

The Crucified Apostle

Edited by
TODD A. WILSON and
PAUL R. HOUSE

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe
450*

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber/Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber/Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)

Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL) · Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg)

J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

450



The Crucified Apostle

Essays on Peter and Paul

Edited by
Todd A. Wilson and Paul R. House

Mohr Siebeck

TODD A. WILSON, born 1976; Senior Pastor of Calvary Memorial Church in Oak Park, Illinois, USA.

PAUL R. HOUSE, born 1958; Professor of Divinity at Beeson Divinity School, an interdenominational seminary in Birmingham, Alabama, USA.

ISBN 978-3-16-153998-5 / eISBN 978-3-16-155610-4

ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2017 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen. www.mohr.de

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book is typeset by Satz & Sonders in Münster, printed on non-aging paper by Laupp & Göbel in Gomariningen and bound by Buchbinderei Nädle in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Table of Contents

Editors' Preface	VII
Abbreviations for Journals, Major Reference Works, and Series	IX
Abbreviations of Deuterocanonical Works, Pseudepigrapha, Targumic Texts, Apostolic Fathers, and Ancient Texts	XIII
Introduction	1
<i>Peter Stuhlmacher</i>	
Reconciled Diversity	5
<i>Joel Willitts</i>	
One Torah for Another. The Halakhic Conversion of Jewish Believers: Paul's Response to Peter's Halakhic Equivocation in Galatians 2:11–21	21
<i>Christopher A. Beetham</i>	
Eschatology and the Book of Proverbs in 1 Peter	47
<i>Paul R. House</i>	
Scripture, the Day of the Lord, and Holiness. Whole Bible Theology in 2 Peter 3	71
<i>John Dennis</i>	
Jesus as the Scapegoat. Paul's Atonement Theology in Romans 8:3 in the Context of Romans 5–7	85
<i>Alexander N. Kirk</i>	
Future Justification in the Golden Chain of Romans 8	107
<i>Douglas C. Mohrmann</i>	
Paul's Use of Scripture in Romans 9–11 as Palimpsest. Literature in the Second Degree	129

Panagiotis Kantartzis

- Israel as ἐχθροὶ and ἀγαπητοὶ in Romans 11:28. An Isaianic
Paradox and Its Pauline Application 151

Joel White

- Identifying Intertextual Exegesis in Paul. Methodological
Considerations and a Test Case (1 Corinthians 6:5) 167

Jeff Wisdom

- Opening the Heart. Compassion and Suffering in Paul's Apostolic
Ministry in the Corinthian Correspondence 189

H. H. Drake Williams III

- Imitate Me as I Imitate Christ. Considering the Jewish Perspective
in Paul's Use of Imitation in 1 Corinthians 209

William N. Wilder

- "To Whom Has the Arm of the Lord Been Revealed?" Signs and
Wonders in Paul's Isaianic Mission to the Gentiles (Romans
15:18–21 and Galatians 3:1–5) 225

Todd A. Wilson

- Scripting and the Rhetoric of Wilderness in Galatians 245

Wesley Hill

- The God of Israel – Crucified? Philippians 2:5–11 and the
Question of the Vulnerability of God 261

Sean McDonough

- Paul and the Semantics of "Justification". Or What Do We Talk
about When We Talk about Righteousness? 277

Elizabeth E. Shively

- The σῶμα and the Transformation of Persons in the Letter to the
Romans 297

Michael Allen

- Self-Denial 321

- List of Contributors 339

- Scripture Index 343

- Index 359

Editors' Preface

The editors wish to thank several people for their help. First, we are grateful to Dr. Henning Ziebritzki and the editors of this series for accepting the project for publication and to Klaus Hermannstädter and the staff of Mohr Siebeck for their excellent assistance. Second, we appreciate the fifteen contributors who joined us in this venture for writing stimulating essays on the great apostles Peter and Paul. We particularly thank Prof. Dr. Peter Stuhlmacher for allowing us to include his essay and Wayne Coppins for translating it from German to English. We also thank Chris Beetham for helping with Greek editing. Third, we owe a special debt of gratitude to Heather House, who copy edited the manuscript. The project absolutely could not have been completed without her hard, reliable work. Of course, any remaining mistakes are our responsibility, not hers. Fourth, we thank Calvary Memorial Church, Oak Park, Illinois, and Beeson Divinity School of Samford University, Birmingham, Alabama, for supporting our efforts.

Most of all, we are thankful to our friend and colleague Scott Hafemann for providing the inspiration for this project. Hafemann was Todd Wilson's teacher over fifteen years ago and continues to be an example of scholarship and pastoral engagement to him. They continue their relationship by working together annually at the Center for Pastoral Theology. Hafemann and Paul House have been friends and colleagues since 1986, and their friendship has included scholarly collaboration. All the contributors except Peter Stuhlmacher and Paul House are Hafemann's former students. Working on this project with others who have benefitted from knowing Scott and his wife, Debara, has given the task joy and purpose.

For these and other kindnesses we are very grateful.

Todd Wilson Paul House

Advent 2016

Abbreviations for Journals, Major Reference Works, and Series

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992
AcBib	Academia Biblica
ACCS Old Testament	Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, Old Testa- ment
ACEBT	<i>Amsterdamse Cahiers voor Exegese en bijbelse Theologie</i>
ACW	Ancient Christian Writers
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AIL	Ancient Israel and Its Literature
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ANF	<i>Ante-Nicene Fathers</i>
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
ApOTC	Apollos Old Testament Commentary
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BDAG	Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000 (Danker- Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich)
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation Series
BibSem	The Biblical Seminar
BN	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wis- senschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wis- senschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>

ConBNT	Coniectanea Neotestamentica or Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series
CTQ	<i>Concordia Theological Quarterly</i>
CTR	<i>Criswell Theological Review</i>
DBSup	<i>Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément</i> . Edited by Lous Pirot and André Robert. Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1928–
DJG	<i>Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels</i> . Edited by Joel B. Green, Jeannine K. Brown, and Nicholas Perrin. 2nd ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2013
DPL	<i>Dictionary of Paul and His Letters</i> . Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993
EDNT	<i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider. ET. 3 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990–1993
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
Enc	<i>Encounter</i>
ExAud	<i>Ex Auditu</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HCOT	Historical Commentary on the Old Testament
HNTC	Harper's New Testament Commentaries
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HThKNT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
ICC	International Critical Commentary
Int	<i>Interpretation</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JETS	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JGRChJ	<i>Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism</i>
JRT	<i>Journal of Religious Thought</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series

<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LHBOTS	The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LNTS	The Library of New Testament Studies
<i>LSJ</i>	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996
LSTS	The Library of Second Temple Studies
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
NAC	New American Commentary
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTL	New Testament Library
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OECS	Oxford Early Christian Studies
OTL	Old Testament Library
<i>OTP</i>	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> . Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985
OTS	Old Testament Studies
PG	Patrologia Graeca [=Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca]. Edited by Jacques-Paul Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857–1886
PNTC	Pelican New Testament Commentaries
<i>ProEccl</i>	<i>Pro Ecclesia</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RBL</i>	<i>Review of Biblical Literature</i>
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
<i>RTL</i>	<i>Revue théologique de Louvain</i>
SB	Sources bibliques
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Sacra Pagina

StBibLit	Studies in Biblical Literature (Lang)
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964–1976
TDOT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis et al. 8 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974–2006
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TS	<i>Theological Studies</i>
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to <i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WTJ	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WW	<i>Word and World</i>

Abbreviations of Deuterocanonical Works, Pseudepigrapha, Targumic Texts, Apostolic Fathers, and Ancient Texts

1 Clem.	1 Clement
1 En.	1 Enoch
1 Macc	1 Maccabees
1QH ^a	Hodayot ^a or Thanksgiving Hymns ^a
1QM	Milhamah <i>or</i> War Scroll
1QpHab	Pesher Habakkuk
1QS	Serek Hayahad <i>or</i> Rule of the Community
2 Bar.	2 Baruch
2 Clem.	2 Clement
2 Macc	2 Maccabees
3 Macc	3 Maccabees
4 Macc	4 Maccabees
4QMMT	Miqsat Ma'asê ha-Torah ^a
Aristotle, <i>Metaph.</i>	<i>Metaphysica (Metaphysics)</i>
Aristotle, <i>Poet.</i>	<i>Poetica (Poetics)</i>
Aristotle, <i>Rhet.</i>	<i>Rhetorica (Rhetoric)</i>
CD	Cairo Genizah copy of the Damascus Document
Cicero, <i>Part. or.</i>	<i>Partitiones oratoriae</i>
Cyril, <i>Quod unus</i>	<i>Quod unus sit Christus (That Christ is One)</i>
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
Epictetus, <i>Diatr.</i>	<i>Diatribai</i>
Eusebius, <i>Hist. eccl.</i>	<i>Historia ecclesiastica (Ecclesiastical History)</i>
Irenaeus, <i>Epid.</i>	<i>Epideixis tou apostolikou kêrygmatos (Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching)</i>
Irenaeus, <i>Haer.</i>	<i>Adversus haereses (Against Heresies)</i>
Isocrates, <i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistulae</i>
Josephus, <i>A.J.</i>	<i>Antiquitates judaicae (Jewish Antiquities)</i>
Josephus, <i>B.J.</i>	<i>Bellum judaicum (Jewish War)</i>
Josephus, <i>C. Ap.</i>	<i>Contra Apionem (Against Apion)</i>
LAE	Life of Adam and Eve
Let. Aris.	Letter of Aristeas
Philo, <i>Decal.</i>	<i>De decalogo (On the Decalogue)</i>
Philo, <i>Fug.</i>	<i>De fuga et inveniione (On Flight and Finding)</i>
Philo, <i>Her.</i>	<i>Quis rerum divinarum heres sit (Who Is the Heir?)</i>

Philo, <i>Mos.</i> 1	<i>De vita Mosis I (On the Life of Moses 1)</i>
Philo, <i>Mos.</i> 2	<i>De vita Mosis II (On the Life of Moses 2)</i>
Philo, <i>Opif.</i>	<i>De opificio mundi (On the Creation of the World)</i>
Philo, <i>Spec.</i> 4	<i>De specialibus legibus IV (On the Special Laws 4)</i>
Philo, <i>Virt.</i>	<i>De virtutibus (On the Virtues)</i>
Plato, <i>Leg.</i>	<i>Leges (Laws)</i>
Plato, <i>Resp.</i>	<i>Respublica (Republic)</i>
Plato, <i>Tim.</i>	<i>Timaeus</i>
Plutarch, <i>Mor.</i>	<i>Moralia</i>
Plutarch, <i>Quaest. conv.</i>	<i>Quaestionum convivialum libri IX</i>
Quintilian, <i>Inst.</i>	<i>Institutio oratoria</i>
Seneca, <i>Clem.</i>	<i>De clementia</i>
Sir	<i>Sirach</i>
Stobaeus, <i>Ecl.</i>	<i>Eclogae</i>
Tacitus, <i>Ann.</i>	<i>Annales</i>
Tg. Isa.	<i>Targum Isaiah</i>
Tertullian, <i>Prax.</i>	<i>Adversus Praxeian (Against Praxeas)</i>

Introduction

Peter and Paul have fascinated Christians since the first century. This is as it should be. These two Jewish apostles of Jesus of Nazareth played significant roles in the formation of congregations from Jerusalem to Europe. Both ministered among Jews and gentiles. Both made their mark on the New Testament through their own writings and as characters in others' writings. They had their differences, as Gal 2:11–21 makes plain. Nonetheless, though often pitted against one another in scholarship and popular imagination, 1 Cor 15:1–11 and 2 Pet 3:15–18 indicate they respected one another. They found common ground in the crucified and risen Christ Jesus and in service to Christ's body, the church. It is fitting, then, that Paul viewed himself as crucified with Christ, yet living (Gal 2:20). Church tradition has it that because of his testimony Roman officials beheaded him, a swifter end for a Roman citizen than crucifixion. Church tradition also holds that Peter was crucified, albeit upside down because he did not feel worthy to die as his friend and master, Jesus, had done. These crucified apostles' lives, examples, and writings will merit examination and emulation in discipleship and scholarship as long as Christianity endures. This volume seeks to continue the long, rich conversation about these two essential, fallible men.

Peter and Paul were saturated in scripture. They quoted, echoed, and alluded to the Law, Prophets, and Writings as they developed deep pastoral theology for churches and people. Their insights inform and inspire exegetes, theologians, pastors, and disciples of all sorts to this day. The contributors to this volume therefore probe old issues, yet hopefully in ways that will provide fresh insight and break some new ground on their chosen topics. No writer will ever issue the final word on these apostles, for their depth seems bottomless and times keep changing. Still, the contributors believe that stating a next word matters enough to make the research contributed here and elsewhere valuable. They also think that the time and trouble taken to learn Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, biblical backgrounds, parallel ancient literature, church history, historical theology, and biblical theology are never wasted. These and other disciplines sustain the life of the mind and thereby homes, churches, communities, and academic institutions.

Fifteen of the contributors learned these foundational scholarly commitments when they were students of Scott J. Hafemann, the person to whom this volume is dedicated. Hafemann has taught New Testament for over thirty years. Currently he holds the position of Reader in New Testament at the University of

St. Andrews in Scotland. Through the years Hafemann has championed original language exegesis, biblical theology, and the importance of Jewish backgrounds of the Bible in his research, while at the same time exhibiting the essential value of quality, personal teaching and mentoring of undergraduate, seminary, and doctoral students. These once-common commitments have become endangered in many places, but as Hafemann would be the first to insist, must never become lost causes if serious biblical studies are to remain healthy.

Of course, Hafemann was once a promising young scholar seeking the sort of permanent scholarly values just noted. Such standards are most often bestowed from one generation to another through personal contact rather than transferred through institutional credentialing. Hafemann learned many of these qualities from Peter Stuhlmacher, who supervised his doctoral work at Eberhard-Karls-Universität-Tübingen in the 1980s and who for Hafemann remains an example of Christian scholarship and discipleship. It is therefore appropriate that Stuhlmacher opens the volume by tracing the unity early Christians practiced while maintaining clear diversity of opinion and missional practice. Focusing on 1 Cor 15:1–11, he demonstrates that despite all their heartfelt differences Paul, Peter, John, and James agreed on foundational convictions, and he argues that these convictions can still unify Christ's body today. Joel Willitts then explores this unity and diversity in the next chapter by treating Gal 2:11–21 as a coherent narrative. From this analysis he determines that Peter and Paul differed over how to walk as Jewish followers of Jesus among gentile believers, not over justification by faith or the necessity of gentile evangelism.

With these treatments of historical interaction between Peter and Paul in place, Christopher Beetham and Paul House probe Peter's use of Proverbs and the whole canon, respectively. Beetham provides criteria for identifying allusions, echoes, and quotations, and stresses how Peter reuses Proverbs' down-to-earth teaching to make eschatological exhortations. House attempts to trace Peter's wide-ranging use of scripture in his teaching about the need for holy living in light of the coming day of the Lord.

Protestant biblical studies have generally focused more on Paul than Peter, and this volume follows this pattern. The next nine essays discuss Paul's intertextual exegesis in key passages in Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians. Jon Dennis and Alexander Kirk focus on Romans 8. Dennis links Rom 8:3 to the scapegoat ritual in Leviticus 16, while Kirk asserts that Rom 8:30 highlights future justification in light of the book of Romans as a whole. Next, Douglas Mohrmann argues that Romans 9–11 exhibits characteristics of ancient rhetoric, uses biblical texts as witnesses for Paul's case that God has not cast off the Jews (see Rom 9:6), and presents the history of Israel in a manner intended to place Jews and gentiles in the grand biblical narrative Paul chooses. Panagiotis Kantartzis utilizes relevant passages in Isaiah to explain what Paul means in Rom 11:28 when he calls Israel both enemies of God and beloved of

God at the same time. In his essay, Joel White weighs in on how to set criteria for intertextual echoes, allusions, and quotations, subjects Beetham raised in his chapter. Using 1 Cor 6:15 as a test case, he decides that Deuteronomy 17 provides the sequence of Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians 5–6. All these writers strive to find how, when, and why Paul refers to earlier biblical passages.

Taking a more audience-focused tact, Jeff Wisdom describes how Paul opens his heart to the Corinthian church in order to show how much he loves them. Indeed, Wisdom claims, Paul's suffering for the church at Corinth demonstrates his great love for them. Also dealing with Corinth, Drake Williams takes up Paul's exhortation that the people imitate him as he imitates Christ (e.g. 1 Cor 4:16). Williams presents evidence from scripture and extra-biblical sources that Paul's "imitation" comes from Jewish sources. William Wilder then investigates how Paul draws his teaching on signs and wonders in Rom 15:18–21 and Gal 3:1–5 from portions of the exodus narratives to provide evidence of his apostolic ministry and to warn against failing to heed God's messenger. Todd Wilson likewise analyzes exodus materials in his case to reveal how Paul uses well-known words and phrases to insert the Galatians into the wilderness narrative. Wilson compares how American civil rights leader Martin Luther King Jr. utilized similar methods of including hearers in the biblical story of perseverance and freedom. Thus, Wisdom, Williams, Wilder, and Wilson all note how Paul utilizes previous biblical texts to reinforce and change congregational behavior.

The final four contributors certainly agree that Paul's intertextual exegesis provides a wealth of information about his pastoral theology. Yet they move forward from the text. Wesley Hill addresses the issue of God's suffering by discussing Phil 2:5–11. He seeks to elucidate the text's Old Testament background, then notes how patristic writers, particularly Cyril of Alexandria, may aid a proper understanding how God can empty himself through death on the cross and retain his identity. Sean McDonough considers the thorny matter of what interpreters mean when they use the word "justification." Noting how commentators and speakers often have only one meaning of the word in mind when they use it, he contends for a nuanced understanding and usage of what remains a very contested term. Elizabeth Shively examines Paul's theology of the body. Drawing on biblical resources and the works of key scholars, she contends that for Paul the self is a connected whole made up of cognition embodied and embedded in the world. Her study is timely, given current discussions of what it means to be human in an electronic world. Michael Allen also seeks a coherent view of the body in Christian thought. In his case he strives to arrive at a Reformed view of asceticism. Like the other contributors, he utilizes biblical texts, and like Wesley Hill, he cites patristic authors. Yet he takes his analysis a step further by tracing how John Calvin counseled appropriate types of self-denial in his New Testament commentaries and in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*.

In short, these four writers demonstrate that Paul's works continue to provide insight into ongoing theological and pastoral issues.

None of the contributors to this volume claims infallible knowledge of the topics he or she addresses. But together they exhibit core principles that sustain viable New Testament research. The oldest contributor was a student over sixty years ago, and he remembers the end of World War II in Germany. His teachers provide historical links back to the nineteenth century. The youngest received theological training just a few years ago. All have benefitted from the scholarly traditions of deep knowledge of and close attention to biblical texts, careful historical study, belief in biblical unity within diversity, and the vocation of teaching the next generation. Honoring Scott Hafemann may have drawn this varied group together, but his values and theirs have a much older pedigree. They ultimately stem from Peter and Paul, the crucified apostles.

Reconciled Diversity¹

Peter Stuhlmacher*

I

In August 2008 my friend and colleague the late Martin Hengel and I had the honor of reporting on fundamental questions of Jesus research in the seminar of Pope Benedict XVI. During the course of the meeting each of us was also granted a private audience. In mine I not only discussed private questions with the Pope but also the fact that the New Testament contains essential teaching about the unity of the church of Jesus Christ and the urgency of following this teaching.

When I received the second volume of Benedict's portrayal of Jesus² three years later, I found important statements on the unity of Jesus's disciples in the chapter on Jesus's high priestly prayer in John 17. Contrary to Rudolf Bultmann's Protestant exposition of John 17:20–23, Benedict maintains – in my view correctly – that Jesus expects his disciples to strive for a unity that is perceptible on earth. Through this unity, the truth that he has sent them becomes visible to people. In light of Christ's commission, Benedict is correct to claim that “the struggle for the visible unity of the disciples of Jesus Christ remains an urgent task for Christians of all times and places. The invisible unity of the ‘community’ is not sufficient.”³ In his catechesis on the origin of the church, Benedict explains that according to the witness of Paul's letters the church is rooted in the sacrament of the body of Christ, and by virtue of the Eucharistic gift becomes a polyphonic corporeal unity. Thus, the apostle's famous admonition in Eph 4:3–4 applies to it: “Strive to preserve the unity of the Spirit through the peace that holds you together. One body and one Spirit, just as it was given to you through your calling through a common hope.”⁴ In the general audience at St. Peter's Square in Rome on April 18, 2012, the Pope spoke about “the little Pentecost” of Acts 4:23–31 and referred to the primitive community's unanimous prayer: “This unity is the fundamental element of the primitive

* Translated by Wayne Coppins

¹ With these reflections I take up a topic that has occupied me for some time. See my essay “Biblich-theologische Erwägungen zur Ökumene,” in Peter Stuhlmacher, *Biblische Theologie und Evangelium*, WUNT 146 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 292–301.

² See Josef Ratzinger, *Jesus von Nazareth* (Freiburg: Herder, 2011). Cf. Josef Ratzinger, *Jesus of Nazareth: Holy Week* (San Francisco: Ignatius, 2011).

³ Ratzinger, *Jesus von Nazareth*, 2:114. Cf. idem., *Jesus of Nazareth*, 96.

⁴ Josef Ratzinger, *Auf dem Fundament der Apostel* (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 2007), 138–39.

community, and it should always be fundamental for the church.”⁵ To seek and live out the unity of the church is therefore a mandate issued by Jesus himself. This unity finds its expression in the common confession, in unanimous prayer, and in the Spirit-sustained communal life of all who believe in Jesus and follow after him.

Christians have not found their way to such unity. The reasons for this are many. But the New Testament – in contrast to what Ernst Käsemann believed⁶ – by no means grounds the division into different confessions and denominations. To this day it has been too little observed and respected that the apostles maintained the fellowship of faith and an ecclesiastical fellowship despite having very different views on important questions. Their example should and can help us to penetrate at last to a *unity in reconciled diversity* in a Christianity that remains separated confessionally. This unity is vital for the survival of European mainline churches in danger of collapsing.

II

In his monumental commentary on 1 Corinthians, Wolfgang Schrage remarks in relation to 1 Cor 15:11 that it is “conspicuous ... that the verse plays, to my knowledge, no role in the ecumenical discussion, although it is precisely here that unity in diversity becomes visible, because as much as they share the resurrection faith, the witnesses mentioned in the text and Paul really do not advocate one and the same theology.”⁷ Schrage is correct. With the observation “whether I or they: so we proclaim and so you believed” the apostle Paul explains that Cephas (Peter), the twelve, James the brother of the Lord, and he himself proclaim in common the gospel that is constitutive for the faith of the Christians in Corinth. In 1 Cor 15:3–5 he states this shared gospel: “Christ has died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and he was buried, and he was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures, and appeared to Cephas and then to the twelve.” In vv. 6–8 Paul lists the series of Jesus’s appearances to witnesses that concludes with himself. He then refers back to the witnesses and to the common faith in v. 11. The unity of the proclamation of all these apostolic witnesses is based in the one gospel that in all probability originated

⁵ Josef Ratzinger, *Beten. Die Kunst, mit Gott zu sprechen* (Augsburg: Sankt Ulrich, 2013), 164.

⁶ Cf. Ernst Käsemann, “Begründet der neutestamentliche Kanon die Einheit der Kirche?” in *Das Neue Testament als Kanon*, ed. Ernst Käsemann (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 124–33; idem., “The Canon of the New Testament and the Unity of the Church,” in *Essays on New Testament Themes*, trans. W. J. Montague (London: SCM Press, 1964), 95–107.

⁷ Wolfgang Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, EKKNT 7.4 (Düsseldorf: Benziger, 2001), 108.

in the primitive Jerusalem community. It is entirely possible that Peter participated significantly in its formulation. Paul learned and adopted the formula in Damascus or Antioch. For him it is a valid expression of his call experience, and he warns against deviating from it.⁸

Paul makes his astonishing statement in 15:11 during a phase of heated theological controversy. While he was active in Syria and Cilicia, i. e., in the “region around Antioch [in Pisidia] and ... his hometown Tarsus”⁹ (Gal 1:21), in Antioch (on the Orontes) members of the circle of Stephen, originating from Cyprus and Cyrenaica, had taken the step of proclaiming “the gospel of Jesus the Lord also to the Greeks” (Acts 11:20). Their work was affirmed by the Levite Barnabas from Cyprus, who had been sent from Jerusalem to Antioch. To strengthen the mission among the gentiles, Barnabas brought Paul from Tarsus and the two of them worked together successfully for a year (Acts 11:25–26). They were then sent out by the Antioch community on the so-called first missionary journey. This endeavor led them initially to Cyprus and then to South Galatia (Pamphylia and Lycaonia). When they founded new communities they baptized the converts, but refrained from also circumcising gentiles.

Following their return from the journey, Jewish Christians from Jerusalem came to Antioch and raised strong objections to their mission praxis. These newcomers “taught the brethren: if you do not let yourselves be circumcised according to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved” (Acts 15:1). Their intervention led to such a bitter controversy between the emissaries on one side and Paul and Barnabas on the other that the decision was made to send a community delegation to Jerusalem to present the controversial question to the apostles and elders there. The delegation included Paul, Barnabas, a few other Antiochenes, and, at the wish of the Apostle, Titus as well (Gal 2:1). As an uncircumcised gentile convert to Christ, Titus was a living test case for the controversy.

For Paul it was all or nothing. His call experience had opened up to him the insight that law-abiding sinners such as himself were accepted by God and acquitted of their guilt, i. e., justified, solely by virtue of the supreme sacrifice and resurrection of Jesus the Son of God. Faith in the living Christ Jesus was the valid way of salvation; no longer was it through the Torah and the practices or works of the law prescribed by it. This insight formed the core of his gospel, and it could not and must not be shaken. According to his own report of the Jerusalem council recorded in Gal 2:1–10, Peter, James, and John, the pillar apostles, affirmed the gospel revealed to Paul. Despite the opposition of

⁸ Wayne Coppins has rightly pointed out that in 1 Cor 15:1–11 Paul not only stresses the unanimity of the apostolic proclamation of the gospel, but also warns against a departure from this proclamation. Cf. Wayne Coppins, “Doing Justice to the Two Perspectives of 1 Corinthians 15:1–11,” *Neot* 44.2 (2010): 282–91.

⁹ Walter Klaiber, *Der Galaterbrief* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 2013), 43.

converted Pharisees, it was agreed that Paul and Barnabas should henceforth go to the gentiles with the “gospel for the uncircumcised” and Peter should go to the Jews with the “gospel for the circumcised.” Paul and Barnabas accepted only one obligation: to gather a collection for the poor in the Jerusalem community (Gal 2:10; Rom 15:26). They did this to set an example for the unity of Jewish and gentile Christians in the one church of Jesus Christ.

Paul stresses that he zealously followed this agreement. Unfortunately, he does not indicate in Galatians or his other letters wherein the difference between his gospel and the “gospel for the circumcision” resided. We can only hypothesize that converted Jews and believing gentiles alike had to confess the Jesus who was crucified and resurrected for us in the sense of 1 Cor 15:3–5. But instead of adhering, like the gentile Christians, only to the “Torah of the Messiah” (Gal 6:2, Rom 8:2) taught by Jesus, which was summarized in the double commandment of love for God and love for one’s neighbor, Jewish Christians continued circumcision and Torah practices they believed did not contradict the instruction of Jesus.

The Jerusalem agreement left open some questions that Paul dealt with throughout his ministry. The first controversy broke out in Antioch shortly after the return of the delegates. While visiting the city Peter behaved in strikingly opposing ways. Initially he participated in community meals, which were connected at that time with the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. But after people sent by James came to Antioch and objected, he broke off this table fellowship. Barnabas followed his example (Gal 2:12–13). At issue was whether and to what degree baptized Jews could be expected to disregard purity and food commandments while having table fellowship with gentile Christians. The so-called Apostolic decree of Acts 15:28–29, which was probably at first practiced in Antioch after Paul’s departure, regulated the controversy in the sense of requiring only the “minimal requirements that the Mosaic Law had made with respect to the cultic purity of foreigners living in the land” (cf. Lev 17:10–14, 18:6–26).¹⁰ In response to the termination of table and Lord’s Supper fellowship, Paul publicly confronted Cephas, accusing him of hypocrisy and offending against the truth of the gospel (Gal 2:13–14). But he did not prevail. For when the second missionary journey began, Barnabas separated from Paul and traveled to Cyprus with his nephew John Mark, who had already left the apostle during the first journey (Acts 13:13). Together with Silas, Paul first passed through Syria and Cilicia to strengthen the communities founded there, and after that he developed his own missionary approach (Rom 15:14–21).

¹⁰ Jürgen Roloff, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 2nd ed., NTD 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 227. Roloff adds that the regulations would correspond also “to the so-called Noahide laws (1 Moses 9.4), which should apply to all people according to Rabbinic theory (*Sanhedrin* 56b).”

First Corinthians 9:5–6, Col 4:10, and Phlm 24 indicate that the separation did not lead to a permanent break between Paul, Barnabas, and John Mark. The apostle even appears to have made peace with Peter (see below). It was different with the faction of the baptized Pharisees that was temporarily defeated at the apostolic council in Jerusalem. They developed a counter-mission in the communities Paul founded. One branch wanted to continue to make baptized gentiles into Christian proselytes through circumcision. The other only pushed for a stricter keeping of the commandments of the Torah. Paul reacted with extreme forcefulness to these efforts that ran counter to his proclamation of the gospel, namely from the time of his letter to the Galatians to the time of his letter to the Philippians, which was probably first composed during his imprisonment in Rome (cf. Phil 3:2, 18–19). However, even in these epistles reconciling notes are not completely absent (Phil 1:15–18). In light of the sharp attacks against the counter-missionaries, it is significant that the apostle refrained from criticizing the “pillars” (Gal 2:9). His ironic reference to the “super apostles” in 2 Cor 11:5 and 12:11 may be understood in different ways. If one identifies them with the opponents of Paul who are called false apostles and servants of Satan in 11:13–15, then they are “Jewish Christian Hellenistic itinerant preachers who boast of a special gift of the Spirit and belonging to Christ, work with letters of recommendation, and accept payment from the communities with reference to old apostle right.”¹¹ But if not, then the Jerusalem apostles come into view. It is true that Paul ascribes a high rank to them. But as in 1 Cor 15:9–10, he claims to be equal to the Jerusalem apostles by virtue of his calling and his Spirit-sustained apostolic behavior.¹²

When Paul dictated the astonishing sentences of 1 Cor 15:1–11 he already had the controversies in Jerusalem and Antioch behind him. Perhaps he had already made it through the fight with the counter-missionaries in the Galatian communities. If one follows the South Galatian hypothesis, which is likely from a mission historical perspective¹³ but is only rarely advocated today,¹⁴ then this is even certain. But the controversies with the opponents in 2 Corinthians (see

¹¹ Friedrich Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, 2nd ed., NTD 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 359. Christian Wolff, *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, THKNT 8 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1989), 218, rejects the interpretation that relates them to the pillar apostles and maintains that “Paul would never have expressed himself ... so negatively about the Jerusalem apostles (cf. 1 Corinthians 15.7–11).”

¹² For this interpretive possibility, cf. Ernst Käsemann, *Die Legitimität des Apostels* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956), 20–30; and Scott J. Hafemann, *2 Corinthians*, The NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000), 430–31, 466.

¹³ Cf. Theodor Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig: Deichert, 1900), 1:139ff.; and Theodor Zahn, *Grundriß der Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1928), 15–16.

¹⁴ Cf. Rainer Riesner, *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus*, WUNT 71 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 243, 250–59; Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, WUNT 108 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 453; I. Howard Marshall, *New Testament*

above) still lay ahead of him, as did the collection journey to Jerusalem. According to Rom 15:30–31, he anticipated the trip with some anxiety. As Hengel writes, “The fact that despite all danger and uncertainty Paul dared to travel to Jerusalem was probably based also in the trust in the brother of Jesus’s willingness to negotiate, on the knowledge that he too wanted to maintain the unity of the Jesus community.”¹⁵

The journey leaves no doubt about the apostle’s desire to hold fast to unity with the mother church in Jerusalem. Indeed, Paul lost his freedom in Jerusalem due to striving to maintain the unity of the one church of Jewish and gentile Christians. After imprisonment in Caesarea and Rome, which Acts 23:12–26, 32 and 28:11–31 report, Paul eventually died in Rome. Legend has it that he – unlike Peter, whom Nero had crucified – was beheaded in keeping with his Roman citizenship.¹⁶

III

James, the brother of the Lord Jesus, met Paul in Jerusalem several times. The first meeting occurred during Paul’s two-week visit with Peter (Gal 1:18–19). Though critical of Jesus during the latter’s lifetime (Mark 3:21; 4:32–33; John 7:5), James now belonged firmly to the Jesus community, because he had seen the Risen One even before Paul had (1 Cor 15:7). We do not know if Paul also met James during the visit with the Jerusalem apostles and elders mentioned in Acts 9:26–30 and 11:30. But for both the encounter at the apostolic council in 48 AD was decisive. Alongside Barnabas, Paul had become the most prominent and the most controversial gentile missionary. James had taken Peter’s place in the leadership of the primitive community. The Jewish king Agrippa I had executed the Zebedaid James, and had afterward also imprisoned Peter (cf. 1 Thess 2:14–15). The baptism of uncircumcised gentiles such as Cornelius (cf. Acts 10) made him suspicious to the Sadducean nobles, and Agrippa I wanted to do them a favor. Peter was able to escape prison, but had to leave Jerusalem immediately (Acts 12:1–17). The primitive community’s leadership passed to James, who was called “the Just”¹⁷ because of his blameless way of life. Despite the Sadducees, who continued to view the primitive community in a hostile manner, James, Peter, and John the brother of James dared to reject the

Theology (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 209; and Donald A. Hagner, *The New Testament: A Historical and Theological Introduction* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012), 437.

¹⁵ Martin Hengel, “Jakobus der Herrenbruder – der erste Papst?” in Martin Hengel, *Paulus und Jakobus, Kleine Schriften III*, WUNT 141 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 580.

¹⁶ 1 Clem. 5.2 and Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* II 25.5.

¹⁷ For this title cf. *Gospel of Thomas* 12 and Hengel, “Jakobus der Herrenbruder – der erste Papst?” 557 ff.

objections of converted Pharisees against the Pauline mission praxis. Instead they recognized it as a legitimate way of bearing witness to and realizing the gospel in relation to gentiles. In his essay “James’ Position at the Summit Meeting of the Apostles and the Elders in Jerusalem (Acts 15),”¹⁸ Jostein Ådna has argued persuasively that James’s speech in Acts 15:13–21 stems from historically sound tradition. Based on then-contemporary exegesis of Amos 9:11–12 and by allusions to other statements of the prophets, James expressed to the council the conviction that “now that God has rebuilt the fallen booth of David by establishing the *ekklesia* of Jesus, the Messiah, the time has come for freely including the Gentiles *qua* Gentiles into the people of God.” This so-called apostolic decree can also be stated in this way: “The only minimum requirements to be imposed on them are those put down by the Scriptures in Leviticus 17–18 for Gentiles living in the midst of Israel, as is now the situation in the Church (cf. Jer 12.16).”¹⁹

At their last meeting, Paul and James were concerned with the delivery and acceptance of the collection for the poor established at the apostolic council. The apostle had already asked the Christians in Rome to pray “that my service for Jerusalem may be acceptable to the saints” (Rom 15:31). When he arrived in Jerusalem with the accompanying delegation, to which Luke also probably belonged, they were amicably received by the brothers and found lodging with the Cyprian Mnason (Acts 21:16–17). The following day they were officially received by James and the complete gathering of the elders (Acts 21:18–26). At first the apostle’s report of the results of his mission were met with thanksgiving. But there followed then a reaction that one can only understand if one considers that “true ‘freedom from the law’ (was) not practicable for Jews in Jewish Palestine” and the primitive community, “which had already suffered a series of persecutions (could) not in the long run expose itself to suspicion of a lax praxis of the law.”²⁰ James did not receive the collection. Instead, he referred Paul to the many Jewish Christians who believed in Jesus Christ and nevertheless were “zealots for the law.” According to James, they harbored the suspicion that Paul taught people to fall away from the Torah.

To allay this suspicion, they advised Paul to prove his loyalty to the law by securing the release of four Jewish Christians from Nazirite vows by providing the required sacrifices. The costs were high: “According to Numbers 6.14 ff., ... Paul would have had to pay four one-year old male lambs and ewe lambs, four rams, four baskets with ring bread from fine flour with oil, unleavened wafers

¹⁸ Jostein Ådna, “James’ Position at the Summit Meeting of the Apostles and the Elders in Jerusalem (Acts 15),” in *The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles*, ed. Jostein Ådna and Hans Kvalbein, WUNT 127 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 125–61.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 161.

²⁰ Hengel, “Jakobus der Herrenbruder – der erste Papst?” 574.

coated with oil, and the remaining food and drink offering.”²¹ Paul could not have paid this expense from the profits of his tent-making. He could only have paid it from the collection. Finally, James reminds his guest of the apostolic decree (cf. Acts 21:25 with 15:20). Since the use of the collection money for the Nazirites corresponded to the purpose of the collection for “the poor among the saints in Jerusalem” (Rom 15:26), it is entirely believable that Paul followed the suggestion of the brother of the Lord the next day. Neither he nor James could foresee that he would be seized in the Temple and taken into Roman protective custody. We do not know what happened with the collection after the apostle’s arrest.

The entire scene of Acts 21:18–26 documents James’s readiness to maintain church fellowship with Paul and the gentile Christian communities he founded. But it also documents the high barriers that stood against this fellowship. By following the advice of the Lord’s brother, Paul proved he was capable of becoming a Jew to the Jews (1 Cor 9:20). But above all he showed that he felt responsible for the fellowship of gentile Christians and Jewish Christians in the one church whose head and Lord is Jesus Christ. The conviction that they were bound together through faith in the one and only God, the one Lord Jesus Christ, and the gospel (of 1 Cor 15:3–5) jointly inspired James and Paul.²²

Two circumstances must still be considered: According to Acts, Paul received hardly any Christian support during his imprisonment in Jerusalem. Only his nephew and members of the community from Caesarea looked after him (Acts 23:16, 24:23). The silence of the primitive community can be explained from the increasingly precarious situation in Jerusalem,²³ in which it had to guard against declarations of sympathy for an alleged apostate. Nevertheless, it is not a glorious chapter, for it illustrates the aversion of the radical Jewish Christians of Jerusalem against Paul and his mission. Something of this aversion also runs through the Epistle of James.

Whether the Epistle of James as a whole or only some of its significant passages, above all 2:14–26, must be addressed as “anti-Pauline polemic,” as Martin

²¹ Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus*, 386 n. 1600.

²² Hengel, “Jakobus der Herrenbruder – der erste Papst?” 570, writes: “The common christological foundation confession remained ... the decisive bond: In 1 Corinthians 15.11 Paul summarizes the preceding ten verses as a conclusion: ‘whether then it be I or they, so we (all) preach and so you believed.’ James, who is named in the fourth position, is also included here. It is the kerygma of Christ and his salvific work, to which all are obligated even in controversy and that grounds the unity of the church.”

²³ “In the years following Nero’s ascension to the throne (54 CE) Jewish nationalism grew in Judea, the influence of the Zealots increased, and an open terror against everything Greek ran rampant, which bore every feature of a culture war (Josephus, *A. J.* 20.159–60). It was this one development in which the catastrophe of the Jewish war (66 CE) was inexorably prepared” (Roloff, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 312).

Hengel believes,²⁴ is less decisive than the fact that the letter fits the time of Paul's imprisonment much better than the years after his martyrdom and the death of the brother of the Lord in 62 AD.²⁵ James's epistle to "the twelve tribes" of the eschatological people of God "who live in the dispersion" (Jas 1:1) reflects the brother of the Lord's concern over the unsound way of life practiced by Christians outside of Jerusalem. James omits discussion of the gospel that unites them all. It was not controversial. What was controversial was conduct determined and guided by antinomians, who according to the Corinthian letters also created difficulties for Paul (cf. 1 Cor 5:1–13 and 6:12–20). In his epistle, the brother of the Lord shows himself to be a Jew who has become a Christian who – in contrast to Paul – thinks in the categories of Jewish wisdom and can do little with the Pauline *sola fide* (Rom 3:28). According to his thoroughly Jewish view, only the one who in the obedience of faith has also done (enough) good works can survive the final judgment. James had no access to Paul's experience and teaching concerning the faith that as God's gift comes anew to the elect (Gal 3:23–25), that makes one free from the compulsion of the law, and that preserves believers, even in the case of the greatest failure, from ruin in the final judgment by virtue of the intercession of the Risen One (1 Cor 5:5). Still, in 2:14–26 he was at least careful enough to take aim at only a Pauline "foolish one" (2:20) and not the apostle himself. Nevertheless, this epistle from Jerusalem must have wounded Paul, imprisoned most recently in Rome, and his supporters. We do not know whether the apostle also reacted to James's statements in the manner of Phil 1:13–18.

Between 62 and 64 AD Paul suffered martyrdom in Rome. We do not know what charges were formulated against him. By contrast, the charges made against James and some of his fellow Christians in Jerusalem in 62 AD are well known. According to Josephus²⁶ the Jewish court condemned the men to death by stoning, because they were lawbreakers who had led the people astray, to apostasy through faith in Jesus.²⁷ The Sanhedrin had made this charge against

²⁴ Martin Hengel, "Der Jakobusbrief als antipaulinische Polemik," in Martin Hengel, *Paulus und Jakobus, Kleine Schriften III*, WUNT 141 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 511–48.

²⁵ For the early dating of the Epistle of James cf. also Franz Mußner, *Der Jakobusbrief*, 3rd ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 1975), 12–23; and Marshall, *New Testament Theology*, 628. Ulrich Wilckens (*Theologie des Neuen Testaments* [Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 2005], 1:358) considers whether the epistle could have "been written between 62 and 70 CE," i. e. after James's death. This is unlikely, for subsequent to the stoning of their leader the primitive community was in such great affliction that it left Jerusalem in 66 AD and went into exile to Pella in East Jordan (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* III 5.3). Given this situation a pseudepigraphical writing to Christians outside the Holy Land could scarcely proceed from it.

²⁶ Josephus, *A. J.* 20.199–203.

²⁷ For this charge cf. Hegesippus's account of James's martyrdom in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* II 23.10; and Hengel, "Jakobus der Herrenbruder – der erste Papst?" 556.

Jesus (cf. Matt 27:63–64; John 7:12).²⁸ The court itself could carry out the judgment against James, because Festus, the Roman procurator responsible for the death sentence, had died and his successor Albinus had not yet taken office.

Thus, James and Paul went to their deaths in their Lord's service. They held fast to the unity of the church without being able to settle their differences. The uncertainty with which today's church encounters Jews who believe in Jesus shows that the differences continue to have an effect. The type of Jewish Christianity that James led in Palestine was decimated after his death during the turmoil of the Jewish revolts against Rome. For this reason, gentile Christians lacked the counterpart with whom they would have had to develop a lasting relationship. To this day it seems self-evident that faith in Christ and observance of the Torah are incompatible, although Peter was entrusted with "the gospel for the circumcised" at the apostolic council (Gal 2:7) and Justin affirms that Jewish Christians who hold fast to the Torah can by all means find ecclesiastical recognition, if they only refrain from persuading gentile Christians "to be circumcised, to celebrate the Sabbath or the like."²⁹ These very demands were made by the Ebionites in the second century AD, who considered James the first bishop of Jerusalem and showered Paul with hateful polemic.³⁰

IV

In his profound study *Saint Peter: The Underestimated Apostle*,³¹ Martin Hengel warned – with good reason historically – against underestimating Peter vis-à-vis Paul. It is true that Paul's letters and Acts always invite one to reflect anew on Paul's thought world and mission-historical significance. But Paul grants Peter the role of the first witness of the resurrection without hesitation (1 Cor 15:5), reports that he visited Cephas as the first apostle in Jerusalem (Gal 1:18), sees him as the great partner on the mission field entrusted with the gospel for the circumcision (Gal 2:7–8), and even stresses their commonality in the faith in justification by faith alone without practices of the Torah (Gal 2:16).

But in Antioch he took him to task over precisely this matter, because at James's insistence Peter, Barnabas, and other Jewish Christians had withdrawn from table and Lord's Supper fellowship with the gentile Christians. Peter evidently regarded it as expected that gentile Christians would refrain from eating

²⁸ For the history of law findings cf. August Strobel, *Die Stunde der Wahrheit*, WUNT 21 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1980), 81 ff.

²⁹ Justin, *Dial.* 47.2.

³⁰ For references see Martin Hengel, "Jakobus der Herrenbruder – der erste Papst?" 568.

³¹ Martin Hengel, *Der unterschätzte Petrus: zwei Studien*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); idem., *Saint Peter: The Underestimated Apostle*, trans. Thomas Trapp (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010).

foods forbidden to Jews at the Lord's Supper, which was still connected with the community meal in his day, and also not let themselves become guilty of any adulterous behavior (cf. Acts 15:20). Paul regarded this – and he was correct theologically – as imposing practices of the law through the back door and accused Peter of offending against the truth of the gospel (Gal 2:11–14). But when Cephas was called anew by the Risen Christ (cf. Luke 22:32; John 21:15–19), the question of the law did not play the same role as it did with Paul in his calling. Therefore, for Peter his withdrawal from the common table fellowship was not an offense against the gospel of 1 Cor 15:3b–5. So he and his friends accepted the temporary break with Paul. Later, however, Paul condemned the flagrant adultery in Corinth in the strongest terms (1 Cor 5:1–3), counseled the Christians at Rome to show the greatest possible consideration for the Jewish Christian community members' manner of thinking and behaving (Rom 14:1–12), and clarified that baptized Christians are indeed obligated to follow Jesus's teaching and to fulfill God's commandments (Rom 8:3–8, 13:8–10).

Thus, the two great apostles' standpoints are not identical, but comparable. This is also attested by the history of mission. After the Agrippa persecution, Peter no longer had a secure place in Jerusalem and had to turn – in a similar way as Paul – to the mission among Jews and gentiles outside the Holy Land. This change was consistent for him insofar as he had baptized the gentile centurion Cornelius and his household in Caesarea without requiring circumcision (Acts 10). Through the reports of this missionary success (Acts 11:1–18, 15:6–12) he had prepared the way in Jerusalem for the recognition of the circumcision-free gentile mission that Barnabas and Paul practiced, starting from Antioch.

In both his Jewish mission in Palestine and gentile mission in foreign lands, the fisherman from Bethsaida, who had received no school education (Acts 4:13), was helped by the fact that he – in contrast to Paul – had accompanied Jesus himself. Jesus had given him the name "Rock" and the commission to advance and complete the gathering of the eschatological people of God, which Jesus had begun with his twelve disciples (Matt 16:16–19; Luke 22:32; John 21:15–17). In his missionary teaching Peter could report authentically about Jesus and the church's beginnings in Jerusalem. According to ancient church tradition John Mark, the nephew of Barnabas (cf. Acts 12:12, 15:37 with Col 4:10), was Peter's missionary assistant and the editor of the Jesus tradition vouchsafed to him by Peter; the Gospel of Mark goes back to John Mark.³² We encounter Peter not only in Antioch (Gal 2:11), but also (together with his wife) on the (Pauline) mission field in Corinth (1 Cor 1:12, 3:22, 9:5). He is the guarantor of

³² Thus Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* III 39.15. Martin Hengel has championed the reliability of this tradition in many publications. Cf. his *Der unterschätzte Petrus*, 58–78; and *Saint Peter*, 36–48.