



Paul and Jerusalem

| Gaston, Lloyd

The theology of the Jerusalem church had no future and cannot be revived today, while the theology of Paul triumphed to such an extent that it is only with difficulty that we can recover the theology of Jerusalem.

Paul and Jerusalem

by Lloyd Gaston

"There is nothing whatever to indicate that the primitive church in Jerusalem, or any elements in it, differed from St. Paul either in the matter of Christology or in sacramental practices and ideas."¹ So wrote Professor Beare at the beginning of the supplementary note to his well-stated radio broadcast on "Jesus and Paul." The attempt to separate Jerusalem and Paul stems from nineteenth-century liberalism, as he correctly points out. Sometimes it took the form of a dislike of Paul's "high" christology and ecclesiology coupled with a romantic longing for the simple piety and practice of the primitive church; sometimes it took the form of a dislike of the "Jewish legalism" of James coupled with a romantic admiration for Paul as the perfect hero of faith. It is also important to avoid a romanticism of the earliest church as a pure virgin, relegating all differences and "heresies" to the post-apostolic period. We will certainly try to avoid these extremes when expanding on and testing Beare's initial statement.

First, it is important to adhere to the language which says that this comparison is to be between Paul and the Jerusalem church² and not something called

"Jewish Christianity." The latter term has been used in so many different senses as to make communication almost impossible.³ An influential book by J . Danielou⁴ uses it in a sense so broad as to be almost meaningless. He refers to the influence of Jewish ideas, particularly apocalyptic, on the entire Christian movement down to the middle of the second century. Another important book, by H. J. Schoeps,⁵ studies only the pseudo-Clementines and other second- and third-century literature without making any explicit connection with the pre-70 C.E. period. To use specific Christian ideas, such as an Ebionite christology⁶ or anti-Paulinism⁷ and the exaltation of James⁸ as criteria, raises the question of the meaning of the adjective "Jewish." Any attempt to try to understand a first-century phenomenon on the basis of second- or third-century sources completely begs the question of continuity.⁹ Malina,¹⁰ who advocates the term Christian Judaism, gives a conceptual definition but without any discussion of the sources. A minimal definition in his view should include at least circumcision¹¹ and enough relation to Torah as covenant and commandments to justify the noun and enough relation to Jesus to justify the adjective. We will try here to avoid confusion by not using the term "Jewish Christianity" at all and by limiting our inquiry geographically to Jerusalem and temporally to Paul's lifetime.¹²

What are the sources that can be used to recover something of the theology of the Jerusalem church? To use material later than the first century raises the issue of continuity without any control, and therefore it must be completely put aside for the moment. If at one time the early chapters of Acts and particularly the mission speeches

could be used for this purpose,¹³ current scholarship on Luke would no longer allow it.¹⁴ If at one time it was thought that the Synoptic Gospels could be used for this purpose, there is today a growing consensus that all three are not only addressed to Gentile Christians but were written by Gentile Christians.¹⁵ The Synoptic Gospels must surely contain earlier traditions,¹⁶ but contemporary study of the gospels with its concern for redaction criticism would need to develop criteria for distinguishing Jerusalem traditions from other traditions. I believe that in fact the synoptic traditions and traditions in Acts and even to a degree later Christian Judaism can be used to corroborate and fill out a picture drawn from other sources, but they certainly can no longer serve as a self-evident starting point. We are left then with Paul as our sole witness.¹⁷

The study of "Jewish Christianity" will always be associated with the name of F. C. Baur, who made extensive use of the Pauline epistles. He created a synthesis brilliant in its simplicity when he declared all of the opponents mentioned in Paul's letters to be identical and then connected them via Gal. 2 and Acts 15 with Jerusalem¹⁸

This thesis can no longer be a presupposition of our study, and we must develop a very cautious methodology. In the first place, we should confine ourselves to opponents who are explicitly mentioned and not confuse them with the congregation actually addressed. In the second place, we must refrain from the kind of mirror reading which assumes that whatever Paul affirms or denies, his opponents must have said the opposite.¹⁹

The opponents are most clearly identified in 2 Corinthians. They are clearly Christian

Jews in Malina's sense (11:22-23a), but Judaizing or the law are not issues at all. This is true also of 2 Cor. 3, where not Moses as law giver but Moses as a *theios aner* model for ministry is the point of the discussion.²⁰ The Galatians were in danger of Judaizing, according to Paul, and the relation between the Galatians and the law is a major theme of the letter, but the identity of the troublemakers (1:6-9; 4:17, 30; 5:10-12; 6:12-13) is not at all clear. Paul says that they "do not keep the law," that is, are not Jews in his opinion.²¹ It is now clear that the opponents in Colossians are in no sense Jews nor is the Jewish Torah in any sense an issue.²² There is nothing to distinguish opponents referred to vaguely in Phil. 3 and Rom. 16 from those in 2 Cor. 10-13. In Rom. 1-15, 1 Corinthians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon there is no reference to opponents at all. In any case, Paul never connects any of his opponents with Jerusalem, and therefore we cannot take them as a starting point in our inquiry.

Paul always speaks of the Jerusalem church in positive terms.²³

He refers to two visits to that church (Gal. 1:18; 2:1) and a planned third visit (Rom. 15:25). The church was in existence then at least between the years 37 and 56. He mentions "the churches of Judea" (Gal.1:22; 1 Thess. 2:14), but the language of Rom. 15: 31 may suggest that by that he means the church of Jerusalem; there is no hint of the possible existence of Christian communities in Galilee. Paul calls the Jerusalem Christians "the saints" (Rom. 15:25-26, 31; 1 Cor. 16:1; 2 Cor. 8:4; 9:1, 12), but one cannot be sure that this was their own self designation.²⁴ He mentions leaders of the Jerusalem church as "apostles" (1 Cor. 9:4; 15:7; Gal. 1:19; 2:8) and "brothers of the Lord" (1 Cor. 9:4), and he mentions by name James (I Cor.15:7; Gal. 1:19; 2:9, 12) and John (Gal. 2:9) and Cephas (I Cor. 1:12; 3:22; 9:5; 15:5; Gal. 1:18;

2:7 v.1., 8 v.1., 9, 11, 14). Since Cephas is not a proper name but an Aramaic nickname ("Rock"),²⁵ we can conclude that the church spoke (also?) Aramaic. When we consider in addition that three leaders are called "pillars" (Gal. 2:9), and that the Jerusalem Christians may be referred to as "members of the house of faithfulness" (Gal. 6:10), the implications for their self understanding as God's temple are great.²⁶ If 1 Thess. 2:14 is not Pauline, as I believe, we know nothing of a persecution of the church, for Paul's own persecutions were not in Judea (Gal. 1:22-23). We do, however, hear of the possibility of persecution (presumably by Zealots) if "the saints" associate themselves too openly with Paul, who was suspected of causing Jews to become apostate (Rom. 15:31).²⁷ Exceedingly important to Paul was the collection from his churches for the Jerusalem church (Gal. 2:10; 6:6-10;²⁸ 1 Cor. 16:1-4; 2 Cor. 8-9; Rom. 15:25-33).²⁹ One of the motivations he gives for it is gratitude to Jerusalem for the "spiritual blessings" (Rom. 15:27) they have given to the Gentiles. When we add to all this Paul's statement of complete agreement with the gospel of Jerusalem-"whether it was I or they, so we preach and so you believed" (1 Cor. 15 :11)-we could simply express complete agreement with the statement with which this paper began and stop here. Almost.

The account of the Jerusalem conference in Gal. 2:1-10 has been read for so long in the light of a theory about Paul's "Jewish Christian" opponents that it is difficult to confine ourselves to what is actually said there. Our proposal, however, is to learn as much as we can about the Jerusalem church from Paul alone as a control over any such theory. Paul says that when he outlined "his" gospel-the gospel which he "preaches

among the Gentiles" (2:2; 1:16), "the gospel to the uncircumcised" (2:7)-for certain influential pillars, James and Cephas and John, they recognized that he had been entrusted with that gospel (by God) and acknowledged the grace (thereby) given to him. Paul also says that God "has been effective for Cephas for the apostolate to the circumcised" (2:8), so that the recognition was mutual. He claims that Titus, since he is a Greek, was not compelled to be circumcised (2:3), but he does not say that the "interloping false brethren" were members of the Jerusalem church at all (2:4). According to Paul, the idea of the collection from his Gentile churches for the Jerusalem church came about by mutual agreement (2:10). It may be that the tangled syntax in verses 4-6 indicates that perhaps things did not go as smoothly as Paul says, but let us remain with what is stated.

In the midst of all this mutual recognition we find astonishingly great theological differences between Paul and Jerusalem. Evidently they agreed on two gospels, one to the circumcised and one to the uncircumcised, and on two apostolates, one to the circumcised and one to the uncircumcised. We can further infer an agreement that the circumcised would continue to obey the commandments of the Torah (cf. 5:3; 1 Cor. 7:18), while the uncircumcised would be responsible for none of them. Presumably this is what is meant by "nothing being imposed" and by "preserving our freedom" and "not submitting to the subjection" (2:5). The Jerusalem church is characterized by circumcision, by Torah, and by a mission restricted to Israel.³⁰

These are considerable differences indeed from Paul's own emphases. Since the incident at Antioch³¹ did not occur in Jerusalem, we do not need to deal with it except to point out that, while Paul has harsh words for Cephas and Barnabas and the behaviour of certain Jews in Antioch, nothing whatsoever is said against James or the Jerusalem church. Nevertheless, must not differences in such vital areas as circumcision and

Torah and mission have other theological consequences, even if they were not recognized by Paul?

We now go beyond specific references to Jerusalem to see if anything further can be gleaned about the theology of that church. There is considerable agreement today that it is possible to isolate certain formulae cited by Paul.³² Often these are identified as being "Jewish Christian" in origin, although the criteria for this designation are seldom spelled out and rarely clear. We shall look briefly at a number of them without going into the complex issues of just how they are to be isolated.³³

We shall begin with those which most clearly can be identified with Jerusalem and use a kind of "criterion of coherence" to help us in other cases.

Most would say that 1 Cor. 15:3-7 contains a traditional formulation stemming from the Jerusalem church.³⁴ Not only does Paul specifically introduce it as tradition ("delivered ... received," 15:3), but he says in effect that this is the gospel preached by the people named, Cephas and James ("whether then it was I or they, so we preach," 15:11). There is also a fair amount of consensus on the extent of the formula.³⁵

died, for our sins, according to the Scriptures
was buried,
was raised, on the third day, according to the Scriptures
appeared to Cephas, then to the Twelve
to James, then

to all the apostles.

If we look for specific aspects of the theology of the Jerusalem church, we find the following. They had a concept of apostle which, especially if it is understood to be parallel to the Twelve, differed from that of Paul.³⁶ That the number twelve was chosen shows a claim of the group on all of Israel but also only on Israel. Jesus' death and resurrection were seen to be "according to the Scriptures," that is, as the climax and culmination of the whole history of Israel which is the subject of the Hebrew Bible. Insofar as these were understood as eschatological events, we can assume an apocalyptic background to the entire conception. Finally, Jesus' death was seen to have expiatory significance: it was "for (*hyper*) our sins."

Paul speaks of a tradition being received or delivered also in the liturgical formula in 1 Cor. 11:23b-25, and the connection with the Jerusalem church is indicated by the close parallel in Mark 14. If a covenant theology was merely implicit in 1 Cor. 15, here it is explicit: the cup is called "the new covenant." Jesus' death is referred to as his "blood," which may well have sacrificial or even specifically covenantal connotations (Exod.24:8). The reference to a new covenant (Jer.31:31) is thus not one of contrast but of culmination and fulfillment. Some have seen in *paradidomi*, in connection with Jesus' death, traces of a *Dahingabeformel* which may go back to the Jerusalem church (cf. Rom. 4:25, Gal. 1:4).³⁷ Jesus' death is said to be "for you" (11:24), and it is probable that Matthew has correctly captured the sense of this statement in the Jerusalem church when he adds more precisely

"for the forgiveness of sins" (26:28).

W. Kramer identifies a pre-Pauline tradition in what he calls a *pistis* formula, which is to be distinguished from a *homologia*.³⁸ Thus Rom. 10:9b would reflect a formula such as, "We believe that God raised Jesus from the dead," a formula that goes back to the earliest church. If it is true that this formula is older than the more complex one in 1 Cor. 15:3-5, then there may have been a stage in the Jerusalem church during which the fundamental significance of Jesus was seen in his resurrection as a revelation that his preaching of the Kingdom of God was indeed true because the church was now living in the end times.

In its present form the formula in 1 Thess. 1:9-10 cannot come from the Jerusalem church because that church did not engage in Gentile mission.³⁹

Nevertheless, it is often referred to as "Jewish Christian,"⁴⁰

and the last three lines could represent Jerusalem theology.

How you turned to God from idols to serve a living and true God
And await his Son from heaven,
Whom he raised from the dead,
Jesus who delivers us from the coming wrath.

We have a *pistis* formula, a strong expectation of the *parousia*, and an

expectation of judgment. The way in which Jesus delivers from the wrath is not stated, but it is presumably through the forgiveness of sin.

Gal. 1:4a has been identified as a pre-Pauline formula,⁴¹

and it fits in well with Jerusalem theology:

who gave himself for our sins
in order that he might liberate us from the present evil age.

Here again the *Dahingabeformel* expresses expiatory self-sacrifice for sins. F.

Bovon argues that the verb *exaireisthai* is to be connected in particular with the Exodus tradition. Liberation in Christ is seen as the new exodus through the forgiveness of sins.

The formula in Rom. 4:25 contains language which by now should be very familiar to us:

who was delivered up for the sake of our faults
and raised up for the sake of our justification.

We have once more the *Dahingabeformel*, and the statement that Jesus' death atones
for our sins. In the light of the usage in the Qumran scrolls we should not be surprised to

find that justification is a concept of the Jerusalem church and not unique to Paul.⁴²

Whether justification functions in the same way in the two theologies remains to be seen.

There are complicating considerations with respect to the formula in Rom. 1:3-4. While the wording is easy to isolate from its Pauline embedding, we have to reckon with Pauline additions within the formula itself. It seems clear that we should omit the words "in power," but whether the contrast "according to the flesh-according to the Spirit of holiness" was part of the original formula is disputed.⁴³

We use the shortest formula here for the sake of simplicity:

who was born of the seed of David ...
who was appointed Son of God ... since resurrection of the dead.

The Jerusalem church called Jesus "Messiah" in two senses. On the one hand he was the Messiah as son of David, but then later he became the Messiah as Son of God. The christology is adoptionist. We have until now avoided any discussion of christological titles which may have been associated with the formulae. Much work has been done on them by Kramer and Hahn,⁴⁴ but confidence in their solutions is not shared by all. To see that this particular formula is clearly messianic, whatever name or title be the antecedent of the relative pronouns, is enough for present purposes.

The formula most useful for our task, Rom. 3:24-26a, also presents the most difficulties and therefore has been kept to the last. First, Bultmann and E. Käsemann⁴⁵ were confident they could identify the text in 3:24-26a simply by omitting as Pauline additions "as a free gift by his grace" in 3:24 and "through faith" in 3:25. However, it has become increasingly difficult to show why 3:24 is not Pauline, with the possible exception of the word *apolytroisis*, and it is hard to make sense of the supposed insertion in 3:25.⁴⁶ Second, the translation of 3:25b-26a is exceedingly difficult, and yet the sense of the whole formula depends on how these phrases are understood. We shall tentatively reconstruct and translate as follows:

whom God set forth as a means of expiation,
through Jesus' faithfulness at the cost of his blood,⁴⁷
in order to demonstrate his righteousness,
because the prosecution of sins committed in the past was dropped in the forbearance of
God.⁴⁸

In his classic study of the formula Käsemann speaks of the righteousness of God as his "Festhalten am Bunde"⁴⁹ it has to do with "the patience of God which demonstrates his covenant faithfulness and which effects forgiveness."⁵⁰ This is in the tradition of Exod. 34:6-7, "The LORD, the LORD, A God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in covenant loyalty and faithfulness, keeping (LXX adds 'righteousness and') covenant loyalty for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin."⁵¹ Jesus' death is seen in cultic terms, and, whether or not we are to think specifically of the "mercy seat," it is clear that it replaces what would otherwise have been the function of the temple and its sacrifices. The righteousness of God is a concept also of

Jerusalem theology, and it expresses itself in the forgiveness of sins. This formula is said by many to have its *Sitz im Leben* in the Eucharist.⁵²

If we may summarize what we have learned about the theology of the Jerusalem church, it would be something like this: Jesus' resurrection was seen as the confirmation of his proclamation of the nearness of the Kingdom of God, as the revelation by God that Israel was living in the end time. In Bultmann's apt phrase, the church understood itself as the eschatological congregation.⁵³ The significance of this was expressed in terms of covenantal theology. What happened in Christ was God's act of eschatological righteousness in his faithfulness to the covenant made with Israel by providing a final means of atonement for the forgiveness of Israel's sins. Jesus' death signifies then the renewal of the covenant, the re-affirmation of the covenant and the commandments, the establishment of Torah. On the other hand, his death means the supersession and replacement of the temple and its sacrifices as a means of expiation. This atonement was celebrated in the Eucharist, now by the church but soon by all Israel. Then would come the final pilgrimage of the Gentiles to Mt. Zion. This is a clear "pattern of religion" to use the words of E. P. Sanders,⁵⁴ and it is clearly a different pattern from that of Paul.

The Jerusalem church said that Jesus' death was "for our sins" (1 Cor. 15:3; Gal. 1:4a; Rom. 4:25; 3:25), but Paul speaks always of sin in the singular as a power and never of sins in the plural as guilt.⁵⁵ Paul also says that Jesus died (Rom. 5:6, 8; 14:15; 1Thess. 5:10), was given up (Rom. 8:32; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 5:2,

25), was crucified (1 Cor. 1:13), was made sin (2 Cor. 5:21), was made a curse (Gal. 3:13) for (*hyper*)-but it is always for us, for you, for persons, and never for our sins.

Rom. 8:3 says significantly that Jesus was sent for (*peri*) sin, not sins. Not only that, but Paul never speaks of forgiveness⁵⁶ and hardly ever of repentance.⁵⁷ The word atonement, for Paul, means not a way of dealing with sins but a one-time act of incorporating Gentiles into the body of Christ, the people of God, the giving of life to the dead. For Paul this takes place at baptism, when one participates in the death and resurrection of Christ. We know little of the significance of baptism for the Jerusalem church; it may even have consisted in repeated lustrations.⁵⁸

Though the Jerusalem church spoke in terms of the covenant and renewed covenant, Paul never uses this concept.⁵⁹ Though for Jerusalem the righteousness of God effects forgiveness of sins, for Paul it refers to the incorporation of Gentiles into the people of God. Though the Jerusalem church spoke of Jesus as the Messiah, Paul never does so.⁶⁰ For Paul, Jesus relates neither to David nor to Moses but to Adam and to Abraham. Jesus is not the climax of the history of Israel nor the fulfillment of the covenant but the one who overcomes the powers which enslave the creation by fulfilling the promises of God concerning Gentiles.⁶¹ Paul's basic confession is "Jesus is Lord," and Jesus is infinitely more important to his theology than he ever could have been for Jerusalem. For Paul, Jesus is not only the revelation of God's eschatological activity but of God himself, and therefore the doctrine of the Trinity is a legitimate development from Pauline theology.

The theology of Paul and the theology of Jerusalem are completely different, and yet Paul can say they are the same (1 Cor. 15:11) and that each acknowledged the position of the other (Gal. 2:1-10). What makes them different is, of course, the fact that one gospel is

addressed to Gentiles and one to Israel. Yet there was such a common core of conviction that many of the differences we have outlined may not have been seen by the first-century participants. There is a real sense in which Professor Beare's statement with which we began is true. Perhaps we should speak of transmutations rather than differences. Paul pays tribute to the gospel of the Jerusalem church and is grateful to it for "spiritual blessings" which flow to the Gentiles (Rom. 15:27). At the same time, the common kerygma spoken in a different situation takes on a greatly transformed significance. The theology of the Jerusalem church had, of course, no future and certainly cannot be revived today, while the theology of Paul triumphed to such an extent that it is only with difficulty that we can recover the theology of Jerusalem. Nevertheless, I expect that in the Kingdom of God Paul and James will still be friends. If Paul can have such a different "pattern of religion" from that of the Jerusalem church, how much more different would his "pattern" be from the teaching of Jesus. And yet Paul was firmly and happily convinced that the gospel he preached among the Gentiles was given to him by a revelation of God in Christ (Gal. 1:15-16) and that he had the full approval of his Lord.

Notes

1. F. W. Beare, "Jesus and Paul," *CJT* 5 (1959), 85. (Abbreviations in references are those used by the *Journal of Biblical Literature*. See *JBL* 95 [1976], 331-346.)
2. We could retain the term "primitive" if that meant nothing more than the Jerusalem church contemporary with Paul, but we will avoid it lest it imply that the church was primitive in comparison with Paul.
3. Cf. R. A. Kraft, "In Search of 'Jewish Christianity' and its 'Theology': Problems of Definition and Methodology," *Judeo-Christianisme* (= *RSR* 60 [1972]), 81-92; A. F. J. Klijn, "The Study of Jewish Christianity," *NTS* 20 (1974), 419-431; S. K. Riegel, "Jewish Christianity: Definitions and Terminology," *NTS* 24 (1978), 410-415.
4. J. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1964).
5. H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1949).
6. So the tradition from Irenaeus to H. Lietzmann, *A History of the Early Church* (New York: Meridian, 1949).
7. Cf. G. Lüdemann, "Zum Antipaulinismus im frühen Christentum," *EvT* 40 (1980), 437-455.
8. The people who appealed to James in the second century may have had as little in common with the real James as many of the people who appealed to Paul had with the real Paul.
9. Cf. the statements by such different scholars as G. Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (Berlin: Akademie, 1958), 214, and J. Munck, "Jewish Christianity in Post-Apostolic Times," *NTS* 6 (1960), 103-116. That the legend of the Pella flight cannot be used as a bridge has now been decisively demonstrated by Lüdemann, "The Successors of Pre-70 Jerusalem Christianity: A Critical Analysis of the Pella-Tradition," in E. P. Sanders (ed.), *Normative Self Definition Vol. 1: The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries* (London: SCM, 1980), 161-173.
10. O. B. J. Malina, "Jewish Christianity or Christian Judaism: Toward a Hypothetical Definition," *JSJ* 7 (1976), 46-57.
11. Statements like: "They are not orthodox Jews, for they do not practice circumcision" (V. Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960], 58) make it necessary to be explicit about this. Cf. my "Judaism of the Uncircumcised in Ignatius and Related Writers" (forthcoming).
12. Our limitation is very close to that of R. N. Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity* (London: SCM, 1970), but when he speaks of Matthew, John, Hebrews, James, 1-3 John, 1-2 Peter, Jude, and Revelation as "addressed to Jewish Christians or to potentially interested Jews" (18), he introduces confusion by including writings which in the opinion of most go far beyond his own definition. By no stretch of the imagination can 2 Pet. 1:4 be called "Jewish Christian"!
13. Cf. C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936).
14. Cf. U. Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961).
15. The fact that none (Mark 12:30, 33; Luke 10:27; Matt. 22:37) can reproduce the *Shema* accurately is but part of the evidence for this.
16. My attempt to reconstruct one such tradition in *No Stone on Another* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 244-365, has not seemed convincing to many.
17. The only New Testament writings for which a convincing case can be made that they were

written by and for Christian Jews or ex-Jews are Revelation, John, and 1-3 John. In none is there an obvious connection with Jerusalem, and all come from a period somewhat later than Paul.

18. I am convinced in general by the thorough refutation of his thesis by two such differing scholars as J. Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (London: SCM, 1959) and W. Schmithals, *Paul and James* (London: SCM, 1965).
19. This principle is well enunciated by H. D. Betz, *Galatians* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) 6, but not always adhered to in his commentary (cf. e.g., 116).
20. Cf. D. Georgi, *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964), and J. F. Collange, *Enigmes de la deuxième épître de Paul aux Corinthiens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972).
21. One must distinguish between breaking certain commandments and not keeping the law at all. I would agree then with the thesis of J. Munck, *Paul*, and others about the Judaizing Gentile Christians. The most careful discussion is by J. G. Hawkins, *The Opponents of Paul in Galatia* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1971).
22. Cf. G. Bornkamm, "Die Heresie des Kolosserbriefs," *Das Ende des Gesetzes* (Munich: Kaiser, 1952), 139-156, and the recent commentaries by E. Lohse and E. Schweizer.
23. I have tried to show that this is true also of Gal. 4:25-31 in "Israel's Enemies in Pauline Theology," *NTS* 28 (1982), 400-423.
24. And they certainly did not call themselves "the poor"; cf. L. Keck, "The Poor among the Saints in the NT," *ZNW* 56 (1965), 100-129, and "The Poor among the Saints in Jewish Christianity and Qumran," *ZNW* 57 (1966), 51-78.
25. We see then how Paul can be used to identify such passages as Matt. 16:17-19 as traditions or the Jerusalem church.
26. Cf. my *No Stone*, 65-243, and for Gal. 6:10, L. Hurtado, "The Jerusalem Collection and the Book of Galatians," *JSNT* 5 (1979), 16-62.
27. That this passage does not indicate an antagonism between Paul and the Jerusalem church is argued by Schmithals. *Paul and James*, 79-84.
28. That these verses belong here, cf. L. Hurtado, "The Jerusalem Collection."
29. Cf. D. Georgi, *Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem* (Hamburg: Reich, 1965), and K. F. Nickle, *The Collection* (London: SCM, 1966).
30. It was hoped that the Gentiles would come of their own accord to Zion once the redemption of Israel was final and visible. The classic statement of the distinction between a "centripetal" and a "centrifugal" concept of mission is by B. Sundkler, "Jésus et les païens," *Arbeiten und Mitteilungen aus dem neutestamentlichen Seminar zu Uppsala VI* (Uppsala, 1937), 1-38. Cf. also J. Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (London: SCM, 1958) and Munck, *Paul*.
31. I would understand it along the lines of Schmithals, *Paul and James*, 63-78.
32. I have used as a convenient summary and control over the passages chosen P. Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), 9-57.
33. Because of its complexity I have not included the hymn of Phil. 2:6-11 in this study, even though it was identified by E. Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus* (Heidelberg, 1928), with the Eucharistic tradition of 'the Jerusalem church. He has not found many followers.
34. Cf. J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1966), 101-103.
35. I follow the most recent study by J. Murphy-O'Connor, "Tradition and Redaction in 1 Cor. 15:3-7," *CBQ* 13 (1981), 582-589.
36. Apart from himself, Paul names as Apostles Junia, Andronicus, Cephas, and probably Barnabas, James, and Silvanus. Cf. W. Schmithals, *The Office of Apostle in the Early Church* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1969).
37. Cf. W. Popkes, *Christus Traditus: eine Untersuchung zum Begriff der Dahingabe im Neuen Testament* (Zürich: Zwingli, 1967).
38. W. Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God* (London: SCM, 1966), 20-26; cf. Vielhauer, *Geschichte*, 13-16. Rom. 10:9a, on the other hand, "we confess that Jesus is Lord," is a *homologia*, which has a different origin and function.

39. Cf. U. Wilckens, *Missionsreden*, 80-82. It may be that from this formula and from the speeches in Acts 14 and 17 we can derive a pre-Pauline pattern of preaching in the Gentile mission. It is related to many of the motifs of Wis. 11-15. Cf. also Rom. 2:4.
40. Cf. Vielhauer, *Geschichte*, 29.
41. F. Bovon, "Une formule prépaulinienne dans l'épître aux Galates (Ga 1, 4-5)," *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme* (Paris: Boccard, 1978), 91-107. Cf. Betz, *Galatians*, 42-43.
42. Cf. Gal. 2:16, where justification is presented as a concept common to Cephas and Paul, who are "Jews by birth."
43. That it was not is argued by R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Scribner's, 1954), 1:49, and Vielhauer, *Geschichte*, 30-31. That it was is argued by E. Schweizer, "Röm. 1, 3f, und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist vor und bei Paulus," *Neotestamentica* (Zürich: Zwingli, 1963), 180-89, and H. Zimmermann, *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968), 192-202.
44. Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*; F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology* (London: Lutterworth, 1969). It seems that in general the title which is the subject of the sentence could be changed more naturally than the formula which begins with the relative pronoun.
45. R. Bultmann, *Theology*, 1:46-47; E. Käsemann, "Zum Verständnis von Römer 3,24" *ZNW* 43 (1950/51), 150-154. The literature on this formula is extensive; cf. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 91-92, and Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer 1* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978).
46. Cf. Wilckens, *Römer*, 183-181, and S. K. Williams, *Jesus' Death as Saving Event* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), 11-16.
47. The translation of this line is based on Williams, *Jesus' Death*, 46-51. The best alternative would refer to God's covenant faithfulness, as argued by A. Pluta, *Gottes Bundestreue; Ein Schlüsselbegriff in Röm 3,25a* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969). There is no way grammatically to make the phrase mean "to be received by faith" as in the usual interpretations, even if it is a Pauline insertion.
48. The translation or paraphrase of this line is based on N. Dahl, "The Atonement- An Adequate Reward for the Akedah?," *The Crucified Messiah* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974), 156. S. K. Williams, *Jesus' Death*, 27-34, makes a strong case for understanding this line with reference to the Gentile mission, in which case we would have a parallel to the expanded formula in 1 Thess. I :9-10 (cf. n.39). But I am not completely convinced.
49. Käsemann, "Verstandnis," 153.
50. Käsemann, *Romans*, 100. Commentaries sometimes point to the contradiction between the forbearance of Rom. 3:25 and the wrath of 1:18-23, but of course the latter has to do with the situation of idolaters outside the covenant.
51. Cf. Wilckens, *Römer*, 197, and the references given there.
52. Cf. Käsemann, "Verständnis," and Pluta, *Gottes Bundestreue*.
53. Bultmann, *Theology*, 1:37-42.
54. E. P. Sanders, "Patterns of Religion in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: A Holistic Method of Comparison," *HTR* 66 (1973), 455-478.
55. One function of footnotes is to list exceptions, in this case Rom. 7:5; 1 Cor. 15:17 (Rom. 4:7; 11:27 are quotations).
56. Rom. 4:7-8 is a quotation.
57. Here the exceptions are Rom. 2:4; 2 Cor. 7:9-11; 12:21.
58. Cf. Heb. 6:2 and Schoeps, *Theologie*, 202-211.
59. Rom. 11:27 is a quotation and 1 Cor. 11:25 is from the Jerusalem tradition. I would argue that in 2 Cor. 3:6, 14, both the "ancient" and the "renewed" covenant are the language of the opponents (cf. the works cited in n. 20). The word does not mean covenant in Gal. 3:15, 17; 4:24 (cf. n.23) nor in Rom. 9:4 (cf. C. J. Roetz, "Diathekai in Romans 9:4," *Biblica* 51 [1970], 377-390).
60. Cf. the discussion in Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*. 131-150.
61. "Nicht die von Moses eingeleitete Heilsgeschichte Israels, sondern die Welt des gefallenen

und unter dem Gotteszorn befindlichen Adam ist für Paulus das Gegenbild des gegenwärtigen Kairos" (Käsemann. "Verständnis." 154).

First published in *From Jesus to Paul. Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare* (Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984)

With kind permission of the author.