunciation of the awe-inspiring Tetragrammaton.⁴¹

(In what follow we will see that the different elements making up Paul’s vision of Christianity, are best understood in light of psychoanalytical theory, rather than in light of either the Hebrew Scripture or the teachings of Jesus and his disciples.)

Paul’s doctrine of sin and atonement rests on two premises, both alien to the Tora, the Prophets, and Jewish tradition. First, his claim that under the Law, ‘righteousness’ stands for perfect conformity, “For as many as are of the works of the law [=the Tora], are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continued not in all things which are written in the book of the law [=the Tora] to do them”—an impossible task! Consequently, “no man is justified by the law [=the Tora] in the sight of God.” Paul also argued, “the law [=the Tora] is not of faith” [cf. *Galileans* 3: 10-12]. Concluding, “Therefore by the deeds of the law [=the Tora] there shall no flesh be justified in his [God’s] sight: for by the law [=the Tora] is the knowledge of sin” (*Romans* 3: 20). It is on the basis of this reasoning that Paul argued: “For I testify, again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law” (*Galileans* 5:3).

The allegation that according to the Tora, failure to comply with even a single precept warrants death (cf. *2Peters* 2:4, 11-12)—is false. Addressing himself to this false statement, George Foot Moore (1851-1931) remarked:

Paul’s definition of righteousness as perfect conformity to the law of God would never have been conceded by a Jewish opponent, to whom it would have been equivalent to admitting that God had mocked man by offering a salvation on terms that they both knew to be impossible.⁴²

The second premise, that according to the Hebrew Scripture, God in His righteousness cannot freely forgive the penitent, is the basis for Paul’s doctrine that “redemption” and the “remission of sins” are only possible through Jesus’ expiatory death (*Romans* 3: 24-25). This is an affront to the Scripture, the Prophets, and the Sages of Israel, all of whom equally taught that God will absolve the sincere penitent. Quoting Professor Moore again:

⁴⁰ *The Greeks and the Irrational*, pp. 45–46; see also *ibid.* Chapter 2.

⁴¹ Elias Bickerman, *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees* (New York: Schocken Books, 1962), p. 66.

⁴² *Judaism*, vol. 1, p. 495.

How a Jew of Paul's antecedent could ignore, and by implication deny, the great prophetic doctrine of repentance, which, individualized and interiorized, was a cardinal doctrine of Judaism, namely, that God, out of love, freely forgives the sincerely penitent sinner and restores him to his favor—that seems from the Jewish point of view inexplicable.⁴³

Indeed, what Paul presented as premises, was in fact two postulates necessitated by the “conclusions” he intend to demonstrate!

The two propositions we are dealing with are not given premises from which Paul draws his conclusions; they are the postulates which the predetermined conclusions demands.⁴⁴

Paul's theology is autobiographic. The answer to Professor Moore's question (“How a Jew of Paul's antecedent could ignore...”), is that Paul's theology has to do with his own biological “father in the flesh”—not with the Hebrew Scripture, the Rabbis, nor, we may add, Jesus and his circle of disciples.⁴⁵ The sadistic ‘God-Father’ poking fun at his children by giving them an unattainable salvation is a Roman paterfamilias: oedipal and devious, implacable and unforgiving! Paul accused the Hebrew ‘God-Father’ to be crafty and fraudulent, for the very same reason that every tragic hero, too, accused his deity of having plotted his tragic end. About the latter it was said:

So it is that, at the moment when he [the tragic hero] realizes that he is responsible for having forged his misfortune with his own hands, he accuses the deity of having plotted and contrived everything in advance, of having delighted in tricking him from start to finish of the drama, the better to destroy him.⁴⁶

Because Paul did not have the foggiest idea about the character of the Hebrew God and or the Tora, he was clueless about the character of “Hebrew sin.” He only knew pagan *guilt*. Accordingly, he demanded *violent* atonement. This he learned from the Roman paterfamilias—not from the Hebrew Scripture! The difference between Hebrew and pagan “sin” is abysmal. Hebrew sin, be it a *het* (=‘error’) or an *abera* (=‘transgression’), pertains to the realm of the legal. It presupposes a previously legislated *law*, promulgated by a Supreme Authority, as when God prohibited Adam to eat of the fruit (see *Genesis* 2: 16-17). Upon confronting him, God referred to a law, which He had previously instructed Adam, *not* to eat. “Is it that you have eaten from the fruit which I ordered you not to eat?” (*Genesis* 3: 11). Hence the rabbinic principle: the Scripture “does not stipulate a punishment unless it has previously promulgated its prohibition (*hizhir*).”⁴⁷ In this connection we should point out that the term *hizhir*, usually translated ‘legislated,’ ‘promulgated,’ is connected with the verb ‘to enlighten,’ ‘to shed light.’⁴⁸ Accordingly, Hebrew ‘sin’ warrants ‘illumination,’ in the sense of full ‘knowledge’ and ‘intentionality.’ Moreover, unlike pagan guilt, Hebrew sin is not final. Essential to the

⁴³ *Judaism*, vol. 3, p. 151.

⁴⁴ *Judaism*, vol. 3, p. 151.

⁴⁵ *Judaism*, vol. 3, p. 151.

⁴⁶ Jean-Pierre Vernant and Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece* (New York: Zone Books, 1990), p. 45.

⁴⁷ *Yoma* 81a, etc. Cf. *MT Ma'ase ha-Qorbanot* 18:4; *Mamrim* 7:1.

⁴⁸ See *Horizontal Society*, Appendix 4.

Tora, the Prophets, and the rabbis is the concept of *teshuba* ‘repentance.’⁴⁹ Psychologically, Jews treat their past as an ‘open book,’ subject to *interpretation*, *revison* and *change* of heart (= Hebrew *teshuba*).⁵⁰ In this manner, sins and offenses are transformed into something positive. “At the rank where the repentant stand,” taught the rabbis, “the perfect righteous cannot stand.”⁵¹

Pagan ‘guilt’ has to do with ‘pollution’—not with ‘transgressions’ of the Law—human or divine. Therefore, it requires neither ‘knowledge’ nor ‘intention.’ Oedipus did not know that Queen Jocasta was his mother, or that King Laius was his father. “If Oedipus had been tried before an Athenian court,” explained Professor Dodds, “he would have been acquitted of murdering his father. But no human court could acquit him of pollution; for pollution inhered in the act itself, irrespective of motive.”⁵² Paul conceived of Adam’s sin, *not* in terms of Biblical theology, but of pagan lore: a tragic end befalling the hero in Greco-Roman lore. Therefore, in Paul’s mind, Adam’s guilt defiled his descents, for all time to come.

Tragic guilt thus takes shape in the constant clash between the ancient religious conception of the misdeed as a defilement attached to an entire race and inexorable transmitted from one generation to the next in the form of an *até* or madness sent by the god.⁵³

That is, precisely, Paul’s understanding of ‘original sin:’ it defiles the subject *against* his will. “For what I do not will, this I do. But what I hate, this I do” (*Rom* 7: 15). Because Paul conceived of sin in oedipal terms, he also conceived the God of Scripture as an oedipal father: implacable and unremitting, haunting this son and his descendants until the end of time.

May I suggest that the reason that Paul opted for oedipal *guilt* and oedipal *atonement* was autobiographical: a projection of his own father “in the flesh,” gestating deep inside his tormented mind.⁵⁴ Addressing himself to this sort of psychological phenomenon, Freud wrote in *Totem and Taboo*:

In the Christian myth the original sin was one against God the Father. If, however, Christ redeemed mankind from the burden of original sin by the sacrifice of his own life, we are driven to conclude that the sin was a murder. The law of *talion*, which is so deeply rooted in human feeling, lays it down that a murder can only be expiated by the sacrifice of another life: self-sacrifice points back to blood-guilt. And if this

⁴⁹ Thus, sin is not terminal and does not carry the overwhelming sense of helplessness peculiar to pagan guilt. Cf. Eric Fromm, *Escape from Freedom* (New York: Avon, 1969), pp. 193–194.

⁵⁰ Hebrew repentance is not a schizophrenic rupture with a transgression, but a *confrontation* and a new *representation* of sin. On the difference between “sin” in the Tora and “oedipal guilt” (and related topics), see Mordechai Rotenberg, “The ‘Midrash’ and Biographic Rehabilitation,” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 25 (1986), pp. 41–55. Cf. *Psalms* 51:15 and *MT Teshuba* 2:1. On the Greek concept of guilt, see *Greeks and the Irrational*, Chapter 2.

⁵¹ *Berakhot* 34b; see *MT Teshuba* 7:4.

⁵² E.R. Dodds, “On Misunderstanding Oedipus Rex,” in ed. Eric Segal, *Readings in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 183.

⁵³ *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*, p. 81.

⁵⁴ Therefore, unlike Biblical sin, Pauline guilt does not admit ‘repentance’—only catharsis, atonement and death in Jesus; cf. *Proverbs* 8:36.

sacrifice of a life brought about atonement with God the Father, the crime to be expiated can only have been the murder of the father.⁵⁵

In the course of developing his vision of Christianity, Paul transfigured the concept of the *diatheke* in the Jewish Septuagint, standing for “Law” and “covenant” (and the grounds for father-son reconciliation), into a term standing for “testament” taking effect *after* the father’s death. A major consequence of this choice was disallowing the efficacy of repentance, taught in the Tora, the Prophets, and the rabbis. According to the Tora, a son can always return to the father. A “testament”—whether ‘old’ or ‘new’—posits, as per oedipal guilt, the impossibility of the son returning to the Father’s bosom, for the simple reason that the Father is *dead*: out of the son’s existence! Instead of the Hebrew doctrine of “repentance,” instructing the sinner to *confront* his wrongdoings and *transform* them into a positive piece of instruction--determining not to succumb to that fault again--Paul demanded *catharsis*, a pagan mode of spiritual purgation, involving the vigorous evacuation of something noxious. The outcome is a schizophrenic rupture with the past, which, paradoxically, will prompt the “oedipal-son” to evolve into an “oedipal father,” and so on in perpetuity.⁵⁶

The ultimate bait in the realm of *metis* is a predator posing as helpless prey. Jewish survival is a function of the differentiation “predator/ prey.” (Anti-Semitism is the spontaneous reaction of the predator upon discovering that the intended prey did not succumb to the charms posed the bait). Within this context, I would like to propose that *Oedipus Rex* (in contradistinction to Sophocles’ full trilogy) portrays the most intense drama facing pagan humanity: ‘father-Laius/Oedipus-child’; whereby ‘loving father-Laius’ matures into brutal-Laius, and ‘innocent infant-Oedipus’ into monstrous-Oedipus. Thus taking place a peculiar type of metamorphosis facing pagan humanity: from birth into death.

3.-Wedding Widow Israel

According to Paul, father the God-Father of Israel was not only ‘dethroned,’ but He actually died and was replaced by the God-Son. The Passion encompasses three steps: [1] Oedipal-God-Father killing his Son; [2] Oedipal-God-Son resurrecting; [3] Oedipal-God-Son displacing the Oedipal-God-Father. Referring to this pivotal point in Christianity, Freud wrote in his *Totem and Taboo* that in this fashion the son accomplished his ultimate goal, “*against* the father [italics in original]. He himself became God, beside, or, more correctly, in place of the father.” Adding: “A son-religion displaced the father-religion.”⁵⁷

The Freudian interpretation of Jesus’ death involves two scenarios: one where Oedipal-Father kills Oedipal-Son; and a second scenario where Oedipal-Father dies and Oedipal-Son is enthroned in His. The scenarios interconnect: the second is the result of the first;

⁵⁵ S.E. 13: 154.

⁵⁶ See *Exodus* 20:5, 34:7, and *Berakhot* 7a. Banished by his father, Oedipus *becomes* the father, passing his guilt down on to his children, in perpetuity.

⁵⁷ S.E. 13: 14his 7.

the first is the outer layer of the second. In the first scenario, [1] God-Father kills Oedipal-Son as an expiatory sacrifice. In the second scenario, [2] God-Father dies as a consequence of [3] Oedipal-Son resurrection. In classical psychoanalysis, too, these scenarios interconnect.

Child sacrifice and infanticide were common in the heathen world, but fiercely opposed by the prophets of Israel. “The increasing resistance to killing one’s own child,” it had been explained, “created the wish that another child should die in his place.” Eventually, “This led to the widespread ancient custom that the King’s son should be sacrificed as a *vicarious sacrifice* [italics in original] for the community.”⁵⁸

This model stands at the foundation of Christian Scripture, where Oedipal-God-Father slaughters innocent-infant-son in sacrificial atonement. A variation of the oedipal motif, foreshadowing the Passion, is the story of King Herod’s (37-4 B.C.E.) attempt to kill infant Jesus. As a man, Herod represents the Oedipal-Father yielding to the impulse to kill his son; as a king, Herod foreshadowed the Passion, where God sacrifices his only son (infant Jesus). The miraculous-Passion requires a real *death* (thus making *resurrection* real).⁵⁹ The second scenario is Paul’s brainchild. Suddenly, Oedipal-Son resurrects! As a direct-effect of this miraculous event, Oedipal-God-Father dies and he is replaced by Oedipal-Son-God!

The code-term, upon which the entire edifice of Pauline’s theological apparatus stands, is the Greek term *diatheke*. Originally, it meant ‘agreement,’ ‘covenant,’ as in Aristophanes’ *The Birds* (l. 439). In this specific sense it was used in the Jewish Septuagint to translate the Hebrew *berit*, “covenant.”⁶⁰ Similarly, in *1Maccabees* (1:57, 63) it is regularly used for “Law,” given that the Jewish Law rests on a bilateral *berit* (“covenant”) contracted by God and Israel. Later, in Hellenistic literature and speech, *diatheke* underwent a semantic change and came to mean ‘last will’ and ‘testament.’ In this latter sense, it is exclusively used in the Christian Scripture and rabbinic literature.⁶¹ Paul took advantage of the semantic change ‘covenant--> last will’ and went on to interpret *diatheke* (as was used earlier in the Septuagint) as ‘last will.’ On the basis of this semantic change, Paul proposed that the Christian Scripture is a ‘new *diatheke*- last will’ made by the dying God of the Jews.⁶² Alluding to the right of a testator to annul his last

⁵⁸ Erich Wellisch, *Isaac and Oedipus* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954), p. 27. Cf. *ibid*, pp. 9-30.

⁵⁹ See Robert A. Paul, “Symbolic Interpretation in Psychoanalysis and Anthropology,” *Ethos* (1980), p. 292.

⁶⁰ See James H. Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London: Erdmann’s, 1952), p. 148. Cf. W. F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 183. Because Christian theologians assumed that the Hebrew *berit* stands for a unilateral “covenant” imposed by God (in the fashion of pagan deities), Greek lexicographers failed to grasp the sense of ‘agreement’ and ‘accord’ peculiar to the term *diatheke* in the Jewish Septuagint.

⁶¹ See Daniel Sperber, *A Dictionary of Greek and Latin Legal Terms* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1984), pp. 84-86.

⁶² Some Christian translators and commentators, shocked by the implications of *diatheke*-testament when applied to God, interpreted this term for ‘alliance’--although the context involves ‘inheritance’ and ‘last will,’ rather than ‘covenant.’ It is highly significant that Greek Lexicographers did not point out to the fact that the Septuagint used this term *exclusively* in the sense of ‘covenant,’ ‘accord,’ whereas Paul used it *exclusively* in the sense of ‘last will.’

will and issue a new one, Paul argued that the Christian Scripture is a “New Testament-*diatheke*” issued by the God-Father. Thereby, annulling, the ‘Old-*diatheke*’ of the Jews. On the basis of an evidence that Paul did not care to divulge, he declared that he was the “minister” in charge of administering “the new *diatheke*” (2*Corinthians* 3:6).⁶³ Elsewhere, however, Paul proposed that Jesus was the “negotiator” (*mesites*) of a new last-will. On the basis of this sort of logic, Paul assumed to have demonstrated: “Tora → ‘testament → ‘old-last-will,’” Equal: “Jesus → ‘new-testament → ‘new-last-will.’” Accordingly, the ‘old-testament’ was revoked and a ‘new-testament’ had been established: simultaneously!

There are two points that merit consideration. First, it would appear disingenuous to ascribe to the term *diatheke* in the *Jewish* Septuagint the meaning ‘last will,’ as per its *later* usage in the *Christian* Scripture, given that the original text of the Scripture is Hebrew—not Greek! At this point we must recall Paul’s personal aversion to the *Hebrew* text, which in his mind had been “blotted out” by Jesus’ blood spilled on the cross.⁶⁴ There are no indications that Paul could read Hebrew, or that he had access to the original text of the Scripture through a teacher or friend.⁶⁵ Let us note that the “Father” which Paul refers had nothing in common with the Jewish Scripture (in the original Hebrew or in the Greek Septuagint). Rather, he is one and the same with the pagan paterfamilias—the only one that Paul actually knew: cunning and malevolent! Against whom all means are proper, including deception! This may explain why he did not hesitate to abuse the trust of a public that could not possibly know that the term *diatheke* in the *Jewish* Septuagint stood for ‘covenant’--not ‘last will’!

The second point is a bit thornier. “*Diatheke*-last-will takes effect *after* the testator’s death, having no operational effect *before* his death! Therefore, essential to Paul’s argument is Marcion’s (c. 110-160) doctrine that the God of the Hebrew Scripture is a demiurge, enemy of humanity, who perished as a consequence of Jesus’ resurrection. Without this doctrine, Paul’s argument about ‘a new-last-will’ does not cohere! To be operative, an absolute condition for a ‘new testament-*diatheke*’ is the testator’s death. In Paul’s case: the death of the God of Sinai, Creator of Heavens and Earth!⁶⁶ A strategic passage (*Hebrews* 9:15–17), “explains” how upon the death of the testator, the beneficiaries of the new *diatheke* were summoned to take possession of their everlasting inheritance:

⁶³On this pivotal point, see the penetrating remarks by Professor Boaz Cohen, “Letter and Spirit in Jewish and Roman Law,” in his *Jewish and Roman Law*, vol. 1 (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1966), pp. 33–35.

⁶⁴See above n. 60. The rabbis noted and answered this argument; see *Jewish and Roman Law*, vol. 1, pp. 34–35.

⁶⁵ Consequently, he never made reference to the Hebrew text of the Scripture.

⁶⁶ On the death of gods in general anthropology, see James George Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, part IV, 2 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1951). The death of the god-father is a fundamental doctrine in the theology of Marcion. For a summary of his views, see George Foot Moore, *History of Religions*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920), p. 155. For a detailed discussion of his principal doctrines, see Abraham Joshua Heschel, *The Prophets* (New York: Burning Bush Press, 1962), pp. 299–306; and Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), pp. 130–146, 163.

And because of this, he [Jesus] is a negotiator (*mesites*) of a new *diatheke*, so that death having occurred for redemption of transgressions under the first *diatheke*, those having called out might receive the promise of the everlasting inheritance. For where a *diatheke* is, death must take place of him who willed (*diathemenon*) a *diatheke*, since it never has force when the testator is living.⁶⁷

Christian commentators explained that the testator's death was accomplished vicariously through Jesus' death. This interpretation makes no sense! *Mesites* is the *executor* of the inheritance, and was appointed by the testator for the explicit purpose to carry out his directions! Therefore, he must be situated *outside* the perimeter of either the testator or beneficiaries, both according to law and according to common sense. If Jesus in function of *mesites* died *in place* of the testator, then the *diatheke* would have been invalid and Jesus' task as a *mesites* would have remained unfulfilled! Therefore, Paul's argument was that the testator—God of Israel, Creator of Heavens and Earth—died! And thereupon, Jesus took over as “the *mesites* of a better *diatheke*” (*Hebrews* 8:6). In essence, this is one and the same argument made by Marcion: the God of the Hebrew Scripture *died* simultaneously with Jesus' resurrection! True, the Church declared Marcion a heretic, and labored tirelessly to demonstrate that his doctrines were contrary to Christian faith. And yet, all the rhetoric of the world cannot change a simple fact: no court would recognize the validity of a last-will unless the testator's death had been duly acknowledged!

There was a significant consequence to the doctrine advanced by Paul (*Romans* 7:1–4). When attempting to explain why Jews were no longer bound to observe the Tora, Paul compared the people of Israel to a widow—an obvious reference to *Lamentations* 1:1.⁶⁸ The gist of his argument is that since Israel's husband had died, she was no longer bound to Him. Therefore, Paul concluded that Israel should now wed “the one rose from the dead,” i.e., her husband's presumptive son!

Or are you ignorant, brothers—for I speak to those knowing the Law [*nomos*, i.e., the Tora]—that the Law [*nomos*, i.e., the Tora] rules over the man for as long a time as he may live? For the married woman was bound by law [*nomos*, i.e., the Tora] to the living husband, but if the husband dies she is set free from the law [*nomos*, i.e., the Tora] of the husband. So then, if the husband is living she will be called an adulteress if she becomes another man's. But if the husband dies she is free from the law, so as for her not to be an adulteress by becoming another man's wife. So that, my brothers, you also were made dead to the Law through the body of Christ, for you to become another's to the one rose from the dead, so that we may bear fruit to God. *Romans* (7:1–4)

A revolting argument! The plain meaning of Paul's reasoning is that although Israel was previously bound to God, as a wife is bound to her husband, she is now free to marry her husband's son given that her husband had been declared dead! Responding to this abomination, R. Saul Levi Mortera (c. 1596-1660) wrote:

⁶⁷ It seems that the *Epistle to the Hebrews* was composed by one of Paul's disciples, and not by Paul himself.

⁶⁸ To counter this position, the rabbis, *Midrash Ekha*, pointed out that the Scripture (*Lamentations* 1:1) said that Israel “was *like* a widow –not a widow!”

Has anyone seen such a profanity and chimeras so that Israel contracting to the Law of marriage with the father, or with his son, or with both together...⁶⁹

Paul's audience was not literate! As with all those ideologues convinced that the end justifies the means, "that man [Paul] took advantage of the people."⁷⁰ That is why, he would only address "illiterate men" (עַם הָאֲרֵץ) who would accept his distortions of Scripture.

...Paul abused the credulity of the people, to whom he would quote these texts [of Scripture], assuming that since they were illiterate (=עַם הָאֲרֵץ) and believed what they heard, without looking at the (text of) Scripture, and the contextual meaning of these verses...⁷¹

In simple words: according to Pauline theology, Israel, in quality of widow, was [like all other widows] a wretch creature. However, upon her refusal to wed Jesus--her defunct God-husband's son—and "bear the fruit to God," Israel was contemptible! Let us repeat Paul's argument: the only means for widow-Israel to gain 'salvation' is by marrying her husband-son! In Paul's mind, Israel's refusal to commit such an abomination is beyond redemption! Crucial to Paul's argument (and subsequent Christianity) is that by refusing to wed her husband's son Israel is responsible for rendering Jesus' mission unfulfilled. In classical counter-oedipal fashion, Paul interpreted Jesus' crucifixion *by* the Romans, as the actual murdering of Jesus *by* the Jews! Given that said "Son-Messiah," was also their "Father-King," Jews were also guilty of the primeval oedipal crime of patricide: beyond redemption and beyond atonement!

A marginal note: the accusation of deicide served to displace the guilt from Jesus-Son for having removed the "Father" [nonetheless cf. *Pater Noster* "Our Father that Art in Heaven" by Jesus' not Paul's disciples!] and Paul's displacing the onus onto "the Jews." Put in Freudian terminology: a son's symbolic murder of the father may be redeemed when the mother accepts the son as her rightful consort. The same is with Pauline anti-Semitic "theology": Israel's refusal to accept "the Son" as her lawful groom has rendered Israel beastly and loathsome!⁷²

In *Romans* (7: 3-4), Paul introduced a new argument: Israel died vicariously with Jesus, and is therefore no longer bound to the Law.⁷³ Some extended this to mean that "the

⁶⁹ R. Saul Levi Mortera, *Obstáculos y Oposiciones Contra la Religión Xptiana* (Amsterdam, 5472/1712), ms. EH 48D 38, (Jerusalem: Hebrew University), 142a. Our translation. Cf. the quotation, above n. 23.

⁷⁰ *Obstáculos y Oposiciones Contra la Religión Xptiana*, 169a. See the quotation cited in *Horizontal Society*, Section III, n. 224.

⁷¹ *Obstáculos y Oposiciones Contra la Religión Xptiana*, 167a.

⁷² While rendering at the same time, Jesus' Passion to be an oedipal agony. Unresolved libidinal attachment to the mother is expressed in the cult of Mary. She, too, acted as an "intermediary" and "intercessor" with "the father." This role is particularly important among southern Italian families, exhibiting the "typical Mediterranean pattern," where sons are unable to transfer their libidinal attachments to their mothers; see Anne Parsons, *Belief, Magic, and Anomie* (New York: Free Press, 1969), pp. 135–150. Obviously, it actually pertains to the Madonna's cult; see *ibid.* pp. 95–96, 274–275.

⁷³ This is the source for depicting Israel as dejected and accursed--a portrait with tragic consequences in the long history of Christian anti-Semitism! The idea that Israel is a "widow," bewildered some Christian

Jews” had *actually* died; therefore, no longer having the right to life and property! Others added that Jews were not only dead but also deadly! An updated version, bearing a similar message was offered by Arnold Toynbee (1889-1975): the Jewish people are a “fossil.”⁷⁴ This should exonerate any and all anti-Jewish measures—you can neither kill a corpse nor steal from it!

4.-Oedipal Theology

The oedipal dimension of Paul’s theology is evident: the Hebrew Scripture stands for *Law* and *paternal* authority. According to Paul the God-Father *must* be substituted by the Son-God; and the Law, representing paternal authority, *must* be substituted by Love. The Son’s authority, however, could be validated only if the mother would accept the Son in incestuous-wedlock. In simple terms: if Israel would have accepted the Son as her rightful husband, then the demise of the Father would have been justified. As it stands, Israel’s refusal to accept the Son as her rightful consort (in place of the Father) must be interpreted as perfidious act. Therefore, oedipal guilt must be displaced (from the Son) and *imputed* onto Wife-Israel.⁷⁵

The symbolic elimination of the father’s role is explicit in the denial of the physical paternity of Jesus. It has been observed that “the father-denial ideology” is oedipal: “He is not killed; he is defined out of existence as far as his children are concerned.” Underlying this idea is the claim that the “mother” was actually “impregnated by a spirit of the totem.” In this fashion, the father is “castrated, rendered ineffective, defined away.”⁷⁶ Anthropologically, this is an “act of symbolic patricide.”⁷⁷ It serves to express the son’s deep hostility, “directed against the father in his role not as a pater, but as a progenitor.”⁷⁸ Concerning the son’s rejection of the role of his father as biological genitor, it has been explained:

That a son should wish to reject knowledge of the fact that his father is his genitor is not, of course, a strange notion in the annals of child development. One explanation for this frequently found wish is based on the assumption—derived from psycho-analytic theory, and supported by a great deal of empirical evidence—that fathers are both loved and hated, and that the latter emotion derives from one or both of the following conditions: resentment over their punitive authority, and or jealous rivalry for the love (sexual and/or affectionate) of the mother. But hatred of the father leads to a typical oedipal conflict. On the one hand, the child, motivated by resentment or by rivalry, wishes to harm, to be rid, of the father. On the other hand, whether from a *talion* fear (“I want to harm him, therefore he wants to harm me”) or from guilt (“Since he loves me and or since I love him, how can I wish to harm him?”) this wish is extremely painful. In the absence of institutional or cultural assistance in dealing with this conflict, the child must cope with it by his own internal resources, of which I shall mention only two. He can *repress* his hatred, which is the typical (and normal) technique found in Western society, or he can express it symbolically by *denying* in

theologians; see Ernst Kasemann, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1973), pp. 176-181.

⁷⁴ See *Horizontal Society*, Section IV, n. 90.

⁷⁵ See below n. 79.

⁷⁶ Robin Fox, *The Red Lamp of Incest* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1980), pp. 70–71.

⁷⁷ Ernst Jones, “Mother-Right and the Sexual Ignorance of Savages,” *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 6 (1925), pp. 129–130.

⁷⁸ Milford E. Spiro, *Oedipus in the Trobriand* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), p. 65.

fantasy that his father is a genitor. (The latter is often accomplished, both in private fantasy as well as in hero myths, by the substitution of grandiose fathers—gods, kings, and so on— for the real father.) Sometimes, it should be added, rather than denying that his father is genitor, the child denies that he had any genitor.⁷⁹ [Italics in the original]

The Oedipus myth had a nuclear value in the formation of the religious life and ideas of the pagan world, a point thoroughly examined by Theodor Reik (1888-1970). Christianity, of all the major religions, succeeded in best synthesizing the psychic constellations of impulses and conflicts of the Greek and Roman societies—a source of its great appeal in pagan humanity. Cautiously hinting at the impact of the Oedipus myth on Christianity, Reik wrote:

I do not know how far I have succeeded in giving the reader of the foregoing pages a notion of the great importance of the Oedipus myth in the religious life of the Greeks, and of the close and cryptic relation of the performance of the *Oedipus* to the religious ritual of Hellas. The profound and lasting influence of the Oedipus legend in antiquity must, I believe, be ascribed to the religious motive which revealed the instinctual life of men in conflict with the laws of the gods. For here, as in the Dionysian games, and the ritual of Attis, Adonis, and Osiris, a young revolutionary savior was represented, rebelling against the old and powerful father-god and suffering a terrible punishment for his offense. I believe the influence of these performances may be compared with that of the ecclesiastical Passion play on the faithful of the Middle Ages, for it depended on the same psychic precedents. The prehistory of Christ is not unlike that of Oedipus. It should be emphasized that in the Oedipus myth, as we now have it, the profoundest psychic motives, which led to the formation of religion, though unrecognized by the auditors, were nonetheless plastically represented, and that here an unconscious sense of guilt was evoked.⁸⁰

Let us point out in this connection that the central topic of *Oedipus Rex* is rebellion against authority.⁸¹

Thanks to the triumph of Christianity, the father continued to exercise “heroic authority” until relatively recent times. (Rank writes that patriarchal ideology collapsed with the end of imperialism in World War I). Bronislaw Malinowski (1884-1942) described this kind of father as the “absolute ruler of the family,” “the source of authority,” and “the origin of punishment.” In families of lower economic income, the father was brutal and sadistic:

When a father returns home tired from work, or drunk from the inn, he naturally vents his ill-temper on the family, and bullies mother and children. There is no village, no poor quarter in a modern town, where cases could not be found of sheer, patriarchal cruelty. From my own memory, I could quote numerous cases where peasant fathers would, on returning home drunk, beat the children for sheer pleasure, or drag them out of bed and send them into the cold night.⁸²

⁷⁹ Milford E. Spiro, “Virgin Birth, Parthenogenesis and Physiological Paternity: An Essay in Cultural Interpretation,” *Man* 3 (1968), p. 256.

⁸⁰ Theodor Reik, “Oedipus and the Sphinx,” in eds. George H. Pollock and John Maunder Ross, *Oedipus Papers* (Madison, Conn.: International Universities Press, 1988), p. 61. For a full treatment of the subject, see *ibid.* pp. 21-65.

⁸¹ See Eric Fromm, “The Oedipus Complex and the Oedipus Myth,” in ed. Ruth Nanda Ashen, *The Family: Its Function and Destiny* (New York: Harper, 1959), pp. 424–426, 445–448.

⁸² Bronislaw Malinowski, *Sex and Repression in Savage Society*, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953), p. 29.

One could well argue that the behavior described by Malinowski is less than typical, and it does not exemplify the Western father. Also, the father's harsh treatment of the son may have been motivated by the son's oedipal rivalry.⁸³ Be that as it may, the absolute authority exercised by fathers in Western tradition, resulted in a profound resentment by the sons, as well as augmented sympathy and love toward their mothers—two key elements of the oedipal model. The final effect was a “guilt culture”—that is, a society obsessed with obtaining atonement for an “archaic sense of guilt.” Let us note, in passing, that short of atonement, guilt feeling, as anger turning inward, can be temporarily alleviated by finding a scapegoat upon which to vent anger outwardly.⁸⁴ With the advent of Christianity came the possibility, as in any religion, for a defensive or demonic deployment of its tenets. Such deployment became the basis for a culturally constituted ‘religious’ behavior. In this context, anti-Semitism may be perceived as a culturally constituted defense, designed to gratify the oedipal impulses of society and thereby protect it from disruptive, antisocial behavior.⁸⁵ As with all culturally sanctioned myths, the individual does not feel any moral or psychological responsibility for acting out those fantasies. Indeed, persecution of Jews may be regarded as one of those cultural mechanisms designed to drain off hostile emotions.⁸⁶ The fact that the Jew would be burned wrapped in the scroll of the Tora shows the close, intimate relation between the Jew and the Law in the eyes of the Romans.⁸⁷

In the Greco-Roman world and heroic societies in general, Jews were perceived as the representatives of the God-Father *on earth*. Therefore, they were hated and murdered for the same reason that Brutus (c. 85-42 BCE) raged against Julius Caesar (d. 44 BCE) and killed him.

5.-Mitigating Oedipal Tension

The oedipal complex is subject to cross-cultural variability. In Judaism, oedipal resolutions are expressed in favor of renunciation, sublimation, and the acceptance of the Law representing the Father's authority.⁸⁸ Various cultural factors contributed to this

⁸³ See *Sex and Repression in Savage Society*, p. 27, n. 1; and *Oedipus in the Trobriand*, pp. 36–37.

⁸⁴ This may help us understand the function of anti-Semitism and persecution of disagreeable minorities, peculiar to totalitarian systems.

⁸⁵ In a different context, Milford Spiro, “Religious Systems as Culturally Constituted Defense Mechanisms,” in ed. Milford E. Spiro, *Context and Meaning in Cultural Anthropology* (New York: Free Press, 1965), p. 113, wrote: “In societies in which religious behavior is appropriate to, rather than disruptive of, the behavioral environment of the actors, and in which a religious world view is consistent with, rather than a distortion of, ‘reality,’ religion serves as a highly constituted defense mechanism.”

⁸⁶ On this type of psychological mechanism, see Milford Spiro, “An Overview and a Suggested Reorientation,” in ed. Francis L. K. Hsu, *Psychological Anthropology* (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1961), pp. 486–487.

⁸⁷ See *Golden Doves*, pp. 4–6.

⁸⁸ See Dorothy F. Zelig, *Psychoanalysis and the Bible* (New York: Human Sciences, 1988), pp. xviii, xxiii, 311–314.

outcome. In Israel this approach was possible because the Law (unlike other political and or religious systems) was not *imposed*; but, was *negotiated horizontally*, with mutual consent, in a *berit* (=the *diatheke* of the Jewish Septuagint) between God and the people of Israel. The Law-*berit* (=the *diatheke* of the Jewish Septuagint) embraces every Jew, establishing, thus, a *horizontal* relation between the negotiating parties: God, the Father and His son, the Nation of Israel.⁸⁹

Freud observed that “the authority of the father or the parents is interjected into the ego, and there it forms the nucleus of the super-ego, which takes over the severity of the father and perpetuates his prohibition against incest.”⁹⁰ Because in Jewish thought authority rests in the *covenantal Law* and not in the *person* of the father, hostility is significantly reduced. The father, in exercising his authority is an instrument of the Law: would he order his son to break the Law, he is not to be obeyed.⁹¹ Moreover, the father’s authority is not always superior to that of the mother. The child must honor his father first because—as a *consequence of the matrimonial bond*—the mother, too, owes respect to the father. However, if they divorce, it is up to the son to choose whom he wishes to honor first.⁹²

Unlike the Oedipus myth dealing with the hostility father-son, in the Biblical ‘*Aqeda* (or “Binding,” where Abraham binds his son Isaac, as a sacrifice in honor of God, *Gn 22:1–9*)—neither father nor son are killed.⁹³ Rather, the ‘*Aqeda* shows how the discovery of the Law leads to conscience formation and a successful resolution of oedipal hostility. Abraham is restrained by a Law which stands above both father and child. From “the delusion of parental omnipotence,” the child passes into the discovery of a moral father and a supreme Law. Concerning the radical passage, from father “regulator” to “exemplar,” Richard Kaufman noted:

The wishes to displace, succeed, or imitate the father can be superseded by an acceptance, respect, and cultivation of the father’s values, standards, goals, morals, and those of the parental generation. Father’s values, the child can recognize, have an existence apart from father. There is a change of function of father image from regulator to exemplar. The child can see the parent demonstrate the positive implications of placing morality and justice superordinate to power and brute strength. The father who acts becomes the father who is acted on and, ultimately, the father who acts upon himself. Finally, to the image of the ideal father is added the image of the father as a man *with* ideas. The dreaded oedipal father becomes the post-oedipal father and his heritage.⁹⁴ [*Italics in original*]

⁸⁹ See my (), vol.

⁹⁰ *S.E.* 19: 176.

⁹¹ *MT Mamrim* 6:14.

⁹² See *Qiddushin* 31a; *MT Mamrim* 6:14, and Radbaz *ad loc.* The thesis defended here is that Judaism is more in accord with the ideal of oedipal resolution. It is likely, however, that in religious families there may be some emphasis on what Lacan calls “the law,” or in the “Name of the Father,” thus mitigating the father-son hostility; see George Devereux, *Basic Problems of Ethno-psychiatry* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980), pp. 98-99. However, “religion” by itself, will not prevent or help cure a mental illness associated with the oedipal conflicts.

⁹³ This point has been overlooked by writers attempting to interpret the ‘*Aqeda* in Christological terms; see *Isaac and Oedipus*, pp. 70–71. Cf. “Symbolic Interpretation in Psychoanalysis and Anthropology,” p. 290.

⁹⁴ Richard Kaufman, “Oedipal Object Relations and Morality,” *Annual of Psychoanalysis* 11 (1982), p. 253.

Abraham succeeded in attaining a measure of reconciliation with his father.⁹⁵ By contrast, Oedipus ended up killing his father. Quoting Kaufman again:

There is a salient distinction between Abraham and Oedipus. Abraham dealt with his father. At the crossroads, Oedipus *became* his father, a vengeful, hateful, impulsive man. There was no atonement, no repentance, and nor reconciliation. When caught for his crime, Oedipus turned on himself in an outburst of rage--with the same unforgiving wrath that destroyed Laius--a wrath that now typified his own superego. Through Oedipus's own superego, Laius achieved a posthumous victory. What father inflicted on the son was repeated by the son upon himself: mutilation and exile.⁹⁶

In Jewish tradition, the son secures sacred and inviolable rights by accepting the *Law-berit*. In this fashion, parental authority, as a source of rivalry, is mitigated.⁹⁷ By way of contrast, in societies in which the father-son conflict is not successfully resolved, there is a need for constant repression. This point had been noted by Spiro:

...in societies in which unconscious Oedipal conflicts require persistent repression for their containment, the Oedipus complex may undergo structural transformations as a result of defensively motivated projections and displacements, which importantly affect other social relationships and institutions.⁹⁸

Finally, we must consider the legislation against all forms of incest in the Hebrew Scripture--the only system of its kind in ancient legal codes--as a factor in the containment of oedipal conflicts.

Before recognizing God as the Father of Israel, an individual must be part of Patriarch Abraham's household. Circumcision is the symbolic act by which the new born is induced into the household of Patriarch Abraham. Thus, at the circumcision ceremony, the father of the new born child gives thanks to God, "for having enjoined us to have him [the child], partake into the covenant of our Patriarch Abraham." The same is with a neophyte incorporating into the nation of Israel: circumcision is the formal induction of the "newborn" into the household of Patriarch Abraham. As it was explained by Maimonides, the ceremony by which a neophyte is induced to Judaism, too, must include the prayer, "Our God and the God of our Fathers, since Patriarch Abraham is *your* father--and [the father] of all those who join Israel."⁹⁹

⁹⁵ According to the rabbis, Abraham's father repented. See *Gn* 15:15, where God assures Abraham, "You shall come to your fathers in peace," i.e., that he shall die peacefully. Let us note that when the time came to find a wife for his son Isaac, Abraham instructed his servant to search for a spouse from among, "my family" (*Gen* 24:4)

⁹⁶ "Oedipal Object Relations and Morality," *Annual of Psychoanalysis* 11 (1982), p. 250. The 'binding' symbolizes castration; see George Devereux, "The Self-Blinding of Oidipous in Sophokles: *Oidipus Tyrannos*," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 93 (1973), pp. 36-49.

⁹⁷ This may explain why rejection of the Law among Jewish secular parents, results in the development of acute oedipal resentment, leading to the eventual dissolution of the family.

⁹⁸ *Oedipus in the Trobriand*, pp. 172-173.

⁹⁹ *Letters and Essays of Maimonides* (Heb.), vol. 1, p. 234. Cf. his *Perush ha-Mishnayot*, on *Bikkurim* 1:4, vol. 1, p. 417; *MT Bikkurim* 4:3; *Homo Mysticus*, pp. 127-131.

Paul did not have good manners. Thus he did not have the foggiest idea of what does it mean to be a family member (Jewish or gentile), and least of all to integrate into Patriarch Abraham's *household* (=bet Abraham). He imagined that circumcision was merely an aid to bring sexual impulses under control; and therefore declared: "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing" (*Galileans* 5:2). Thus, instead of choosing Patriarch Abraham, Paul ended up choosing the pagan paterfamilias. With a major consequence: members of Patriarch Abraham's household can always return home; children banished from the paterfamilias end up in "mutilation and exile."¹⁰⁰

6.-"Sold Under Sin"

Paul could not control his "fleshy" impulses. "For we know that the law [*nomos*=Tora] is spiritual, and I am fleshly, having been sold under sin. For what I work out, I do not know. For what I do not will, this I do. But what I hate, this I do" (*Romans* 7:14-15). We can only speculate about the nature of Paul's inability to control his "fleshy" desires. However, that much we know. In addition to the spiritual '*nomos*/Tora,' he confessed to be under the rule of the carnal/*nomos*, controlling every limb of his "fleshy" self or second *nomos*. "For I delight in the law [*nomos*=Tora] of God according to the inward man; but I see another law [*nomos*] in my members warring against the law [*nomos*=Tora] of my mind, and taking me captive by the law [*nomos*] of sin being in my members" (*Romans* 7:22-23). The 'war' to which Paul was alluding is the faculty (=image of God within) awarding every men and women to choose between good and evil. It is by virtue of this faculty that a human is different than a beast. "A beast has no evil impulse" (יצר הרע)--taught the rabbis;¹⁰¹ therefore, it could not have a good impulse (יצר הטוב).¹⁰² Essential to Judaism (and contrary to Paul), is that having been endowed with the image of God, meant that humans have the faculty to bring these conflicting impulses under control and choose "life" (see *Deuteronomy* 30:19). Accordingly, the rabbis explained that the true "governors" (*mosheleim*) are those individuals that know how to "govern" themselves.¹⁰³ The study of Tora can be a helping factor in this struggle.¹⁰⁴ However, to be effective, the study of Tora must be accompanied by "acts of loving kindness" toward others.¹⁰⁵ "Someone who is engaged in the (study of) Tora for its own sake," that is, with the intention to fulfill it, "his Tora would be for him an elixir of life."¹⁰⁶ Such individual, not only will be able to bring his evil impulses under control,

¹⁰⁰ See above nn. 62, 66.

¹⁰¹ *Abot de-R. Nathan* XVIIA, p. 64.

¹⁰² *Berakhot* 5a. In Judaism, good and evil are syntagmatic impulses and concepts. When weighing such an option, "An individual should always have his good impulse (יצר הטוב) be 'annoyed' at his evil impulse (יצר הרע)."

¹⁰³ See *Proverbs* 16:32; *Baba Batra* 78b.

¹⁰⁴ See *Baba Batra* 16a, etc.

¹⁰⁵ *Aboda Zara* 5b.

¹⁰⁶ *Ta'aniyot* 7a. A similar view was expressed in *Yerushalmi Shabbat* I, 2, 3b: "One that studies (Tora) to fulfill it—not (one) that studies Tora not to fulfill it. Because one that studies (Tora) not to fulfill it, it would be better for him had he not been born."

but also, to transform them into something positive.¹⁰⁷ However, “someone engaging in Tora not for its own sake,” that is, without the intention to fulfill it, the Tora that he studies “would be for him a deadly poison.”¹⁰⁸ Indeed, unless an individual dedicates himself to the *practice* of benevolence, he would not be able to experience the God of Israel. That is why, “Whoever occupies himself only with Tora (without acts of love and kindness), is equal to someone having no God.”¹⁰⁹

Eric Fromm observed that failure to exercise freedom of choice is a matter of character.

Freedom of choice is not a formal, abstract capacity which one either ‘has’ or ‘has not’; it is, rather, a function of a person’s character. Some people have no freedom to choose the good because their character structure has lost the capacity to act in accordance with the good.¹¹⁰

Freedom of choice entails *responsibility*. “If your evil impulse were to say to you: Sin and God will forgive you! Don’t believe it.”¹¹¹ Paul denied responsibility: “But if I do what I do not desire, it is not longer I working it out, but sin dwelling in me” (*Romans* 7:21; hence the need of intercession cf. *ibid.* 8: 3, 34 as per pagan political system). According to the rabbis, someone entrenched in evil, claiming to have been “sold under sin” (*Romans* 7:14) has forfeited the image of God within and equals a corpse. “The wicked, while [biologically] alive are dead.”¹¹² Echoing this doctrine, Paul cried: “Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” (*Romans* 7:24). Because Paul refused to assume responsibility for his own thoughts and behavior, he sought to excuse himself by laying down the fault outside himself. Concerning Paul’s state of mind, a distinguished psychiatrist explained:

Because it often appears as something unconscious that is independent of, and often counter to, my conscious intentions, it is experienced as something happening outside of me. That is the demons. As Paul says, they cause me not to do the good that I would do and to carry out the evil that I would not (*Romans* 7:19). Since they often thwart my will, I experience them as alien to my ego.¹¹³

Paul did not have the foggiest notion of the Biblical idea of sin. He only knew pagan guilt and was ensnared by it.¹¹⁴ Thus, he could pin fault on others, but he could not look within himself: *metis* forbids the prey to look inside the trap, only outside. To justify his behavior, Paul declared that “Christ is the end of law [=Tora], for righteousness is to everyone that believes” (*Romans* 10:4); i.e., behavior and personal activities are inconsequential! That is why, in Paul’s mind, ‘faith’ alone—not behavior—is enough for

¹⁰⁷ See *Sukka* 52a and *Abot de-R. Nathan* XVI, A, p. 64.

¹⁰⁸ *Ta’anivot* 7a. A similar view is expressed in *Yerushalmi Shabbat* I, 2, 3b: “One that studies (Tora) to fulfill it—but not someone studying Tora with no intention to fulfill it! Because, if someone studies (Tora) with no the intention to fulfill it, it would be better for him not to have been born.” See following note.

¹⁰⁹ *Aboda Zara* 17b.

¹¹⁰ Eric Fromm, *Heart of Man* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), p. 168.

¹¹¹ *Hagiga* 16a. Cf. *Baba Qamma* 50a.

¹¹² *Berakhot* 18a. Cf. *MT Teshuba* 6:3, and *Homo Mysticus*, p. 127.

¹¹³ *Demons of the Inner World*, p. 192.

¹¹⁴ Cf. above n. 35.

salvation (see *Romans* 1:17; 3:20-28; 4: 15-16; 10:9-10, 13; *Galileans* 5:5; *1Peter* 5:9-10; *John* 6:27-29).

A significant point: Paul proposed that Jesus violent death atones for people too lax to look inwardly and assume responsibility. Therefore, he declared that Jesus “gave Himself on our behalf” (*Titus* 2:14, see *Romans* 3:25; *Galileans* 1:4). Instead of following the advice of the Tora, the Prophets and Sages of Israel, and pursue the path of *teshuba* (“repentance”), Paul chose to escape accountability by taking refuge in Jesus (see *Romans* 7:25). With this purpose in mind, he claimed that there is “no condemnation to those” in Jesus (*Romans* 8:1), since they are “free from the law of sin and of death” (*Romans* 8:2). However, there is nothing in Jesus’ words, as transmitted by *his* disciples, indicating that he would have consented to be used as a pretext for people too sluggish to exercise self-control and follow the Law!

Paul’s theological notions bore four major consequences:

1.-A total rupture with the *Law* of Israel, the *people* of Israel, and the *God* of Israel. Aptly put by Nietzsche (1844-1900): *Deus, qualem Paulus creavit, Dei negatio*. (“The God that was created by Paul is the negation of God”).¹¹⁵

2.-A total rupture with the Ebionites, Jesus’ original disciples of Jewish stock. We can now understand why the Ebionites regarded Paul to be Jesus’ arch-enemy. Later, for matters having nothing to do with either the person of Jesus or his teachings, the Church chose Paul *over* Jesus’ actual disciples, and declared the Ebionites to be “heretics.”¹¹⁶ This may be the reason why in late Coptic dialect, *ebien* (from Heb. *ebyon*) came to mean ‘bad,’ ‘evil.’ Thus, the *Catholic Encyclopedia* defines the Ebionites, as “one or more early Christian sects *infected* [our italics] with Judaistic errors.”¹¹⁷

3.-The 12th benediction instituted in the Hebrew daily prayer against the *minim*, is a reference to those Jews who like the Nazarites and Ebionites believed that Jesus was a [or *the*] messiah. They were banned from the Synagogue, not because of their creed, but *because* they were in the habit of *disrupting* the services.

4.-The clause “do not be of *hope*” in the Hebrew Prayer ¹¹⁸ is a reference to *Jeremiah* 31:16.¹¹⁹ The point of this clause is that the hope of the Ebionites will remain unfulfilled. The fact that in the end, the Church excommunicated the Judeo-Christian followers of Jesus, illustrates with eerily precision the words of the rabbis: they ended up losing ‘hope,’ both among Jews and among Christians!¹²⁰

¹¹⁵ Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Anti-Christ* (Cosimo Edition, 2005), Section (= Aphorism #) 47.

¹¹⁶ See Eusebius, *History of the Church* (Penguin Books, 1965), #27, pp. 136-137.

¹¹⁷ J. P. Arendzen, “Ebionites,” *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 5, p. 242b.

¹¹⁸ As per the Sephardic *Prayer Book*: למינים...אל תהי תקוה, “to sectarians...do not be of hope.”

¹¹⁹ Regarding the “reward” that the righteous hopes for, see Mishna *Qiddushin* 4:14.

¹²⁰ On the one hand, the Church reproached the Synagogue for classifying the Judeo-Christians as *minim*, while on the other hand, the Church did not hesitate to declare them “heretics” (= *minim*)! On the precise meaning of the term *minim*, see *Horizontal Society*, Appendix 55.

7.-Paul, “a Roman to Romans”!

Maimonides noted that the main reason for pagan persecution of Jews was “envy,” motivated by the Jewish unique legal and political systems.¹²¹ It was the Greek and Roman encounter with Jews and the Tora, (challenging their *heroic* superiority), what prompt them to engage in mortal combat against the “Biblical man,”¹²² who maintains that unlike pagan deities, the God of the Hebrew is neither mischievous nor malicious.¹²³ If we were to accept this definition of “Biblical man,” then we would have to conclude that Paul, who maintained that “God had mocked man by offering a salvation on terms that they both knew to be impossible,”¹²⁴ was indeed mocking the “Biblical man of faith.”

Rather than the Tora, Paul believed in Greek *metis* (“cunning”). Thus, he assumed different personalities, according to the circumstances at hand. “And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law (=Tora), as under the law (=Tora)...To them that are without law, as without law...” (1*Corinthians* 9:20-21; see *Acts* 21:39). In the same mood, Paul was to the Pharisees a “Pharisee the son of a Pharisee” (*Acts* 23:6). In earnest, however, he was a “Roman to Romans” (see *Acts* 22:25-29; cf. *ibid.* 16:37-38; 23:27, etc.), both in pathos and ethos. To illustrate this point, we will examine three strategic doctrines first advanced by Paul, and later used as the theoretic basis of the Roman Empire and European societies, for time to come. These are:

First, Imperial Rome rules by Divine Right, known in later history as the Divine Right of Kings. The rationale is self-evident. If “power” is of God, and Rome has “power,” then the faithful must submit to the sovereign, as a *religious imperative* (see *Luke* 22:25; cf. *Mark* 10:43). Addressing the faithful Christian, Paul taught:

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisted the power, he had resisted the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For the rulers, they are not terror to good works, but to evil. Wilt you then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good and you shall have praise of the same: For he [the political ruler] is the minister of God to thee for good. But if you do that which is evil, be afraid; for he [the political ruler] bared not the sword in vain: for he [the political ruler] is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that does evil. Wherefore ye must be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. (*Rom* 13: 1-5; cf. *1Pet* 2: 13-19)

A consequence of this doctrine is the principle justifying the heroic enslavement of the vanquished that must be “regarded as godless men, so that along with civil liberty they lost natural liberty.”¹²⁵

¹²¹ See Maimonides, *Epistle to Yemen* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1952), pp. 8–9. Cf. Elias Bickerman, *The God of the Maccabees* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979), p. 23.

¹²² See *The God of the Maccabees*, p. 13.

¹²³ See Konvitz, “A Philosophy of Human Rights,” cited above, I, n. 123.

¹²⁴ Cf. the quotation cited above n. 42.

¹²⁵ *New Science* #676, p. 255.

Second, the theological-political principle, postulating: “among gods as among mortals the king can do no wrong and the conquered no right.”¹²⁶ On the basis of this principle it was proclaimed, the *right of the sword* and absolute dominion over the vanquished. A consequence of this principle is the notion that *might* is the basis of rights, including the civil and criminal administration of justice. (Some of the men refusing to join the American Revolution against the British cited Paul’s doctrine professing unlimited submission to the monarch).

Third, Imperial Rome (=Power) is godly. Therefore, defiance of Rome is sin. On the basis of this principle, Paul not only recognized the authority of Imperial Rome *over* the Jews, but also he encouraged *Jewish* disobedience to the *Jewish* authorities (see *Acts* 4:19, cf. 5, 6; 5: 21, 29, cf. 5, 6, 17).

Fourth, the Roman legal system is superior to the Tora. On the basis of this premise, Paul assailed the alleged “Jewish trial of Jesus,”¹²⁷ and asked:

It is the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers face, and have license to answer for himself, concerning the crime laid against him. (*Acts* 25:16).

Therefore, Paul wished to be tried by the Romans—and not by the Jews: “I stand at Caesar’s judgment seat, where I ought to be judged” (*Acts* 25:10; see *ibid.* 11, 21, 25; 28:19, etc.). His wish was granted. He was subsequently taken to Rome and executed by Nero.¹²⁸ This last detail is omitted by Luke, so as not to strain Roman-Christian relations. Therefore, Luke closed his writings with Paul free to speak openly in Rome about “the kingdom of God and...the Lord Jesus Christ,” subjects not without political nuances. Rome is not only just and powerful, but unlike Jews it can abide the Christian message.¹²⁹

8.-Two Clashes between Rome-Paul and Israel-Tora

There is a political dimension to Paul’s vision of Christianity. The purpose was to help Rome in her war against Jews. That is the reason that Nietzsche postulated: *Deus, qualem Paulus creavit, Dei negation*; translation: “The God which Paul created is the negation of God.”¹³⁰ Thus began a strategic alliance sword-cross. “Rome” would onslaught the Jews *politically* and *militarily*; “Paul” *socially* and *theologically*, and only against “Israel after the flesh” (*1Corinthians* 10:18). Thus the coordination of the military and the

¹²⁶ See Jane Ellen Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1922), p. 339.

¹²⁷ An invention contrived in order to promote hatred against a defenseless crowd. There is nothing “Jewish” in the so-called “Jewish trial of Jesus.” Rather, it was written by someone wishing to turn good, faithful Christians, into rabid anti-Semites.

¹²⁸ See ‘... *And so we came to Rome*’, pp. 58-63; and *Horizontal Society*, Section III, n. 247. Intrinsic to the ‘Roman ethos’ was the habit to execute Jews that had collaborated with them; see the case of Pappus b. Judah, described in *Horizontal Society*, Chapter 39.

¹²⁹ ‘... *And so we came to Rome*’, p. 63.

¹³⁰ Friedrich Nietzsche, *Antichrist* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941), Aphorism # 47, p. 135.

ecclesiastical powers: “Rome” butchering the Jews, and “Paul” trumpeting the title “Israel of God” (*Gal 6:17*).¹³¹

There are two closely related doctrines advanced by Paul, grounded on a *religious* imperative, postulating that the physically weak must submit to the physically strong. These are: the subjugation of wives and the advocacy of slavery.

A. The subjugation of wives to the will of their husbands.

It is a logical imperative following Paul’s doctrine, postulating the subjugation of the physically weak to the physically strong. Consequently, Paul urged the submission of wives to their husbands as a *religious imperative*. Addressing himself to Christian wives, Paul taught:

Submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord (*Kyrio*)! For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the savior of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in *everything* [our underlining]. Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it! (*Ephesus 5:21-25*)

The standard translation of “Lord,” for the Greek term “*Kyrios*,” is misleading. Consistently, the Septuagint uses the Greek tem *Kyrios* to translate the Hebrew *Adonai* and *Tetragrammaton*, both terms standing for the God of Israel!¹³²

In defense of Paul one may argue that his attitude toward women was not different than the attitude of “those brave men” crowning pagan humanity, who treated their wives as slaves.¹³³ The last verse, about husbands loving their wives, as “Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it,” seems a bit confusing, given that there was no Church before Jesus’ death.¹³⁴

A. Slavery

In the eyes of the Greeks and Romans, slaves were non-persons. They had no right even to bear a name. The doctrine was vital to pagan economics, given that *their entire economy of the heathen world was based on slave labor*.¹³⁵ Because of his own personal

¹³¹ This will explain the strange “coincidence” of both the “spiritual” [by the *religious* institutions] and the “racial” [by the *state* institutions] peculiar to anti-Semitic states; see *Horizontal Society*, Appendix 30.

¹³² See the quotation above at n. 33.

¹³³ See the quotations above, at notes 22-23.

¹³⁴ See, however, Professor Harry A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), chapters VIII-XI.

¹³⁵ On the Greek attitude toward slavery, see M. I. Finley, “Was Greek Civilization Based on Slave Labour?” in *Slavery in Classical Antiquity: Views and Controversies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960); Victoria Cuffel, “The Classical Greek Concept of Slavery,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 27 (1966), pp. 323-342. *Ecclesiastes* 10:17 alludes to the fact that within a tyrannical system the king himself is in fact a slave. Therefore, Pharaoh was not free to choose; see *Exodus* 7: 3, 13, 14, 22, etc. and *MT Teshuba* 6:2. The same idea was echoed by Elias Canetti, *Crowds and Power*, p. 358. Concerning the anxiety peculiar to despots he wrote:

ideology, Paul went a step further and sanctioned slavery as a *religious imperative*. “Servants, obey in all things your Masters according to the flesh!” Slavery is not merely a matter of fact, but it also is a *religious duty*. “Not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but in singleness of heart, as fearing the Lord” (*Colossians* 3:22; cf. *Romans* 13:1-7; *1 Corinthians* 9:27; *1 Peter* 2:13-21; *Titus* 3:1, etc.). Paul’s doctrine bore fruits and was a determining factor in the promotion of Christianity to pagan humanity.

Slavery was an overwhelming factor in pagan economics.¹³⁶ This may explain the curious fact that the Roman upper-echelons, whose entire economy was based on slave labor, discovered the beatitudes of Paul’s teachings: he was not only anti-Jewish but also pro-slavery! Judiciously, and over the course of three centuries (2nd-4th), Paul’s devotees and Roman oligarchs put their shoulders to the wheel and forged an alliance between the political establishment and the Church.¹³⁷ This may explain the special deference of Roman judiciary authorities towards Paul’s followers:

We should not be surprised then to discover that in turn, time and time again, when Paul and his companions were brought to the authorities for disciplinary action, they were protected by the process of Roman law. Even when due process was neglected, as in Thessalonica, the magistrates quickly remedied the situation when challenged by Paul.¹³⁸

Given that slaves are *not* people, they must be regarded as “goods” and “properties.” Martin Luther (1483-1546) extended this doctrine to include Christian men and women owned by Muslim masters. Sternly, Martin Luther admonished Christian slaves not to disobey their Muslim owners, given that they are their *property*, “like cattle or other possession.”¹³⁹

If one were permitted to express the conflict “Paul vs. Tora” in prosaic terms, it may be explained as follows: is there such a thing as a “free lunch” [in Pauline vocabulary: “grace”; Greek: *charis*]? According to Paul’s theological apparatus, The ‘God-Father’ administers death freely: “but death reigned from Adam until Moses, even on those who had not sinned in the likeness of Adam’s transgression” (*Romans* 5: 14, 19; cf. *1 Corinthians* 15:21). It would then stand that the ‘God-Son’ would be capable to administer unmerited salvation (=“grace”; Greek: *charis*). “For the Grace of God which brings salvation to all men” (*Titus* 2:11). Conversely, the same ‘God-Son’ would be able to render unmerited perdition.

It is the strongest in the mightiest. The concentration of anxiety is greatest in one who is a source of commands, who creates *orders* and receives them from no one above him. A ruler can keep it hidden, or under control, for a long time, but, in the course of a life, it can increase until, as with certain Roman emperors, it suddenly manifests itself as madness.

¹³⁶ The alternative to “slavery” is “commerce.” This is why slave-economics was/is deemed more humane and ethically superior to “Jewish-commerce.” Let us note that according to Jewish Law “slaves” are *not* “real state,” see *Giin* 39a; *MT Mekhira* 3:11-12.

¹³⁷ See Forrest G. Wood, *The Arrogance of Faith* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990), pp. 67-83.

¹³⁸ ‘... *And so we came to Rome*,’ p. 59.

¹³⁹ Quoted by Walter Kaufmann, *Religions in Four Dimensions* (New York: Reader’s Digest Press, 1976), p. 157. This doctrine could not apply to Jewish owners, given that the Church regarded Jews as not fully human, without the right of ownership, see below n. 249?

Maran Joseph Caro (1488-1575)—one of the most illustrious Jews flourishing after the Expulsion from Spain (1492), wrote a collection of dialogues that he had with the *Maggid* --some kind of a celestial figure. Maran asked him the following question: given that before descending into this world, the Patriarchs' souls resided under the celestial "Throne of Glory"—the highest elevation a human soul could reach--for what purpose were they brought down into *this* world?! "Prior to having descended to the world," the *Maggid* explained, humans "were like guests eating of the king's bread without having toiled for it." About that sort of people the rabbis said: "it would have been better for men not to have been created."¹⁴⁰ The Tora is for those brave souls that believe that they had come down here because they did not want to feed on the king's bread as a matter of "grace," but as a matter of right, without "embarrassment."¹⁴¹

The explanation given by the *Maggid* suggests that Adam's children are those brave souls that opted to risk "Paradise," rather than feed on "the bread of embarrassment." It is a matter of character. Grace is for dummies, too lethargic to discover the image of God within. They need not a covenant with God! What for? It entails responsibility! There are plenty of people who would gladly tell you what to hear and what to see and what to feel: as a matter of "grace" (see *Titus* 2:11)—gratis!

The above permits an accurate definition of 'Jew.' A 'Jew' is an individual (of whatever spiritual and intellectual background) who doesn't want to subsist on 'free lunches,' either down here, in planet earth, or up there in Glorious Paradise!

¹⁴⁰Given that they were already enjoying the heavenly bliss; see 'Erubin 13b; *Yerushalmi Berakhot* I, 2, 3c.

¹⁴¹ Maran Joseph Caro, *Maggid Mesharim* (Vilna, 5635-1875), 5b. On this sort of "embarrassment" see *Nedarim* 20a cf. *Yerushalmi Qiddushin* IV, 1, 65b

Oedipal Paul

II

Preliminary Remark

The principal thesis of this section is that the spiritual system urged by the upper echelons of Christianity, is the application of Greek political *metis* ('cunning') to the realm of the spiritual. As such, it is a unique system in the history of religions, as it comes to debunk a religion [Tora, Judaism] that it recognizes as the foundation of its own authority. For reasons that will be obvious in the course of the following chapters, Christianity chose the process "displacement-->substitution," which can be used to underline the similarities with the "old," and or to stress the superiority of the "new" over the "old" system. Christianity—not of Jesus—but the faith urged by the upper ecclesiastic echelons upon the masses—is the application of Greek political *metis* ('cunning') to the realm of the spiritual. As such, it is a unique system in the history of religions, as it comes to debunk a religion [Tora, Judaism] that it recognizes as the foundation of its own authority.

The principal thesis of this Section is that the system urged by the upper echelons of Christianity, is the application of Greek political *metis* ('cunning') to the realm of the spiritual. As such, it is a unique system as it comes to debunk a religion [Tora, Judaism], while proposing, at the same time that said religion is the foundation of its authority. With this purpose in mind, the Christian Scripture proposes not only to *displace*, but actually to *fulfill* the Tora. In like manner, the Christian faithful displaces, thereby becoming, *verus* or "true" Israel--in contradistinction to "Israel after the Flesh" (see *1Corinthians* 10:18). Over the centuries, Christian authorities toiled diligently and aggressively to argue the negative aspects of the Tora and demonize Jews and Judaism—and this to an audience that could not distinguish between the first and second letter of the Hebrew Scripture! In this fashion, the people of Israel were portrayed as a stateless mass void of virtue, and the Hebrew Scripture and Rabbinic Tradition as dead and deadly, in contradistinction to Christian folks and Christian authorities.

The key point of this Section is that Greek and Roman political institutions were governed by ideas related to the concepts of *Metis*-Oedipus-Hero; whereas Judaism stood for Covenant-Family-Law. Specifically, that in a culture of *metis* ("cunning"), oedipal considerations are of the essence: survival is a function of *heroic* performance. True, we all were taught that Greek and Roman civilizations are synonymous with 'rationality' and 'freedom' and 'democracy' and all things good and wise. But that may be the work of *metis*! Classical scholars, although assuming the tone of objective and omniscient observers, consistently ignored the irrational and brutish aspects of Greek ethos and culture. This essential point has been made by E. R. Dodds, *Greeks and the Irrational* (1968), where he showed that classical scholars have systematically overlooked the role

played in Greek culture, by irrationality, orgiastic ecstasy, etc.¹⁴² In what follows I propose that the ‘oversight,’ is fundamental to both the culture and the erudition of *metis*.

Not only such institutions as ‘covenant,’ ‘family,’ and ‘law’ are not operational in a cunning society, but they constitute a challenge to heroic ethos and to heroic logic, where ‘might’ equals ‘right.’ Vico commented on the conceit peculiar to heroic man.¹⁴³ ‘Law’ is inconsequential in a heroic culture. That is why, anyone attempting to relieve the lot of the lower strata with some legislation, “was accused of treason and sent to his death.”¹⁴⁴ It was on the basis of their conceit that heroic men “had caused themselves to be adored as gods.”¹⁴⁵ So that a hero would not hesitate to avenge a personal offense, even if would result in “the ruin of his entire nation.”¹⁴⁶ To understand the mind of the ancient man and his civilization, is essential to come to grips with “the supreme arrogance characteristic of barbarous times, which formed their heroic nature,”¹⁴⁷ together with the “conceit of nations.”¹⁴⁸ “To this conceit of nations is added that of scholars, who will have it that what they know is as old as the world.”¹⁴⁹ A conceit, we may add, characteristic of the literati and specialists, old and new, dedicated to the promotion of heroic ethos and ideology.

A consequence of heroic behavior was the harsh, brutal authority exercised by the father. The heroic ideal of education involved what Vico described as “cyclopean paternal authority”:

...the [heroic] education of the young was severe, harsh, and cruel, as in the case of the unlettered Lacadaemonians, who were the heroes of Greece. These people, in order to teach their sons to fear neither pain nor death would beat them within an inch of their lives in the temple of Diana, so that they often fell dead in agonies of pain beneath their father's blows. This cyclopean paternal authority survived among both the Greeks and Romans, permitting them to kill their innocent born babes.¹⁵⁰

This type of family produced in its members an unshakable feeling of dread and anxiety, symptomatic of strong repression.¹⁵¹ Thus, giving rise to feelings of hostility against the father:

The family situation in ancient Greece, like the family situation today, gave rise to infantile conflicts whose echoes lingered in the unconscious mind of the adult. With the rise of the Sophistic Movement, the conflict became in many households a fully conscious one: young men began to claim that they had a ‘natural right’

¹⁴² See *Horizontal Society*, Appendix 30.

¹⁴³ *New Science*, #667, p. 253.

¹⁴⁴ *New Science*, #668, p. 253. An important element peculiar to “heroic thinking” is contempt to those occupying a lower rank. As an example, Vico noted the place of the plebes in heroic cultures and societies. Because of their lower status, they were the sworn enemy of the Greeks and Romans.

¹⁴⁵ *New Science*, #449, p. 151; cf. #437, pp. 143–144.

¹⁴⁶ *New Science*, #667, p. 252.

¹⁴⁷ *New Science*, #38, p. 24.

¹⁴⁸ *New Science*, #125, p. 61.

¹⁴⁹ *New Science*, # 126-127, p. 61; cf. *ibid.*, ##123-124, pp. 60-61.

¹⁵⁰ *New Science* #670, p. 254; cf. #256, pp. 80–81.

¹⁵¹ See the quotation from *Greeks and the Irrational*, p. 46, cited above, I, n. 17, and the story about a pagan who refused to disturb his father’s sleep.

to disobey their fathers. But it is a fair guess that such conflicts already existed at the unconscious level from a very much earlier date—that in fact they go back to the earliest unconfessed stirrings of individualism in a society where family solidarity was still universally taken for granted.¹⁵²

A similar situation prevailed throughout Roman society, where the power of the fathers over the sons was absolute. Sons belonged to the ‘have-not’ group and constituted a rebellious class striving to usurp parental authority. Concerning the status of sons in Roman society, Otto Rank noted:

The right of every citizen to social fatherhood meant no right for the sons except the one to become a father in his turn, that is, a social type prescribed by this first totalitarian state. Since the legal power of the father over his sons was equivalent to his power over his slaves [the word ‘family’ is derived from ‘*famulus*’—servant, slave]¹⁵³ we can justly say that the sons dominated by legal fatherhood actually were the first ‘have-nots.’ Not that the slaves had more, but they had no hope and hence no real desire to demand or take what the ‘haves’ possessed. It was different with the sons, who, despite their lack of legal rights, were brought up with the idea of promotion—provided they behaved—from the ‘have-not’ into the ‘have’ group. Hence, they could easily form the nucleus of a rebellious class striving to overthrow the ruling class of fathers.¹⁵⁴

The Roman father was invested with the same attributes of the hero and was exemplified by the patriarchal dominance over the “herd of brothers”:

At the height of the patriarchal rule in ancient Rome, the father had become invested with a power derived from the magic self of the hero in whose image civic fatherhood was created as a social type. Paradoxically enough, it seems that Freud’s “primitive dominance of the father” who ruled tyrannically over the “herd of brothers” only existed politically in the highly organized Roman state at the peak of its power.¹⁵⁵

The brutal attitude of the father is related to the low status of women, in a culture where might was the only constitutive of right. “Wives were maintained as a necessity of nature for the procreation of children. In other respects they were treated as slaves.”¹⁵⁶ In this connection, we must point out at the heroic habit of abandoning the wives that had been taken captives from the enemies. These ‘brave men’ would “...not marry them. And their actions, noted Vico, “were held to be heroic, while to us, with our present feelings, they seem, as they indeed are, the deeds of scoundrels.”¹⁵⁷

The Tora is the only system intended to serve as an alternative to the culture of cunning (*metis*). Rather than conceiving of the ‘other’ as a potential prey or predator, the Hebrew Scripture teaches that every human being is imprinted with the image of God within, and therefore equal to everyone else. Survival, both politically and individually, must be predicated on a freely contracted covenant, ruling supreme, as the covenant contracted at Sinai between God and Israel. That is, “a single Law and a single judicial procedure

¹⁵²*Greeks and the Irrational*, p. 47. For an excellent analysis of the conflict between sons and fathers in classical Athens, see Barry S. Strauss, *Fathers & Sons in Athens* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993).

¹⁵³ See *Indo-European Languages and Society*, pp. 253, 291.

¹⁵⁴ Otto Rank, *Beyond Psychology* (New York: Dover, 1958), p. 126.

¹⁵⁵ *Beyond Psychology*, p. 126.

¹⁵⁶ *New Science*, # 671, p. 254.

¹⁵⁷ *New Science* #611, p. 226.

(משפט), which must apply to you [the Hebrew people] and to the alien sojourning among you” (*Numbers* 15:16, cf. *ibid.* v. 29). Persecution of Jews and defamation of the Tora were the favorite tools used by Christianity on behalf of the heroic value-system. Maimonides noted that in their attempt to vanquish Israel, gentile nations would use both, the military and theological options: they would massacre the Jews with one hand, while offering the Gospel of Love with the other.¹⁵⁸ The ultimate purpose was the elimination the Law. The military option sought to abrogate the Law by eliminating the *people* of Israel. As we will see in the following Chapter, Paul sought to abrogate the Law by eliminating the *Father*. Thereby transforming the Tora, from a *diatheke*-covenant (as per the Septuagint, or Greek translation of Hebrew Scripture), into a *diatheke*-last will (as per *late* Hellenistic usage of this term).

A valuable detail: to transform the sense of *diatheke*-covenant into *diatheke*-last will, the ‘Father’—in our case “God,” creator of Heavens and Earth--would have to die, so that the “New” *diatheke*, in the sense of “Testament,” could take effect!

Although much work in the psychoanalytic aspect of religion has focused on the relation of religion to various stages of pre-oedipal development, we propose that the oedipal stage, best illustrates Paul’s mindset, and the subsequent strategy taken by Christianity towards Jews and Judaism.

1.-Paul, the Man

Paul was the son of proselytes barely converted to Judaism. The fact that he could pass himself as a Roman to the Roman guards is clear evidence that he was uncircumcised.¹⁵⁹ Let us read a critical passage concerning his entering the Temple at Jerusalem. Jews that knew him from Asia Minor were offended by his presence, and he was about to be lynched.¹⁶⁰ Roman soldiers standing guard to keep order at the Temple were about to flog him:

And as they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by. Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned? When the centurion heard that, he went and told the chief captain, saying, Take heed what you do: for this man is a Roman. Then the chief captain came, and said unto him: Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said: Yea. And the chief captain answered: With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, but I was free born. Then straightway the departed from him which should have examined him: and the chief captain also was afraid, fully knowing (*epignous*) that that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him. (*Acts* 22:25-29; cf. *ibid.* 21: 21; 16:37-38)

And now a fundamental question: unless Paul was found to be uncircumcised, how could the captain “fully know” (*epignous*) that he was not Jewish? Similarly, how could one possible “learn” (*mathon*) that he was a Roman and not a Jew (see *Acts* 23:27)? The first

¹⁵⁸ See above, I, n. 25.

¹⁵⁹ There were rabbinic authorities at the time, among them R. Joshua, that admitted into Judaism a proselyte that was not circumcised; see *Yebamot* 46a.

¹⁶⁰ In my opinion the accusation against Paul was not that he brought a ‘Greek’ to the “Hall of the Israelite,” but that he himself was a ‘Greek’; i.e., gentile. About this episode, see Paul W. Walaskay, ‘... *And so we came to Rome*’ (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 53-55.

step taken by the Roman authorities in such circumstances was to make sure that the man in question was uncircumcised. “A female can conceal her identity and say ‘I am a gentile,’” noted the rabbis, “But a male cannot conceal his identity and say ‘I am a gentile.’”¹⁶¹

The rabbis noticed the lack of basic Jewish knowledge among those “converting among the nations.”¹⁶² This statement surely applied to a place such as Tarsus, Cilice. The reason for Paul’s failure to circumcise may have been due to parental neglect or because upon his family’s conversion, he refused to circumcise. At any rate, the fact that he was not circumscribed affected him. Consider, by way of illustration, his diatribe against circumcision, *Galatians* 5:1-3:

Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ had made us free, and be not engaged again with the yoke of bondage. Behold I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law.¹⁶³

There is no basis to ascertain that Paul had any formal Jewish education. A clear indication that he could not read Hebrew was his morbid fear of the *Hebrew* Scripture (but not the Greek, the only language in which he wrote). Only someone unable to read a word of Hebrew could have written that “the letter [of the Tora] killed” (*2Corinthians* 3:6). His tirade against *Hebrew* writing is indicative of something deeper than mere antipathy to a foreign language. In his tormented mind the *Hebrew* alphabet constituted an impassable “veil,” rendering the text of the Tora impossible to understand! Speaking about his personal experience, when hearing the Tora read at the Synagogue, he confessed: “But even unto this day, when Moses [i.e., the Tora; cf. *Acts* 15:21] is read, the veil is upon their heart” [i.e., of men not acquainted with the Hebrew letters] (*2Corinthians* 3: 15). His aversion to the Hebrew text acquired surrealistic dimensions. In his tormented mind, he believed that the purpose of the crucifixion was to remove the “veil,” which “is done away in Christ” (*2Corinthians* 3: 14). To accomplish this mission Jesus had to be nailed to the cross and his blood spilled. Thus, “Blotting out the handwriting [=the Hebrew text] of ordinances that were against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross” (*Colossians* 2:14). It is difficult to imagine that someone having this attitude about the text of Scripture had any Hebrew schooling.

Most probable, Paul belonged to the group of “illiterate man” (=עם הארץ) mentioned by the rabbis.¹⁶⁴ They constituted a special class, based not on birth or economic status, but on their hostility towards Jewish life and Jewish learning. “Greater is the hatred that

¹⁶¹ *Yerushalmi ‘Aboda Zara* II, 2, 40c. Cf. R. Israel Iserlin, *Terumat ha-Deshen* (Venice, 5306/1546), #197. The case of Josephus Roman citizenship was most unusual; see Josephus, *The Life* (Loeb Classical Library), 422-426, pp. 155-157. Generally, Jews would admit someone as a Jew by his say so; see R. Solomon b. Adrete, *She’elot wu-Tshubot*, vol. 2, #15.

¹⁶² *Tosefta Shabbat* 8:5, p. 30; *Shabbat* 68a-b.

¹⁶³ See *Romans* 2:25-3:1, cf. 30 and *Horizontal Society*, Section III, n. 274.

¹⁶⁴ The claim made by some critics that Paul’s occasional departure from the text of the Septuagint is because he was following the original ‘Hebrew’ of the Scripture, may only be made by people having no knowledge of either the Hebrew or the Greek text of the Bible.

illiterate men (עמי הארץ) profess towards the disciples of sages,” said the rabbis, “than what the (pagan) nations profess against Israel.”¹⁶⁵ His assertion, that he sat at the feet of R. Gamliel the elder (d. 52 C.E.), as well as the alleged missions that he supposed to have accomplished, do not pertain to factual history.¹⁶⁶ (Concerning his flagrant ignorance of Tora, see below Chapter 2.)

Accordingly, we propose that Paul’s rejection of the Covenantal-Law, as well as the displacement of the God-Father on behalf of the Son-hero, were the effect of oedipal disorders. In particular, we intend to show that Paul’s God incarnates the Roman paterfamilias: cunning and malevolent. That is why he conceived of Jesus in terms of an *oedipal son*, whose principal objective was to rebel, then displace, and ultimately substitute, the pagan paterfamilias. Let it be noted, in passing, that his attacks against the circumcision and the Tora were intended to delegitimize Jesus and his disciples, all of whom, including Jesus himself, were circumcised and professed allegiance to the Hebrew Scripture; see *Acts* 21:20-25.

2.-Paul’s God—“Father in the Flesh”

In classic psychoanalytic theory, ‘God’ is the projection of the father’s image. It has been shown that the Greek gods, too, were modeled on the image of the paterfamilias.¹⁶⁷ Concerning this critical point, Freud wrote in *Totem and Taboo* that “personal relation to God depends on [our] relation to [our] father in the flesh.”¹⁶⁸ In *Moses and Monotheism*, Freud made the very important observation that Christianity is a ‘son’ religion, whereas Judaism is a ‘father’ religion:

[T]he Christian ceremony of Holy Communion, in which the believer incorporates the Savior’s blood and flesh, repeats the content of the old totem meal....The ambivalence that dominates the relation to the father was clearly shown, however, in the final outcome of the religious novelty. Ostensibly aimed at propitiating the father god, it ended in his being dethroned and got rid of. Judaism had been a religion of the father; Christianity became a religion of the son. The old God the Father fell back behind Christ; Christ, the Son, took his place, just as every son had hoped to in primeval times.¹⁶⁹

In the Hebrew Scripture, too, God is associated with the “father in the flesh.” When God spoke for the first time to Moses, He said to him, “I am the God of your father” (אבִיךָ)—in the singular—and then continued, “the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” (*Exodus* 3:6). Accordingly, the rabbis explained that God “Revealed Himself to Moses with the voice of his father Amram.”¹⁷⁰ Similarly, when God revealed Himself for the first time to the people of Israel, at the crossing of the Red Sea, they exclaimed: “This

¹⁶⁵ *Pesahim* 49b. See *Horizontal Society*, Appendix 21.

¹⁶⁶ He may have known some elementary words in Hebrew that were part of the common vocabulary. Passages such as those attesting that he spoke “in the Hebrew dialect” (*dialekto*) (*Acts* 21:40, cf. 22:2), meant the ‘Aramaic dialect’ in vogue among both Jews and pagans of the region. At that time, ‘Hebrew’ ceased to be spoken by the general public.

¹⁶⁷ See *Greeks and the Irrational*, pp. 47-48.

¹⁶⁸ *S.E.* 13:154.

¹⁶⁹ *S.E.* 23:87–88.

¹⁷⁰ *Midrash Tanhuma*, ed. S. Buber (Vilna, 5645/1885), *Exodus* XVI, vol. 1, p. 9. Cf. *Shemot Rabba*, (Vilna, Reprinted: Jerusalem, 5735/1975), III, 1, 10d.

is my God and I shall praise Him, the God of my father and I shall exalt Him” (*Exodus* 15:2)—again using “father” in the singular (אב) and pointing to the association “father in the flesh-God.” Given that the model for the God of Israel has to do with the “father in the flesh,” “A bastard cannot enter into God’s assembly” (see *Deuteronomy* 23:3); i.e., it would not be viable for him to have an adequate conception of the God-Father of Israel.

For a proper understanding of Paul’s ‘god’ we must first gain a glimpse at the structure of the Greco-Roman family. It was an organization incarnating heroic values and heroic logic, with the paterfamilias at the center, in function of the supreme deity “in the flesh.” This is how Dodds described it:

Its organization, as in all Indo-European societies, was patriarchal; its law was *patria potestas*. The head of a household is its king...and his position is still described by Aristotle as analogous to that of a king. Over his children his authority in early times was unlimited: he is free to expose them in infancy, and in manhood to expel an erring or rebellious son from the community, as Theseus expelled Hyppolytus, as Oeneus expelled Tydeus, as Strophios expelled Pylades, as Zeus himself cast out Hephaestus from Olympus for siding with his mother. In relation to his father, the son had duties but no rights; while his father lived, he was a perpetual minor—a state of affairs which lasted at Athens down to the sixth century, when Solon introduced certain safeguards. And indeed more than two centuries after Solon the tradition of family jurisdiction was still so strong that even Plato—who was certainly no admirer of the family— had to give it a place in his legislation.¹⁷¹

The only god that Paul ever knew was a god incarnating the Greco-Roman paterfamilias. Evidence to this is the fact that he associated the Greek term *Kyrios* “Lord” with “husband.” *Kyrios* is the holiest word in the vocabulary of Greek speaking Jews. Semantically, it stands for the Tetragrammaton (=YHWH), pronounced in Hebrew ‘*Adonai*’ (which the Septuagint translates: ‘*Kyrios*’). This is how Professor Bickerman defines *Kyrios*:

[A] legal term meaning the legitimate master of someone or something, a word which as a substantive was not used in Greek religious language. It is simply a literal translation of the Hebrew appellative A-donai (the Lord), which became in the meantime the standard pronunciation of the awe-inspiring Tetragrammaton.¹⁷²

In *Ephesus* 5:22-24 Paul preached:

Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord (*Kyrio*)! For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the savior of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything. (See below chapter 7)

To urge women to submit to their husbands as if he would be *Kyrios*-God—a term that Greek speaking Jews used in their prayers to address God—was rank idolatry! It also provides a window into Paul’s tortured mind! In what follow we will see that the different elements making up Paul’s vision of Christianity, too, can be best understood in

¹⁷¹ *Greeks and the Irrational*, pp. 45–46; see also Chapter 2.

¹⁷² Elias Bickerman, *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees* (New York: Schocken Books, 1962), p. 66.

light of psychoanalytical theory, rather than the Hebrew Scripture or the teachings of Jesus and his disciples.

Paul's doctrine of sin and atonement rests on two premises, both of which are alien to the Tora and Prophets. First, is his assertion that under the Law, righteousness stands for perfect conformity, "For as many as are of the works of the law [=the Tora], are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is everyone that continued not in all things which are written in the book of the law [=the Tora] to do them"—an impossible task! Consequently, he declared: "no man is justified by the law [=the Tora] in the sight of God." Second, "the law [=the Tora] is not of faith" (see *Galileans* 3: 10-12). "Therefore by the deeds of the law [=the Tora] there shall no flesh be justified in his [God's] sight: for by the law [=the Tora] is the knowledge of sin" (*Romans* 3: 20). It is on the basis of this obtuse logic that Paul declared: "For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law" (*Galileans* 5:3).

The allegation that according to the Tora, failure to comply with a single precept warrants death (cf. *2Peter* 2:4, 11-12)--is incorrect. Addressing himself to this lie, George Foot Moore (1851-1931) remarked:

Paul's definition of righteousness as perfect conformity to the law of God would never have been conceded by a Jewish opponent, to whom it would have been equivalent to admitting that God had mocked man by offering a salvation on terms that they both knew to be impossible.¹⁷³

The second premise, proposing that according to the Hebrew Scripture, God in his righteousness cannot freely forgive the penitent, is the basis for the Pauline doctrine that "redemption" and "remission of sins" are only possible through Jesus' expiatory death (*Romans* 3: 24-25), is an affront to the Scripture, to the Prophets, and to each and every Sage of Israel, all of whom taught that God will absolve the sincere penitent. Quoting Professor Moore again:

How a Jew of Paul's antecedent could ignore, and by implication deny, the great prophetic doctrine of repentance, which, individualized and interiorized, was a cardinal doctrine of Judaism, namely, that God, out of love, freely forgives the sincerely penitent sinner and restores him to his favor—that seems from the Jewish point of view inexplicable.¹⁷⁴

Indeed, what Paul presented as premises, were in fact the two postulates required to uphold the 'conclusions' he intend to demonstrate.

The two propositions we are dealing with are not given premises from which Paul draws his conclusions; they are the postulates which the predetermined conclusions demands.¹⁷⁵

The answer to Professor Moore's question ("How a Jew of Paul's antecedent could ignore..."), is that Paul's theology is autobiographic. It has to do with his, "father in the flesh"—not with the Hebrew Scripture, the rabbis, nor, we may add, Jesus and his circle

¹⁷³ *Judaism*, vol. 1, p. 495.

¹⁷⁴ *Judaism*, vol. 3, p. 151.

¹⁷⁵ *Judaism*, vol. 3, p. 151.

of disciples. The sadistic ‘God-Father’ poking fun at his children by giving them an unattainable salvation is a Roman *paterfamilias*: oedipal, devious, implacable and unforgiving. Paul accused ‘god’ of fraudulence for the same reason that every tragic hero accuses his deity of scheming his tragic end. About the latter it was said:

So it is that, at the moment when he [the tragic hero] realizes that he is responsible for having forged his misfortune with his own hands, he accuses the deity of having plotted and contrived everything in advance, of having delighted in tricking him from start to finish of the drama, the better too to destroy him.¹⁷⁶

Because Paul did not have the foggiest idea about the Hebrew God, he was clueless about Hebrew sin. What he knew was pagan *guilt* demanding *violent* atonement. This he learned from the Roman *paterfamilias*—not from Scripture. Hebrew sin, be it a *het* ‘error’ or ‘*abera* ‘transgression,’ pertains to the realm of the legal. Specifically, it presupposes a previously legislated law, clearly promulgated by the proper authority; e.g., as when Adam was instructed *not* to eat the fruit (see *Genesis* 2: 16-17). Upon confronting Adam, God cites the law that He had instructed him: “Is it that you have eaten from the fruit which I ordered you not to eat?” (*Genesis* 3: 11). Hence the rabbinic principle, that the Scripture “does not stipulate a punishment unless it had previously banned it (*hizhir*).”¹⁷⁷ It should be pointed out that verb *hizhir*, usually translated ‘legislated,’ ‘promulgated,’ actually means ‘to enlighten,’ ‘to illuminate.’¹⁷⁸ Accordingly, Hebrew ‘sin’ warrants previous ‘knowledge’ and ‘intentionality.’ Fundamental to the Hebrew idea of sin is the belief that a sinner can erase his wrongdoings through *teshuba*, ‘repentance.’¹⁷⁹ Thus, unlike pagan sin, Hebrew sin is never final, and it does not carry the overwhelming sense of foreboding connected to pagan guilt. Rather, Jews treated their past as if it were an “open book,” subject to revision and change of heart. The relation of the sinner to his past is not a schizophrenic rupture with his former transgressions, but a *confrontation* with the sin and full assumption of personal responsibility.¹⁸⁰ In this manner, sin and offenses against the Law are transformed into something positive. “At the rank where the repentant stands,” taught the rabbis, “the perfect righteous cannot stand.”¹⁸¹

‘Guilt’ pertains to the realm of the anthropological. It has to do with ‘pollution.’ It was known through the myths carried on by society, and requires neither ‘knowledge’ nor ‘intention.’ Oedipus did not know that Queen Jocasta was his mother or that King Laius was his father. “If Oedipus had been tried before an Athenian court,” explained Dodds, “he would have been acquitted of murdering his father. But no human court could acquit

¹⁷⁶Jean-Pierre Vernant and Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece* (New York: Zone Books, 1990), p. 45.

¹⁷⁷ *Yoma* 81a, etc. Cf. *MT Ma'ase ha-Qorbanot* 18:4; and *Mamrim* 7:1.

¹⁷⁸ See *Horizontal Society*, Appendix 4.

¹⁷⁹ See *Escape from Freedom*, pp. 193–194. In addition, there were various sacramental offerings covering different types of errors, etc.

¹⁸⁰ See Mordechai Rotenberg, “The ‘Midrash’ and Biographic Rehabilitation,” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 25 (1986), pp. 41–55. In this article, the author discusses in detail the difference between “sin” in the Tora and oedipal “guilt,” and their relation to hermeneutics, interpretation and rehabilitation. Cf. *Ps* 51:15 and *MT Teshuba* 2:1. On the Greek concept of guilt, see *Greeks and the Irrational*, Chapter 2.

¹⁸¹ *Berakhot* 34b; see *MT Teshuba* 7:4.

him of pollution; for pollution inhered in the act itself, irrespective of motive.”¹⁸² Paul conceived of Adam’s transgression not in Biblical terms, but in terms of the tragic guilt befalling the hero, producing a defilement that passes on to all of his descents, for all time to come.

Tragic guilt thus takes shape in the constant clash between the ancient religious conception of the misdeed as a defilement attached to an entire race and inexorable transmitted from one generation to the next in the form of an *até* or madness sent by the god.¹⁸³

That, precisely, is how Paul understood the ‘original sin.’ The “tragic guilt” haunting Paul is one and the same with oedipal guilt. A guilt that defiles the subject against his will. “For what I do not will, this I do. But what I hate, this I do” (*Romans 7: 15*).

Because Paul conceived of sin in oedipal terms, he portrayed the God of Scripture as an oedipal father: haunting unremittingly the offender and his descendants till the end of time. Unlike Biblical sin, tragic guilt does not admit *teshuba*: only catharsis and purgation and death. This is why Paul proposed that only Jesus’ death can serve as the means of salvation. The reasons for opting for oedipal *guilt* and oedipal *atonement* are autobiographical: a projection of his father “in the flesh,” gestating deep inside his tormented mind. Addressing himself to this sort of psychological phenomenon, Freud wrote in *Totem and Taboo*:

In the Christian myth the original sin was one against God the Father. If, however, Christ redeemed mankind from the burden of original sin by the sacrifice of his own life, we are driven to conclude that the sin was a murder. The law of *talion*, which is so deeply rooted in human feeling, lays it down that a murder can only be expiated by the sacrifice of another life: self-sacrifice points back to blood-guilt. And if this sacrifice of a life brought about atonement with God the Father, the crime to be expiated can only have been the murder of the father.¹⁸⁴

In the course of developing his vision of Christianity, Paul transfigured the concept of the *diatheke* in the *Jewish Septuagint*, standing for “Law” and “covenant” (as well as the grounds for father-son reconciliation), into a term standing for “testament” and “death of the father.” A major consequence of this choice was disallowing the efficacy of repentance. According to the Tora, a son can always return to the father. Paul’s “testament”—whether ‘old’ or ‘new’—posits, as per oedipal guilt, that the son can never return to the father: the “father” is psychologically dead—eliminated out of existence. Instead of *teshuba*, whereby the sinner *confronts* his wrongdoings and transforms them into something positive, Paul proposed pagan *death* and pagan *catharsis*. The result was a schizophrenic rupture with the Tora. A rupture, we may add, which will permit the son become the father. As with Oedipus who, banished by the Father, becomes the Father, ending up inflicting on himself the wrath of the Father. In this fashion, the Father passes down his guilt to his children and them to theirs, in perpetuity.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸² E.R. Dodds, “On Misunderstanding Oedipus Rex,” in ed. Eric Segal, *Readings in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 183.

¹⁸³ *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*, p. 81.

¹⁸⁴ *S.E.* 13: 154.

¹⁸⁵ See the quotation below, n. 66.

The ultimate bait in the realm of *metis* is a predator posing as prey: survival is a function of the differentiation predator/prey. Within this context I would like to propose that *Oedipus Rex* (in contradistinction to the full trilogy of Sophocles) comes to portray the most powerful drama facing pagan humanity, whereby ‘loving father’ is metamorphosed into brutal Laius, and ‘innocent child’ into monstrous Oedipus. It fully defines pagan drama: from birth to death.

3.-Wedding Widow Israel

According to Paul, the God-Father of Israel was not ‘dethroned.’ In his mind, He actually died and was substituted by His own Son. The “Passion” portrays the killing (murdering?) of the Son by the Oedipal-Father and the resurrection of the Oedipal-Son, who then displaces the Father-God and becomes the Son-God.¹⁸⁶ Referring to this essential point in Christianity, Freud wrote in *Totem and Taboo* that in this fashion the carnal son fulfills,

... [H]is wishes *against* the father [italics in original]. He himself became God, beside, or, more correctly, in place of the father. A son-religion displaced the father-religion.¹⁸⁷

The Freudian interpretation of Jesus’ death involves two distinct scenarios: one in which the Oedipal-Father kills the Son; and a second scenario where Father dies and Oedipal-Son is enthroned in place of Oedipal-Father. The two scenarios are interconnected: the second is the direct effect of the first; more precisely: the first is the outer layer of the second. In the first scenario, the God-Father kills son as an expiatory sacrifice. In the second scenario, introduced by Paul, God-Father dies as a consequence of the God-Son resurrection. In classical psychoanalysis theory both scenarios are interrelated.

Child sacrifice and infanticide were common religious practices throughout the heathen world. It had been explained: “The increasing resistance to killing one’s own child created the wish that another child should die in his place.” Eventually, “This led to the widespread ancient custom that the King’s son should be sacrificed as a *vicarious sacrifice* [italics in the original] for the community.”¹⁸⁸ The model was adopted by the Christian Scripture, where Oedipal-God-Father is depicted as killing his son in a sacrificial atonement. A variation of the same oedipal motif, foreshadowing the Passion, is the story of King Herod’s attempt to murder infant Jesus. As a man, Herod represents the oedipal-father yielding to his impulse to kill his own son; as a king, Herod foreshadowed the final Passion, where God-Father sacrifices Jesus, his only son.¹⁸⁹ The second scenario is the effect of Paul’s interpretation of the Passion: as a result of the resurrection of the son, the Oedipal-Father dies and is replaced by Oedipal-Son-Jesus.

¹⁸⁶ What a ‘family’! It does not seem ‘Jewish’ to me!

¹⁸⁷ *S.E.* 13: 147.

¹⁸⁸ Erich Wellisch, *Isaac and Oedipus* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954), p. 27. See *ibid*, pp. 9-30.

¹⁸⁹The miraculous event of the Passion requires a genuine *death* (thus making resurrection real). See Robert A. Paul, “Symbolic Interpretation in Psychoanalysis and Anthropology,” *Ethos* (1980), p. 292.

The code-term upon which the entire edifice of Pauline's theology stands is the Greek term *diatheke*. Originally it meant 'agreement,' 'covenant,' as in Aristophanes' *The Birds* (l. 439). In this specific sense it was used in the Jewish Septuagint to translate the Hebrew term *berit*, "covenant."¹⁹⁰ Similarly, in *1Maccabees* (1:57, 63) this term is regularly used for "Law," given that the Jewish Law rests on a *berit* or "covenant" contracted by God and the nation of Israel. Later, in pagan Hellenistic literature and speech, *diatheke* underwent a semantic transformation and came to mean 'last will,' 'testament.'¹⁹¹ Paul took advantage of the semantic change, 'covenant--> last will' and went on to interpret the term *diatheke*, (as it appeared earlier in the Septuagint), to mean 'last will.' Taking advantage of this semantic change, Paul proposed that the Christian Scripture is the 'new *diatheke*-testament' made by the God-Father.¹⁹² Alluding to the right of a testator to annul his last will and to issue a new one, Paul argued that the Christian Scripture, too, is a 'New Testament/*diatheke*' issued by the moribund Father, as he was approaching his end. Thereby, annulling, the Tora or 'Old/*diatheke*.' Paul was the self-appointed "minister" or deacon in charge of administering "the new *diatheke*" (*2Corinthians* 3:6).¹⁹³ Elsewhere, however, Paul says that Jesus was the "negotiator" (*mesites*) of the new 'last will.' In short, the shift Tora--> 'testament--> 'old last will,' resulted (=) in Jesus--> 'new testament-->'new last will.' Thereby, simultaneously revoking the 'old' testament and establishing a 'new' testament. Within this context, there are two critical issues meriting consideration.

First, it would appear disingenuous to ascribe to *diatheke* in the Septuagint the meaning 'last will,' as per its later usage; specially, since the Tora was written in Hebrew—not in Greek! At this point we must recall Paul's personal aversion to the Hebrew text, which in his mind had been "blotted out" by Jesus' blood, spilled on the cross! Most probably affected by his own experience, Paul believed that the God of the Hebrew Scripture was a cunning and hideous paterfamilias, against whom all means are legitimate, including deception. Thus, he ended up abusing the trust of a public that could not know that *diatheke* in the Septuagint meant 'covenant' and not 'last will'!

¹⁹⁰ See James H. Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London: Erdmann's, 1952), p. 148. Cf. W. F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, *Greek-English Lexicon of New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: Chicago Press, 1957), p. 183. Because Christian theologians assumed that the term *berit* in the Hebrew Scripture, stood for a unilaterally covenant *imposed* by God, as per pagan theology, Greek lexicographers failed to grasp the sense of 'agreement' and 'accord' of *diatheke* in the Septuagint.

¹⁹¹ In this latter sense it is exclusively used in the Christian Scripture and rabbinic literature; see Daniel Sperber, *A Dictionary of Greek and Latin Legal Terms* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1984), pp. 84-86.

¹⁹² Some Christian scholars, shocked by the implications of *diatheke*-testament applied to God, interpreted it in the original sense of 'alliance,' although the context involves 'inheritance,' 'testator,' and notions pertaining to a 'last will,' rather than 'covenant.' It is highly significant that New Testament scholars and Greek Lexicographers *did not point* to the fact that the whereas the Septuagint uses this term *exclusively* in the sense of 'covenant,' 'accord,' Paul uses it *exclusively* in the sense of 'last will'!

¹⁹³On this fundamental point see the penetrating remarks of Boaz Cohen, *Jewish and Roman Law*, vol. 1 (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1966), pp. 33-35. The rabbis noted and answered this argument; see *ibid*, pp. 34-35.

The second issue is a bit thornier. ‘*Diatheke*/last will’ takes effect *after* the testator’s *death*; beforehand, it has no operational effect. Therefore, essential to Paul’s argument is the doctrine developed by Marcion (ca. 110-160) that the God of the Hebrew Scripture was a demiurge, an enemy of mankind, who died upon Jesus’ resurrection! Without this doctrine (or a more refined equivalent thereof), Paul’s argument about a ‘new last will’ would not cohere. Thus, an absolute condition for a ‘*new testament/diatheke*’ is the death of the ‘testator,’ who happened to be the Creator of Heavens and Earth and spoke to Israel at Sinai.¹⁹⁴ A key passage (*Hebrew* 9:15–17), explains how upon the death of the God-testator, the beneficiaries of the new *diatheke* are called to take possession of their eternal inheritance:

And because of this, he [Jesus] is a negotiator (*mesites*) of a new *diatheke*, so that death having occurred for redemption of transgressions under the first *diatheke*, those having called out might receive the promise of the everlasting inheritance. For where a *diatheke* is, death must take place of him who willed (*diathemenon*) a *diatheke*, since it never has force when the testator is living.¹⁹⁵

According to Christian commentators, the testator’s death was accomplished vicariously through Jesus’ death. This interpretation makes no sense. *Mesites* is the ‘executor’ of the inheritance, who had previously been appointed by the testator in order to carry out his directions. Therefore, he must be situated outside the perimeter of the testator-beneficiaries, both according to law and according to common sense. If Jesus in function of *mesites* died *in place* of the testator, then the *diatheke* would have been void and Jesus’ task as a *mesites* would have remained unfulfilled. The plain argument, however, was that with the death of the testator—(that *happened* to be the God-Father-of Israel, who spoke at Sinai and created Heavens and Earth) perished! And thereupon, Jesus took over as “the *mesites* of a better *diatheke*” (*Hebrews* 8:6). More or less, the same doctrine was taught by Marcion: the God of the Hebrew Scripture died—simultaneously—with the resurrection of Jesus! True, the Church declared Marcion a heretic, and labored tirelessly with all kind of arguments (set forth in arid prose), to demonstrate that his doctrines are heretical and contrary to Christian faith. And yet, all the theological rhetoric would not change the fact that no court on earth will recognize the validity of a last will, unless the testator’s death had been duly confirmed!

There is a significant consequence to Paul’s doctrine, advanced in *Romans* (7:1–4). When trying to explain why Jews were no longer bound to observe the Tora, he compared the people of Israel to a widow—an obvious reference to *Lamentations* 1:1.¹⁹⁶ The gist of his argument is that since Israel’s husband is dead, she is no longer bound to

¹⁹⁴ On the death of gods in general anthropology, see James George Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, part iv, 2 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1951). The death of the God-Father is a fundamental doctrine in the theology of Marcion. For a summary of his views, see George Foot Moore, *History of Religions*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920), p. 155. For a detailed discussion of his principal doctrines, see Abraham Joshua Heschel, *The Prophets* (New York: Burning Bush Press, 1962), pp. 299–306; and Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), pp. 130–146, 163.

¹⁹⁵ Most probably the *Epistle to the Hebrews* was composed by one of Paul’s disciples, and not by Paul himself.

¹⁹⁶ To counter this position, the rabbis (*Midrash Ekha*) explained: “she was *like* a widow” (*Lam* 1:1), but not *a* widow!”

Him. Accordingly, Paul proposed that she ought to wed “the one rose from the dead”; i.e., her husband’s presumptive son!

Or are you ignorant, brothers—for I speak to those knowing the Law [*nomos*, i.e., the Tora]—that the Law [*nomos*, i.e., the Tora] rules over the man for as long a time as he may live? For the married woman was bound by law to the living husband, but if the husband dies she is set free from the law of the husband. So then, if the husband is living she will be called an adulteress if she becomes another man’s. But if the husband dies she is free from the law, so as for her not to be an adulteress by becoming another man’s wife. So that, my brothers, you also were made dead to the Law through the body of Christ, for you to become another’s to the one rose from the dead, so that we may bear fruit to God.

The plain meaning of this argument is that although Israel was previously bound to God as a wife, she was now free to marry His son, since He (the Father) had been declared dead by Paul! Responding to this abomination, R. Saul Levi Mortera (ca. 1596-1660) wrote:

Has anyone seen such a profanity and chimeras so that Israel contracting to the Law of marriage with the father, or with his son, or with both together...¹⁹⁷

As with all ideologues convinced that the end justifies the means, “that man [Paul] took advantage of the people.”¹⁹⁸ That is why, he consistently addressed a crowd made up of “analphabetic men” (עם הארץ) who would his distorted references to Scripture.

...Paul abused the credulity of the people, to whom he would quote these texts [of Scripture], fully knowing that they were illiterate (=עם הארץ) and would believe what they heard [from Paul] without looking at the (text of) Scripture, and (gather) the contextual sense of these verses...¹⁹⁹

In simple words: according to Paul, Israel, in quality of (God’s) widow, is a hideous creature, for the simple fact that she refused to marry Jesus (son of her now-defunct-husband), and “bear the fruit to God.” By refusing the marriage proposal, Israel is beyond redemption! In classical counter-oedipal fashion, the crucifixion must be interpreted as the murdering of Jesus *by* the people of Israel. Thus, every member of the Jewish people—henceforth and till the end of time—is guilty of the primeval oedipal sin of patricide: beyond redemption and beyond atonement.²⁰⁰ Put differently: killing the father may be redeemed when the mother accepts the son as her rightful consort. By refusing to wed Jesus, the Jews or symbolic wife of the God-Father, rendered son-Jesus no longer a Savior, but an oedipal-murderer and the usurper of the God-Father!²⁰¹

¹⁹⁷ R. Saul Levi Mortera, *Obstáculos y Oposiciones Contra la Religión Xptiana* (Amsterdam, 5472/1712), ms. EH 48D 38 (Jerusalem: Hebrew University), 142a. See the quotation, above n. 24.

¹⁹⁸ *Obstáculos y Oposiciones Contra la Religión Xptiana*, 169a. See the quotation in *Horizontal Society*, Section III, n. 224.

¹⁹⁹ *Obstáculos y Oposiciones Contra la Religión Xptiana*, 167a.

²⁰⁰ Unresolved libidinal attachment to the mother is expressed in the cult of Mary. Mary, as the true manifestation of “motherhood” in Western lore, intercedes with the Father who is in Heaven, on behalf of their children. This role is particularly important among southern Italian families (and similar societies) exhibiting the “typical Mediterranean pattern,” where sons are unable to transfer their libidinal attachments from their mothers. See Anne Parsons, *Belief, Magic, and Anomie* (New York: Free Press, 1969), pp. 135–150. Hence the popularity of the “Madonna cult” in these areas; see *ibid.* pp. 95–96, 274–275.

²⁰¹ The accusation of deicide against Jews, served to displace the guilt from Jesus the son [who else could have had the power to “kill” the Father?!] and project it onto the Jewish people.

In the last verse quoted above (*Romans 7: 4*), Paul introduced a new argument: the Jewish *people* died vicariously in Jesus and are now free from the restrictions of Law.²⁰² Herein lays one of the possible sources for depicting Israel as dejected and accursed, and thereby legitimating violence against her—a portrait that had tragic consequences in the long history of anti-Semitism! Later, theologians would say that Jews are not only dead but also deadly. Surely no one can murder or spoil the goods of a defunct people. An updated version, bearing the same message, was offered by Arnold Toynbee (1889-1975), who declared that the Jewish people and civilization to be a “fossil.”²⁰³ This could exonerate all anti-Jewish measures—you can neither rob nor murder a corpse!

4.-Oedipal Theology

The oedipal components of Paul’s theology are clear: the Hebrew Scripture representing Law and paternal authority that is to be substituted by Son, who came to replace paternal authority with Love. The authority of the Son, however, could be validated only if the mother would accept him in incestuous wedlock.²⁰⁴ If Widow-Israel would have accepted her Husband’s Son as her rightful Husband, then (and only then) the demise of the Father would have been justified. As it stands, Israel’s refusal to accept Son-Jesus (in place of the dead-Father) is to be interpreted as an act of pure wretchedness. Accordingly, oedipal guilt must be displaced; theologically speaking: *imputed* on them.

The symbolic elimination of the father’s role is explicit in the denial of the physical paternity of Jesus. It has been observed that “the father-denial ideology” is oedipal: “He is not killed; he is defined out of existence as far as his children are concerned.” Underlying this thesis is the claim that the “mother is impregnated by a spirit of the totem.” Socially, the father is “castrated, rendered ineffective, defined away.”²⁰⁵ Anthropologically, it represents the “act of symbolic patricide.”²⁰⁶ It is an expression of deep hostility on the part of the son, and it “is directed against the father in his role not as a pater, but as a progenitor.”²⁰⁷ Concerning the son’s rejection of the role of his biological father, it had been noted:

That a son should wish to reject knowledge of the fact that his father is his genitor is not, of course, a strange notion in the annals of child development. One explanation for this frequently found wish is based

²⁰² Paul’s argument presupposes the rabbinic doctrine that the dead are free from duties; see *Shabbat* 30a and parallels, cf. *MT Kil’aim* 10:25. The argument is valid as long as the individual were to remain in a state of death—not if he were to come to life again. (Therefore, the Vatican refused to recognize the State of Israel, while recognizing the rights of non-Jews to the same land)! The doctrine that Israel is a widow bewildered some Christian theologians and commentators; see Ernst Kasemann, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1973), pp. 176-181.

²⁰³ See *Horizontal Society*, Section IV, n. 90.

²⁰⁴ Incest was widely practiced in pagan society, past and present.

²⁰⁵ Robin Fox, *Red Lamp of Incest* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1980), pp. 70–71.

²⁰⁶ Ernst Jones, “Mother-Right and the Sexual Ignorance of Savages,” *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 6 (1925), pp. 109–130.

²⁰⁷ Milford E. Spiro, *Oedipus in the Trobriand* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), p. 65.

on the assumption—derived from psycho-analytic theory, and supported by a great deal of empirical evidence— that fathers are both loved and hated, and that the latter emotion derives from one or both of the following conditions: resentment over their punitive authority, and/or jealous rivalry for the love (sexual and/or affectionate) of the mother. But hatred of the father leads to a typical oedipal conflict. On the one hand, the child, motivated by resentment or by rivalry, wishes to harm, to be rid, of the father. On the other hand, whether from a *talion* fear (“I want to harm him, therefore he wants to harm me”) or from guilt (“Since he loves me and/or since I love him, how can I wish to harm him?”) this wish is extremely painful. In the absence of institutional or cultural assistance in dealing with this conflict, the child must cope with it by his own internal resources, of which I shall mention only two. He can *repress* his hatred, which is the typical (and normal) technique found in Western society, or he can express it symbolically by *denying* in fantasy that his father is a genitor. (The latter is often accomplished, both in private fantasy as well as in hero myths, by the substitution of grandiose fathers—gods, kings, and so on— for the real father.) Sometimes, it should be added, rather than denying that his father is genitor, the child denies that he had any genitor.²⁰⁸ [Italics in the original]

The Oedipus myth had nuclear importance in the formation of the religious life and values of pagan humanity, a point that was fully examined by Theodor Reik (1888-1970). Christianity, of all the major religions, succeeded in best synthesizing the psychic constellations of impulses and conflicts peculiar to Greek and Roman societies. Cautiously hinting at the impact of the Oedipus myth on Christianity, Reik wrote:

I do not know how far I have succeeded in giving the reader of the foregoing pages a notion of the great importance of the Oedipus myth in the religious life of the Greeks, and of the close and cryptic relation of the performance of the *Oedipus* to the religious ritual of Hellas. The profound and lasting influence of the Oedipus legend in antiquity must, I believe, be ascribed to the religious motive which revealed the instinctual life of men in conflict with the laws of the gods. For here, as in the Dionysian games, and the ritual of Attis, Adonis, and Osiris, a young revolutionary savior [=Jesus] was represented, rebelling against the old and powerful father-god and suffering a terrible punishment for his offense. I believe the influence of these performances may be compared with that of the ecclesiastical Passion play on the faithful of the Middle Ages, for it depended on the same psychic precedents. The prehistory of Christ is not unlike that of Oedipus. It should be emphasized that in the Oedipus myth, as we now have it, the profoundest psychic motives, which led to the formation of religion, though unrecognized by the auditors, were nonetheless plastically represented, and that here an unconscious sense of guilt was evoked.²⁰⁹

The father continued to exercise “heroic authority” until recent times.²¹⁰ Bronislaw Malinowski (1884-1942) described this kind of father, as the “absolute ruler of the family,” “the source of authority,” and “the origin of punishment.” In families of lower economic income, the father was brutal and sadistic:

When a father returns home tired from work, or drunk from the inn, he naturally vents his ill-temper on the family, and bullies mother and children. There is no village, no poor quarter in a modern town, where cases could not be found of sheer, patriarchal cruelty. From my own memory, I could quote numerous

²⁰⁸ Milford E. Spiro, “Virgin Birth, Parthenogenesis and Physiological Paternity: An Essay in Cultural Interpretation,” *Man* 3 (1968), p. 256.

²⁰⁹ Theodor Reik, “Oedipus and the Sphinx,” in eds. George H. Pollock and John Maunder Ross, *Oedipus Papers* (Madison, Conn.: International Universities Press, 1988), p. 61. For a full treatment of the subject, see *ibid.* pp. 21-65.

²¹⁰ Significantly, Rank wrote that the “patriarchal ideology” collapsed with the end of “imperialism” in World War I.

cases where peasant fathers would, on returning home drunk, beat the children for sheer pleasure, or drag them out of bed and send them into the cold night.²¹¹

One could well argue that this behavior is less than typical and does not exemplify the “Western” father, and that the father’s harsh treatment of the son may be motivated by his own oedipal rivalry.²¹² Be that as it may, the absolute authority exercised by the father in Western society, resulted in a profound resentment harbored by sons against their fathers, as well as the augmented sympathy and love toward their mothers—two essential elements of the oedipal model. Short of atonement, guilt feeling expressed as anger turning inward, could be temporarily alleviated by finding a scapegoat upon which to vent anger outwardly. Christianity provided the ‘religious’ basis for a culturally constituted behavior. In this regard, persecution of the Jews is one of those cultural displacement-mechanisms, designed to drain off hostile emotions.²¹³ Anti-Semitism may be classified as a culturally constituted defense, designed to gratify the oedipal impulses of society, and also protect it from a disruptive, antisocial behavior. In a different context Milford Spiro noted:

In societies in which religious behavior is appropriate to, rather than disruptive of, the behavioral environment of the actors, and in which a religious world view is consistent with, rather than a distortion of, ‘reality,’ religion serves as a highly constituted defense mechanism.²¹⁴

In which case, as with all culturally sanctioned myths, the individual does not feel any moral or psychological responsibility for acting out his own ‘religious’ fantasies.

In brief, the world of the Greeks, Romans, and heroic cultures in general, perceived the Jew as the embodiment of the Law and the representative of the God-Father on earth. The fact that Jews were burned wrapped in the scroll of the Tora shows the intimate relation between Jew and Law in the eyes of the Romans.²¹⁵ (In this connection it is worth remembering that the central topic of *Oedipus Rex* is rebellion against authority.²¹⁶) Thus, they hated and murdered the Jews for the same reason that Brutus raged against Caesar and killed him.

5.-Mitigating the Oedipal Tension

The oedipal complex may be subject to cross-cultural variability.²¹⁷ One of the variants is Judaism, where the possibilities of an oedipal resolution are augmented in favor of

²¹¹ Bronislaw Malinowski, *Sex and Repression in Savage Society*, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953), p. 29.

²¹² See *Sex and Repression in Savage Society*, p. 27, n. 1; and *Oedipus in the Trobriand*, pp. 36–37.

²¹³ On this type of mechanism, see Milford Spiro, “An Overview and a Suggested Reorientation,” in ed. Francis L. K. Hsu, *Psychological Anthropology* (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1961), pp. 486–487.

²¹⁴ Milford Spiro, “Religious Systems as Culturally Constituted Defense Mechanisms,” in ed. Milford E. Spiro, *Context and Meaning in Cultural Anthropology* (New York: Free Press, 1965), p. 113.

²¹⁵ See *Golden Doves*, pp. 4–6.

²¹⁶ See Eric Fromm, “The Oedipus Complex and the Oedipus Myth,” in ed. Ruth Nanda Ashen, *Family: Its Function and Destiny* (New York: Harper, 1959), pp. 424–426, 445–448.

²¹⁷ See Bronislaw Malinowski, *Sex and Repression in Savage Society*. On the famous Jones-Malinowski debate, see Anne Parsons, *Belief, Magic, and Anomie*, pp. 3–63. For a devastating critique of Malinowski’s thesis, see *Oedipus in the Trobriand*, Chapter 2.

renunciation, sublimation, and the acceptance of a supreme Law, representing the will of the Father.²¹⁸ Various cultural factors contributed to this outcome. Primary among these was the fact that the Law was not *imposed*, but *negotiated* by mutual consent in a *berit* (“covenant”—the *diatheke* of the Septuagint!) between God and Israel. The Law-*berit* embraces everyone, establishing a horizontal relation between all parties: God the Father, the people at large, the biological parents and their offspring, as well as all social, political and ecclesiastical authorities and institutions.

Freud observed that “the authority of the father or the parents is interjected into the ego, and there it forms the nucleus of the super-ego, which takes over the severity of the father and perpetuates his prohibition against incest.”²¹⁹ Because in Jewish thought, authority rests in the covenantal-Law and not in the *person* of the father, hostility is significantly reduced. In exercising his authority, the father is merely an instrument of the Law: would he order his son to break the Law, he should not be obeyed. Moreover, the father’s authority is not categorically superior to that of the mother. The child must honor his father *before* his mother, because—*as a consequence of the matrimonial bond*—the mother, too, owes the father respect. If they would divorce, then it would be up to the son to choose whom he wants to honor first.²²⁰

Unlike Oedipus and other ancient myths dealing with father-son hostility, in the ‘*Aqeda* (“Binding”) story—where Abraham “binds” his son Isaac as a sacrifice to be offered to God (*Genesis* 22:1–9)—neither father nor son is killed.²²¹ Rather, the ‘*Aqeda* shows how the discovery of a “higher Law” leads to conscience formation and to a successful resolution of oedipal hostility. Abraham is restrained by a Law standing *above* father and son. From “the delusion of parental omnipotence,” the child passes into the discovery of a *moral* father and a *supreme* Law. This seminal point was well explained by Richard Kaufman:

The wishes to displace, succeed, or imitate the father can be superseded by an acceptance, respect, and cultivation of the father’s values, standards, goals, morals, and those of the parental generation. Father’s values, the child can recognize, have an existence apart from father. There is a change of function of father image from regulator to exemplar. The child can see the parent demonstrate the positive implications of placing morality and justice superordinate to power and brute strength. The father who acts becomes the father who is acted on and, ultimately, the father who acts upon himself. Finally, to the image of the ideal father is added the image of the father as a man *with* ideas. The dreaded oedipal father becomes the post-oedipal father and his heritage.²²² [Italics in original]

²¹⁸ See Dorothy F. Zeligs *Psychoanalysis and the Bible* (New York: Human Sciences, 1988), pp. xviii, xxiii, 311–314.

²¹⁹ *S.E.* 19: 176.

²²⁰ See *Qiddushin* 31a; *MT Mamrim* 6:14, and Radbaz *ad loc.* Cf. George Devereux, *Basic Problems of Ethno-psychiatry* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980), pp. 98-99.

²²¹ Traditional Christian commentaries overlooked this basic point and went out of their way to interpret the ‘*Aqeda* in Christological terms; see *Isaac and Oedipus*, pp. 70–71. Some modern writers, too, manage to overlook this seminal point; cf. “Symbolic Interpretation in Psychoanalysis and Anthropology,” p. 290.

²²² Richard Kaufman, “Oedipal Object Relations and Morality,” *Annual of Psychoanalysis* 11 (1982), p. 253.

According to Jewish tradition, Abraham succeeded in attaining a measure of reconciliation with his own father.²²³ By contrast, Oedipus, banished by his father, ended up killing him. Quoting Kaufman again:

There is a salient distinction between Abraham and Oedipus. Abraham dealt with his father. At the crossroads, Oedipus *became* his father, a vengeful, hateful, impulsive man. There was no atonement, repentance, or reconciliation. When caught for his crime, Oedipus turned on himself in an outburst of rage with the same unforgiving wrath that destroyed Laius, a wrath that now typified his own superego. Through Oedipus's own superego, Laius achieved a posthumous victory. What father inflicted on the son was repeated by the son upon himself: mutilation and exile.²²⁴

In Jewish tradition, the son secures his sacred and inviolable rights by accepting the Law-*berit*. In this fashion, parental authority, as a source of rivalry, is mitigated.²²⁵ An important factor in the lessening and containment of oedipal tension is the prohibition against all forms of incest--the only system of its kind among ancient codes. By contrast, in societies in which this conflict was not resolved, there is a constant need for repression. Regarding this pivotal point, Spiro wrote:

...in societies in which unconscious Oedipal conflicts require persistent repression for their containment, the Oedipus complex may undergo structural transformations as a result of defensively motivated projections and displacements which importantly affect other social relationships and institutions.²²⁶

Before recognizing God, Father of Israel, the individual must be part of Abraham's *household*. The circumcision is the symbolic act by which the new born is induced into the Patriarch's *household*. Thus, at the circumcision ceremony, the father of the new born child gives thanks to God, "for having enjoined us to have him [the child] join in the covenant of our Patriarch Abraham." The same is with neophytes being incorporated into the nation of Israel. Circumcision constitutes their formal induction into the household of Patriarch Abraham. Maimonides explained to a neophyte, that he too, must recite in the prayers, "Our God and the God of *our* Fathers, since Patriarch Abraham is *your* father--and [the father] of all who join (the nation of) Israel."²²⁷

Paul did not have the foggiest idea how a prospective proselyte becomes, "a member of Abraham's household." Therefore, he rejected circumcision altogether: "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing" (*Galileans* 5:2). Thus, Paul casted himself out from the household of Abraham, and chose the pagan

²²³ The rabbis taught that Abraham's father repented. See *Genesis* 15:15, where God assures Abraham, "You shall come to your *fathers* in peace." Let us point out that when time came to find a wife for Isaac, Abraham instruct his servant to go and search from among "my family" (*Genesis* 24:4).

²²⁴ "Oedipal Object Relations and Morality," *Annual of Psychoanalysis* 11 (1982), p. 250. 'Blinding' is symbolic of castration; see George Devereux, "The Self-Blinding of Oidipous in Sophokles: *Oidipus Tyrannos*," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 93 (1973), pp. 36-49.

²²⁵ One could argue that rejection of the Law and the covenantal ground between father and son in Jewish secular culture actually intensifies oedipal resentment and hostility. This is the sense of the verse: "For they are a treacherous (תהפכת) generation, [therefore they will have] children who are disloyal" (*Deuteronomy* 32:20. The JPS translation is faulty).

²²⁶ *Oedipus in the Trobriand*, pp. 172-173.

²²⁷ *Letters and Essays of Maimonides* (Heb.), (Maaleh Adumim: Maaliyot Press, 5748/1988), vol. 1, p. 234; cf. *Perush ha-Mishnayot, Bikkurim* 1:4, vol. 1, p. 417; *MT Bikkurim* 4:3; and *Homo Mysticus*, pp. 127-131.

paterfamilias. With a major consequence: members of Abraham's household can always return home; whereas the children of paterfamilias end up in "mutilation and exile."

6.-"Sold Under Sin"

Paul admitted that he could not control his carnal desires. "For we know that the law [*nomos*=Tora] is spiritual, and I am fleshly, having been sold under sin. For what I work out, I do not know. For what I do not will, this I do. But what I hate, this I do" (*Romans* 7:14-15). We can only speculate about the nature of Paul's transgressions. However, that much is clear, in addition to the spiritual '*nomos*/Tora,' Paul confessed to be captive of a second, carnal/*nomos*, controlling his "fleshly" self. "For I delight in the law [*nomos*=Tora] of God according to the inward man; but I see another law [*nomos*] in my [carnal] members warring against the law [*nomos*=Tora] of my mind, and taking me captive by the law [*nomos*] of [carnal] sin being in my members" (*Romans* 7:22-23). The "inward man" about whom Paul was talking, is intrinsic to the "image of God" awarding every individual the faculty to choose between good and evil. It is by virtue of this faculty that man is fundamentally different than other creatures. "A beast has no evil impulse" (יצר הרע),²²⁸ taught the rabbis, for the simple reason that it neither has a "good impulse" (יצר הטוב). When man finds himself struggling with this choice, the rabbis advised, "An individual should always have his good impulse (יצר הטוב) upset at his evil impulse (יצר הרע),"²²⁹ for trying to pervert him. It is a matter of self-esteem. Every human, having been endowed with the image of God within, has the faculty to bring these conflicting impulses under control. The proper study of Tora could be a helping factor in this struggle.²³⁰ However, to be effective, the rabbis recommend accompanying Tora studies with "acts of loving kindness" toward others.²³¹ "Someone who is engaged in the (study of) Tora for her own sake," that is, with the intention to fulfill it, "his Tora would be for him an elixir of life."²³² Such an individual could not only control his impulses, but also turn them into something positive.²³³ However, "someone engaging in the [study of] Tora not for its own sake," that is, as a purely intellectual task, without intention to fulfill it, "it would turn to be a deadly poison for him."²³⁴ In short, unless the Tora-student is devoted to the practice of benevolence, he would not be able to experience the God of Israel. That is why, "Whoever occupies himself with Tora [without acts of love and kindness], equals someone having no God."²³⁵

²²⁸ *Abot de-R. Nathan* XVIIA, p. 64.

²²⁹ *Berakhot* 5a.

²³⁰ See *Baba Batra* 16a, etc.

²³¹ *Aboda Zara* 5b.

²³² *Ta'anivot* 7a.

²³³ See *Sukka* 52a and *Abot de-R. Nathan* XVIIA, p. 64.

²³⁴ *Ta'anivot* 7a. A similar view is found in *Yerushalmi Shabbat* I, 2, 3b: "Someone who studies (*Tora*) to fulfill it—[he will be successful]—but not someone who studies Tora and does not fulfill it, because one that studies (*Tora*) not to fulfill it, it would be better for him that he had not been born."

²³⁵ *Aboda Zara* 17b.

There are two distinct responsibilities associated with fatherhood: that of a [1] “regulator” (=ושננתם) and that of [2] “exemplary” (=ודברת בם) (*Deuteronomy* 6:7). In quality of “regulator,” the father must repeat the same basic message, in accordance to the child’s linguistic and mental development.²³⁶ However, to be effective, the message must be conveyed in an “exemplary” manner, as when you are recapitulating a conversation (=ודברת בם). Richard Kaufman explained this seminal point:

The wishes to displace, succeed, or imitate the father can be superseded by an acceptance, respect, and cultivation of the father’s values, standards, goals, morals, and those of the parental generation. Father’s values, the child can recognize, have an existence apart from father. There is a change of function of the father image from regulator [=ושננתם] [2] to exemplar [=ודברת].

Failure to exercise freedom of choice would affect the individual. As noted by Eric Fromm (1900-1980):

Freedom of choice is not a formal abstract capacity which one either ‘has’ or ‘has not’; it is, rather, a function of a person’s character structure. Some people have no freedom to choose the good because their character structure has lost the capacity to act in accordance with the good.²³⁷

Freedom of choice entails *responsibility*. “If your evil impulse were to say to you: ‘Sin and God will forgive you! Don’t believe him.’”²³⁸ Paul, denied responsibility: “But if I do what I do not desire, it is no longer *I* working it out, but *sin* dwelling in me” (*Romans* 7:21). Someone entrenched in evil, and claiming to have being “sold under sin” (*Romans* 7:14) has forfeited the image of God within and equals a corpse. Thus, the rabbis taught that the wicked, even while alive “are regarded as dead.”²³⁹ Echoing this doctrine, Paul cried: “Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” (*Romans* 7:24). Because Paul refused to assume responsibility, he laid down the fault outside himself. Concerning Paul’s state of mind, a distinguished psychiatrist explained:

Because it often appears as something unconscious that is independent of, and often counter to, my conscious intentions, it is experienced as something happening outside of me. That is the demons. As Paul says, they cause me not to do the good that I would do and to carry out the evil that I would not (*Romans* 7:19). Since they often thwart my will, I experience them as alien to my ego.²⁴⁰

Paul had no idea of the meaning of Biblical “sin.” He only knew of pagan guilt and was ensnared by it. Thus, he could blame others, but not himself: *metis* forbids the prey to look inside the trap lest it frees itself: the prey is only permitted to look outside the trap. To justify his behavior, Paul declared that “Christ is the end of law for righteousness to everyone that believes” (*Romans* 10:4); i.e., works are inconsequential. That is why

²³⁶See *Qiddushin* 29b-30a; *MT Talmud Tora* 1:6; cf. *ibid.* 1-3, etc.

²³⁷ Eric Fromm, *Heart of Man* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), p. 168.

²³⁸ *Hagiga* 16a. Cf. *Baba Qamma* 50a.

²³⁹ *Berakhot* 18a; cf. *MT Teshuba* 6:3 and *Homo Mysticus*, p. 127.

²⁴⁰ Alfred Ribi, *Demons of the Inner World* (Boston: Shambala, 1990), p. 192.

‘faith’—not actions—is enough for salvation (see *Romans* 1:17; 3:20-28; 4: 15-16; 10:9-10, 13; *Galatians* 5:5; *1Peter* 5:9-10; *John* 6:27-29). In this fashion, Paul repudiated Biblical responsibility on behalf of pagan guilt. With one major difference: pagan guilt can only be atoned through violence against the guilty party. This is why, upon declaring “Sold under sin,” Paul fantasized that, as per magic, Jesus’ death would serve for atonement to a people too lax to assume responsibility and declared that Jesus “gave Himself on our behalf” (*Titus* 2:14, see *Romans* 3:25; *Galatians* 1:4). Instead of following the advice of the Tora and pursue the path of *teshuba*, Paul chose to escape responsibility by taking refuge in Jesus’ death (see *Romans* 7:25). Consequently, he claimed that there is “no condemnation to those” in Jesus (*Romans* 8:1), since they are “free from the law of sin and of death” (*Romans* 8:2). This is a total fabrication! There is nothing in the words of Jesus (and or transmitted by his disciples) warranting that he would serve as ‘refuge’ for a people, too sluggish to exercise self-control, abstain from sin, and ask God for forgiveness.

The outcome of Paul’s doctrine of “guilt” was rupture with the Law of Israel, with the people of Israel, and with the God of Israel. Concerning the latter, Nietzsche observed: *Deus, qualem Paulus creavit, Dei negatio* (“The God that Paul created, negates God”).²⁴¹ We should not be surprised, therefore, to discover that the Ebionites, who were Jesus’ original disciples, regarded Paul as a fraud. For reasons that will be clear in the next chapter, the Church chose Paul *over* Jesus and *excommunicated* the Ebionites.²⁴² This may be the reason why in late Coptic dialect, *ebien* (from Hebrew *ebyon*) came to mean ‘bad,’ ‘evil.’ Kindly, the *Catholic Encyclopedia* defines the Ebionites as, “one or more early Christian sects infected with Judaistic errors.” By the way, the same could be said of Jesus and his disciples!

A note, concerning the 12th benediction instituted in the Hebrew daily prayer against the *minim* [as per the Sephardic *Prayer Book*: אל תהי תקוה למינים... “to sectarians...do not be of hope”]. It is a reference against *Jews* who, like the Nazarites and Ebionites, believed that Jesus was a messiah, and were in the habit to disrupt the public services. The clause, “do not be of *hope*” is a reference to *Jeremiah* 31:16 (cf. Mishna *Qiddushin* 4:14), concerning the *hope* that these individuals expected to receive. It is not a ‘curse,’ but a foresight: Ye *Minim*! Your hope will remain unfulfilled. The fact that some time later, the Church excommunicated the Judeo-Christians followers of Jesus, illustrates with eerily precision the rabbis’ foresight: the *minim* ended losing ‘hope’ among both Jews and Christians. There is a marked level of sanctimony on the part of the Church, for reproaching the Synagogue for criticizing the Judeo-*minim*, while at the same time the Church was burning them alive at the sake!²⁴³

²⁴¹ Friedrich Nietzsche. *The Anti-Christ* (Cosimo Edition, 2005), Section # 47.

²⁴² See Eusebius, *History of the Church* (Penguin Books, 1965), #27, pp. 136-137.

²⁴³ On the precise meaning of *minim*, see *Horizontal Society*, Appendix 55.

7.-Paul, “a Roman to Romans”—in Earnest!

There is a remarkable passage by Professor Milton Konvitz (1908-2003), defining the character of “Biblical man.”

The Biblical man of faith believed that God does not play moral tricks; that in the moral realm He is as subtle as in the physical realm, and that in neither realm is He malicious.²⁴⁴

If we were to accept this definition, then we will have to conclude that Paul, who believed that “God had mocked man by offering a salvation on terms that they both knew to be impossible,” was not a man of “Biblical faith.” A close look at his words and manners will reveal that Paul was a man of *metis* for whom the end justifies the means. Unabashedly, Paul admitted that he assumed different characters according to the circumstances at hand. “And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law (=Tora), as under the law (=Tora)...To them that are without law, as without law...” (1 *Corinthians* 9:20-21; see *Acts* 21:39). To the Pharisees he was a “Pharisee the son of a Pharisee” (*Acts* 23:6). At the same time, he also was a “Roman to Romans” (see *Acts* 22:25-29; cf. *ibid.* 16:37-38; 23:27, etc.). To illustrate our point we shall examine three strategic doctrines advanced by Paul that served to trace Church policy, and further consolidate the Roman Empire and European society for time to come. These are:

First, a doctrine referred in early history, as the Divine Right of Imperial Rome, and later as the Divine Right of Kings. It postulates the unconditional submission of the faithful to the *political* sovereign, as a *religious imperative* (see *Lk* 22:25, cf. *Mark* 10:43). Addressing the faithful, Paul said:

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisted the power, resisted the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For the rulers are not terror to good works but to evil. Will you then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and you shall have praise of the same. For he (the political leader) is the minister of God to you for good. But if you do that which is evil, be afraid (of the ruler); for he bears not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that does evil. Wherefore you must be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. (*Rom* 13: 1-5; cf. *1Pet* 2: 13-19)

By admonishing the people to submit to Imperial Rome, as a *religious imperative*, Paul was confirming the heroic ideology, according to which a vanquished people are to be “regarded as godless men, so that along with civil liberty they lost natural liberty.”²⁴⁵ Or what amounts to the same, that “among gods as among mortals the king can do no wrong and the conquered no right.”²⁴⁶ (It may be of some interest to note that those who

²⁴⁴ Milton B. Konvitz, “A Philosophy of Human Rights,” in eds. Abraham I. Katsh and Leon Nemoy, *Essays on the Occasion of the Seventieth Anniversary of the Dropsie University* (Philadelphia: Dropsie University, 1979), p. 301. {Section I, n. 123.}

²⁴⁵ *New Science* #676, p. 255.

²⁴⁶ Jane Ellen Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1922), p. 339.

opposed the American Revolution cited on their behalf, Paul's doctrine of unlimited submission.)

Consistent with the ideal that Imperial Power is godly, Paul endorsed disobedience to *Jewish* authorities (see *Acts* 4:19, cf. 5, 6; 5: 21, 29, cf. 5, 6, 17). He also claimed that Roman system of justice is superior to that of Israel. He justified his thesis with following argument:

Is it the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers face, and have license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him. (*Acts* 25:16).

Consequently, Paul wished to be tried by the Romans, rather than by a Jewish tribunal: "I stand at Caesar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged" (*Acts* 25:10; see 11, 21, 25; 28:19, etc.). His wish was granted, and he was taken to Rome where he was executed by Nero.²⁴⁷ This last detail was omitted by Luke so as not to strain Roman-Christian relations.

Luke therefore closed his writings with Paul free to speak openly in Rome about "the kingdom of God and...the Lord Jesus Christ," subjects not without political nuances. Rome is not only just and powerful; Rome can abide the Christian message.²⁴⁸

Second, Paul urged the absolute submission of wives to the paterfamilias, as a *religious imperative*:

Submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord (*Kyrios*)! For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the savior of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything. Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it. (*Ephesians* 5:21-25)

As noted earlier, the translation "Lord" for the Greek *Kyrios* is misleading. In the Septuagint, *Kyrios* translates *A-donai* standing for the Tetragrammaton.²⁴⁹ From a theological perspective, Paul urging women to relate to their husband as *Kyrios* was no less outrageous, than "those brave men" mentioned earlier who treated their wives as slaves.²⁵⁰ The last verse, requesting husband to love their wives as "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it," seems a bit disingenuous in light of the fact that there was no Church before the death of Jesus.

²⁴⁷ See '... *And so we came to Rome*', pp. 58-63; cf. *Horizontal Society*, Section III, n. 247. Paul did not question the fairness of the Romans justice system. In this context let us point out, that a favorite expression of gratitude used by the Roman authorities to thank Jewish collaborators was agonizing torture; see the case of Pappus b. Judah, *Horizontal Society*, Chapter 39.

²⁴⁸ '... *And so we came to Rome*', p. 63.

²⁴⁹ See the quotation above at n. 31.

²⁵⁰ See the quotation above, notes 15-17.

Third, sanctioning slavery as a *religious imperative*. This doctrine was important to Rome, given that the entire Roman economy was based on slave labor. Consistent with their hierarchic view of humanity, Greeks and Romans regarded slaves as non-persons, who had no right even to bear a name. In support of imperial dominion, Paul defined ‘freedom’ as the absolute submission to the *earthly* masters. “Servants, obey in all things your Masters according to the flesh!” To Paul, slavery was not merely a matter of fact, but a *religious imperative*: “Not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but in singleness of heart, as fearing the Lord” (*Colossians* 3:22; cf. *Romans* 13:1-7; *1 Corinthians* 9:27; *1 Peters* 2:13-21; *Titus* 3:1, etc.). Later, Martin Luther (1483-1546) extended this doctrine to include Christian slaves owned by Muslims. Sternly, he warned them not to disobey their earthly masters since they were their *property*, “like cattle or other possession.”²⁵¹ Paul’s words served as the main defense in support of Christian slaveholders.²⁵²

Roman authorities recognized the favor. Accordingly, time and again, when Paul and his companions were brought to the authorities for disciplinary action, they were protected by the process of Roman law. Even when due process was neglected, as in Thessalonica, the magistrates quickly remedied the situation when challenged by Paul.²⁵³

Thus began a close collaboration between “the crosier and the sword” which, as noted by Oscar S. Straus (1850-1926), “has been the prime source of more bloodshed in Europe than all other causes combined.”²⁵⁴

8.-Paul and Rome: Putting their Shoulders to the Wheel

There was a good reason for Rome and Paul’s followers to join forces. Their interest and ideologies coincided, both in ethos and pathos. Essential to heroic value was the notion of their national antiquity and cultural superiority. Vico made the very important observation that when the philosophers first appeared,

...the Greeks were still in a crude state of barbarism, from which they advanced immediately to one of the highest refinement while at the same time preserving intact their fables both of gods and of heroes.²⁵⁵

However, instead of promoting a sense of humanism and respect for other cultures, Greek ‘rationalism’ served to further inflate their notion superiority and the belief that they could treat those ‘below’ inhumanly. As noted by Vico:

²⁵¹ Quoted by Walter Kaufmann, *Religions in Four Dimensions* (New York: Reader’s Digest Press, 1976), p. 157.

²⁵² See Forrest G. Wood, *The Arrogance of Faith* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990), pp. 67-83.

²⁵³ ‘... *And so we came to Rome*’, p. 59.

²⁵⁴ *The Origin of the Republican Form of Government*, p. 91.

²⁵⁵ *New Science*, #158, pp. 65-66. #38, p. 24.

To these heroic deeds we must add the intolerable pride, profound avarice and pitiless cruelty with which the ancient Roman patricians treated the unhappy plebeians, as is clearly seen in Roman history precisely during that period which Livy himself describes as having been the age of Roman virtue and the most flourishing popular liberty yet dreamt of in Rome.²⁵⁶

Vico contrasted the “intolerable pride,” “the conceit of nations,”²⁵⁷ and “supreme arrogance characteristic of barbarous times,”²⁵⁸ with the unassuming attitude of the Jews:

Flavius Josephus the Jew purges his nation [of this vain boast] by the magnanimous confession that the Hebrew had lived cut off from all gentiles. And sacred history assures us that the world is almost young in contrast to the antiquity with which it was credited by the Chaldeans, Scythians, Egyptians, and in our day by the Chinese. This is a great proof of the truth of sacred history.²⁵⁹

A similar argument is found in the *Book of Maccabees*: Greek hatred of the Law was an extension of their “arrogance” (1Mac 1:21). In the same vein, Maimonides regarded anti-Semitism in general to be an extension of “envy.” Anticipating Strauss, Maimonides noted the union of “the crosier and the sword,” slaughtering Jews with one hand while offering salvation with the other hand.²⁶⁰ Nothing was more offensive to heroic ethos than human equality. Thus, Jewish Law and Jewish values, proposing the absolute equality of *all* human beings, by virtue of bearing the image of One God, together with the rule of Law, standing above *all* types of authority, was anathema to heroic ethos and pathos. Hence the virulent anti-Semitic propaganda, “At the bottom of all these stories, we always find the same conception of Judaism as a misanthropic and superstitious power engaged in a struggle against the whole world.”²⁶¹

Jewish persecution, from Hellenistic times and throughout the ages, has to do with the fact that societies governed by oedipal feelings needed to vent their oedipal rage against the ‘Father.’ This will explain the assault against the Law, standing for God-Father, and the mass-murder of Jews, standing for His authority. The destruction of Synagogues and immolation of Jewish sacred texts marking the murder of Jews, may serve as evidence of those feelings. Paul’s main contribution was to ascribe religious significance to those feelings.

Finally, we would like to point out to a fundamental element common to Paul’s Christianity and heroic ethos: greed. ‘Greed’ comprises two elements: predatory coveting of wealth and contempt for labor. For the heroic mind labor is demeaning. It pertains to ‘the lower echelons’ of society, such as plebeians, slaves, and Jews. It is unbecoming for heroes, or the new version, in the form of the landed aristocracy, the military elite, etc., and the clergy in particular, to soil the hands with common work. Wealth must be acquired by despoiling the work of ‘others’--those belonging to the lower echelons, Jews

²⁵⁶ *New Science of Giambattista Vico*, #38, p. 24.

²⁵⁷ *New Science of Giambattista Vico*, #125, p. 61.

²⁵⁸ *New Science of Giambattista Vico*, #38, p. 24.

²⁵⁹ *New Science* ## 125-126, p. 61.

²⁶⁰ See *Epistle to Yemen*, pp. 8–9, and 10–11, and above n. 17.

²⁶¹ Elias Bickerman, *God of the Maccabees* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979), p. 13.

in particular.²⁶² Paul proposed to accomplish the same in the realm of the spiritual. By de-authorizing the Law and ascribing to it the sense of ‘last will’ [=Old *Testament*], Paul sought to eliminate the God/Father’s authority, and abolish the spiritual dimension of the Jewish people. In this manner, the children of Israel, became “Israel after the flesh” (1*Corinthians* 10:18). Thus, by virtue of heroic logic, Paul could appropriate for himself and his followers the title “Israel of God” (*Gal* 6:17).²⁶³

A note, according to the explanation given by the *Maggid* to Maran Joseph Caro (c. 1485-1575), Adam’s children are those brave souls in Heaven that refused to consume “the bread of embarrassment,” and *chose* to come to this world, and gain celestial bliss by “the labor of their hands”! This permits a better definition of ‘Jew.’ A ‘Jew’ is an individual (of whatever denomination and or religion) who came to the realization that there are no ‘free lunches,’ either down-under in planet earth or up-there in Heaven. By way of contrast, Paul and his followers propose that you can always grab somebody else’s lunch, rob his identity, and fool ‘Our Father in Heaven’—it’s all a matter of *metis*!

²⁶² See my, “Jews, *Conversos*, and Native Americans: The Iberian Experience,” *Annual of Rabbinic Judaism* 3 (2000), pp. 95-121.

²⁶³ See *Horizontal Society*, Appendix 30.