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ABSTRACT

It is a commonplace of New Testament scholarship that the theology of Paul has been distorted or homogenized in certain late New Testament and early non-canonical Christian writings. This critical judgement implies the existence of a theological standard to which Paul has been conformed in these writings.

It is the purpose of this thesis, first, to identify that standard, for which the coined expression "mainline faith" is used; and secondly, to trace its origins.

The first purpose is achieved through an inventory of the teachings of literature often alleged to homogenize or distort Paul: within the canon, the Pastoral epistles, Acts and 2 Peter; outside the canon, 1 Clement and the writings of Ignatius and Polycarp. A search for patterns of agreement in our literature over against characteristic Pauline teachings shows the chief tenets of the "mainline faith" to be a strong stress on atonement, repentance and forgiveness of sins; a focus on morality as central to the gospel; an untroubled appropriation of Judaism as mere background to Christianity; and a stereotyped concept of unanimous apostolic teaching. These tenets are not diametrically opposed to Paul's central teachings, but cluster near the commonsensical, general and anthropocentric end of a continuum with Paul at the paradoxical, specific and theocentric end.

On the second objective, with the exception of the stereotyped concept of apostolicity which is attributed to trends
usually called "early catholicism," the thesis concludes that the roots of the mainline faith can be traced back to the so-called "Hellenist mission" found evangelizing the Gentiles of Antioch at Acts 11:19 f. The thesis does not endorse all the details of a binary opposition between "Hellenists" and "Hebrews" as propounded by many scholars, but does argue that the Hellenists of Antioch were less Law-observant and more mission-minded than the Jerusalem church, and that the gospel in the form they preached it was no mere "bridge to Paul"; it was rather an independent instrument of the evangelization of the Roman Empire even in Paul's lifetime, and survived beyond Paul's time to exercise a major influence on our literature and subsequent Christianity.
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## New Testament books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td>NT Rom</td>
<td>Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor</td>
<td>1 Corinthians</td>
<td>Phmn</td>
<td>Philemon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor</td>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>1 Pt</td>
<td>1 Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal</td>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>2 Pt</td>
<td>2 Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>Rev</td>
<td>Revelation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jn</td>
<td>1 John</td>
<td>1 Thess</td>
<td>1 Thessalonians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Jn</td>
<td>2 John</td>
<td>1 Tm</td>
<td>1 Timothy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>2 Tm</td>
<td>2 Timothy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT Eph</td>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>Tt</td>
<td>Titus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT Phil</td>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Apostolic Fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Clem</td>
<td>1 Clement</td>
<td>IgRom</td>
<td>Ignatius, Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IgEph</td>
<td>Ignatius, Ephesians</td>
<td>IgSm</td>
<td>Ignatius, Smyrneans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IgMag</td>
<td>Ignatius, Magnesians</td>
<td>IgTr</td>
<td>Ignatius, Trallians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IgPhd</td>
<td>Ignatius, Philadelphians</td>
<td>MarPol</td>
<td>Martyrdom of Polycarp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IgPol</td>
<td>Ignatius to Polycarp</td>
<td>Poly</td>
<td>Polycarp, Philippians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Books of the Hebrew Scriptures and Apocrypha/Deuterocanonicals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal</td>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>Tob</td>
<td>Tobit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Bible Translations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB     Jerusalem Bible</td>
<td>NKJV New King James Version</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KJV    King James Version</td>
<td>NRSV New Revised Standard Version</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB    New American Bible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASB   New American Standard Bible</td>
<td>REB Revised English Bible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEB    New English Bible</td>
<td>RSV Revised Standard Version</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIV    New International Version</td>
<td>TEV Today's English Version</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJB    New Jerusalem Bible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAGD   Bauer et al, <em>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament</em> and other Early Christian Literature (see works cited)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDF    Blass, Debrunner and Funk, <em>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament</em> (see works cited)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ins.   inscription (greeting of letters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX    Septuagint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mg.    margin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PART I: INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 1: THE PROBLEM

After Jesus, Paul of Tarsus is the biggest name in the New Testament. From the time Jesus leaves the earthly scene at the ascension (Acts 1:9) until the Bible ends with a warning and promise of his return (Rev 22:20 f.), Paul is "on stage," whether as narrative protagonist or as writer of letters, for fully 58 per cent of the text.¹ Sixteen of the 28 chapters of the account of the post-Easter church in Acts are dominated by the doings of Paul; 13 of the 21 New Testament epistles -- 71 per cent by length -- bear his name.

But in the consensus of scholarly opinion, much of that content is Pauline in name only. Scholars consider as many as six of the 13 letters to be pseudonymous; not only that, they are said to contain material the real Paul would not have written.² Many scholars also regard the portrait of Paul in Acts as historically unreliable and theologically distorted.³ In other words, certain New Testament books may show more respect for Paul's name than for his principles. That tendency continues in some of the earliest Christian writings outside the New Testament canon: Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch and Polycarp of

¹ Based on a page count in a pocket NRSV New Testament.
² E.g. Beker 9 and passim, Roetzel 131 ff.; differently e.g. Guthrie Pastoral 18 ff.
³ E.g. Haenchen 98 ff., 112 ff., Achtemeier 62 ff., Vielhauer passim; differently e.g. Munck xxxiii ff.
Smyrna all quote Paul and praise him, yet critics often question how well they understood him.⁴

If all this is true, it does not diminish Paul's importance as a New Testament figure. It is his name, not someone else's, that other writers have borrowed to add authority to so many letters; it is Paul, not someone else, who is worth half the book of Acts, no matter how distorted the story. The honor implied by all this might be left-handed, but it is still enormous.

These claims do, however, raise a crucial question. If Paul's name is being used (pseudonymously or in narrative) in the service of ideas not his own, what ideas, and whose ideas, are they?

It is a question often answered in colorful generalities. Walter Bauer says "the complete surrender of [Paul's] personality and historical particularity" in such literature as the pseudonymous Pastoral Epistles was the price of Paul's acceptance by "the church." Dennis MacDonald refers in a similar context to "the victory of the bishops," Arland Hultgren more kindly to "the common Christian tradition." Acts, says J. Christiaan Beker, gives us a "catholic Paul" who says the same things as everybody else, especially Peter. Ernst Käsemann says the Pauline mission was "submerged in the broad stream of the early Christian mission." Harry Gamble says Paul's image as an "exemplary apostolic figure" for Clement, Ignatius and Polycarp, as well as

⁴ Richardson 38, 78 f., Achtemeier 62, Guthrie Pastoral 53.
for the author of the canonical 2 Peter, owes nothing to any knowledge of his distinctive theology.\(^5\)

Running through all these turns of phrase is the implication that there was some sort of standard, homogenized mainstream theology to which Paul had to be, or at least was, conformed by his imitators and his champions. Of course, such "conforming" might well vary from author to author; after all, Luke, the "Pastor" and the others would have had their own agendas, no less than Paul did. But the emphasis in claims like these is not on the submerging of the particularity of Paul in the particularity of Luke or the Pastor or Polycarp, but rather on its submerging in broader trends, the sort that attract such language as "the church," "catholic Paul," or "common tradition."

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

But is it in fact possible to find any such "common tradition" or "broad stream" that unites these varied writings — and unites them over against Paul? If so, what is its content? Where did it come from? And when did it arise — before Paul, in Paul's own time, or after his death?

It is the contention of this thesis that such a stream can indeed be discerned, although its content (with a couple of exceptions) differs primarily in emphasis from that of the undisputed Pauline letters. It is further my contention that this mainstream predates Paul in most respects, that it rivalled Paul's work in influence even in Paul's own lifetime, and that

\(^5\) Bauer 227, MacDonald 81, Hultgren Normative 71, Beker 57, Käsemann 240, Gamble 43.
analysis of its teachings suggests an origin in what is usually known as the Hellenist mission (though that expression requires careful qualification) which is found evangelizing the Gentiles of Antioch at Acts 11:19 f.

More specifically, this stream or tradition is focused on a loosely-understood concept of Christ's death and resurrection as providing atonement and forgiveness for sins, to be appropriated through repentance, all in contrast to Paul's more precise and paradoxical understanding of God's breaking of the power of sin and death in the Christ-event. It preaches holy living or Christian morals as a central part of the gospel, rather than a consequence of the gospel as in Paul's characteristic thought. It displays a breezy and at times patronizing appropriation of Judaism as nothing more than Christian background, quite unlike Paul's radical critique of a Jewish heritage which nevertheless remains in a very real sense normative for him. Finally, it appeals for its own validation to a stereotyped concept of apostolic unanimity very different from Paul's complex relationship to "those who were already apostles before me" (Gal 1:17). It is the first three of these four points -- the gospel of atonement, repentance and forgiveness, the focus on holy living and the attitude toward Judaism -- which I propose to find also, for the most part, in the thinking of the Hellenist mission; the stereotyped concept of apostolicity is, I shall argue, a post-Pauline development.

Before proceeding, it is necessary to give this phenomenon a name to be used consistently. Most candidates pose a danger of
claiming more than I can or wish to defend within the scope of this thesis.⁶ "Common tradition," my original choice, sounds as if everybody or nearly everybody believed it, but I shall not be considering the question of competing streams in early Christianity⁷ whose adherents may or may not have believed these same things. "Orthodoxy," "proto-orthodoxy," and "the Great Church" are anachronistic for all or part of the period under discussion. "Early catholicism" refers to trends which are a possible explanation of this phenomenon (see Chapter 11), so its use as a label would be question-begging in the present context. "Formative Christianity" stresses early diversity while I am focusing on a single stream. And "normative Christianity" would give this stream a comprehensiveness I shall not claim for it, since I am far from denying normative status to certain Pauline formulations; "normative" also carries a connotation of approval which is largely inappropriate to this thesis. "Mainstream" is close: its connotations reflect the eventual "establishment" nature of this material, its obvious continuity with a great deal of historical Christian thought, and its power to "conform" the image of the great apostle. But "mainstream" also carries some connotation of normative status, and if pressed too far would make Paul a fringe figure or a crank by contrast.

⁶ Cf. the discussion of many of these same terms by Hultgren *Normative* 2 ff., which I have followed in part.

⁷ The danger of anachronism in the use of "Christian," "Christianity" and related words is acknowledged, but I shall use them nevertheless. See discussion at end of present chapter.
In the end I have chosen "mainline," as an expression which has many of the same connotations as "mainstream" but lacks the normative claim. Pentecostals and Catholics can speak of "mainline Protestantism" as readily as Presbyterians do, without implying agreement with it or fringe status for themselves; in the same spirit, I shall contrast mainline positions with those of Paul without implying that mainline authors were right and Paul wrong, or vice-versa. Because "mainline," spelled as one word, is properly an adjective in need of a noun to modify, I shall frequently speak of "the mainline faith"; this use of "the faith" to designate the content of doctrine is characteristic of the "mainline" primary literature I shall be studying (see especially Chapter 5).

I should stress, if this is not already clear, that I do not intend to claim that this mainline faith constitutes the essence of Christianity. If Christianity indeed has an essence (and I am convinced, for philosophical reasons outside the scope of this paper, that it is impossible to maintain consistently that it doesn't), that essence is likely to be both smaller and larger than this mainline faith: smaller, because it is hard to believe that every detail of the mainline faith is essential to Christianity; larger, because it is equally hard to believe that it covers everything of importance, as if Paul or John had nothing essential to contribute. And while I shall claim that the

---

8 Having explained my reasons for coining the somewhat odd expression "mainline faith," I shall henceforth disregard its oddity and spell it without quotations marks.
mainline faith goes back before Paul, I shall not discuss whether it is truly primitive; that is a thesis for someone else to write.

METHOD AND PRESUPPOSITIONS

I shall begin the search for the mainline faith with the late New Testament and early non-canonical Christian writings which most often attract the sort of suggestions already noted. The New Testament writings are Acts, with its much-disputed account of Paul's career and teaching; the Pastoral Epistles (1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus), bearing Paul's name but widely regarded as pseudonymous; and 2 Peter, the only New Testament work other than Acts and the genuine or pseudonymous Pauline letters to mention Paul's name. Excluded are the three other Pauline letters often regarded as pseudonymous: Colossians, NT Ephesians and 2 Thessalonians. I am less impressed with the arguments for pseudonymity in the case of Colossians and NT Ephesians than in the case of the Pastorals; more important, pseudonymous or not, these two letters have a very different theological drift from the mainline faith as found in the Pastorals and elsewhere. As for 2 Thessalonians, its suspected dynamic of pseudonymity is quite distinct from that of the

---

9 The Gospel of Luke, written by the same author as Acts, might well shed light on the theology of the latter work, but I have excluded it because it does not share either the post-Easter setting or the explicit treatment of Paul characteristic of my literature.

10 E.g. Hanson 2 ff., Hultgren I-II Tm 17.

11 Beker 64 f., Hanson 7.
Pastorals or of Colossians and NT Ephesians, and not particularly relevant to my purpose.\(^{12}\)

My non-canonical literature consists of the writings of those "Apostolic Fathers" who mention Paul:\(^{13}\) 1 Clement, Polycarp's letter to the Philippians, and the seven letters of Ignatius generally accepted as genuine.\(^{14}\) 2 Clement is excluded because it is generally considered to be a later work by a different author\(^ {15}\) and does not mention Paul. These works are all (in later terms) orthodox Christian writings,\(^ {16}\) and thus fit well into a discussion of the mainline faith of "the church." They also fit within the same time frame as my canonical literature: around 80-120 CE (see Chapter 2). I shall refer to these canonical and non-canonical writings as "our literature," and to the six individuals presumed to have produced them ("Luke," the "Pastor," the author of 2 Peter, "Clement," Ignatius and Polycarp) as "our authors."

How is the mainline faith to be identified in our literature? A simplistic definition would run as follows: All those teachings with respect to which our authors

1) agree among themselves, and
2) disagree with Paul.

\(^{12}\) Roetzel 144 ff., Beker 72 ff.

\(^{13}\) Lindemann "Apostolic" 27.

\(^{14}\) Grant 5, Richardson 81 ff., Lake 168 ff.

\(^{15}\) Grant 44, 46, Lake 126 f., Richardson 183.

\(^{16}\) Grant v ff., Richardson 16 f.
Simplistically applied, such a definition would bring this thesis to a premature halt. As will emerge in later chapters, I would not be prepared to argue that there is a single point unanimously held by our authors which is flatly opposed by, or even unknown to, Paul's undisputed letters. However, there is no reason to use so simplistic a definition, nor to apply it simplistically. "Mainline" and other such expressions are most reasonably understood to refer to a tradition within which our authors wrote, while retaining their own theological peculiarities and agendas; in other words, there is no reason to expect any one of them, still less all six, simply to embody the mainline faith or to affirm every mainline belief explicitly in their writings. Similarly, it is not reasonable to expect diametrical opposition between our authors on the one hand and Paul on the other, and at any rate, as later chapters will show, such diametrical opposition is seldom if ever found in practice.

A more reasonable set of criteria for mainline teachings, then, is that they should be

1) general or recurrent in our literature, and
2) in discernible contrast or tension with Paul's teachings.

These criteria will be used extensively in Chapters 3 through 10, my inventory of the content of our literature, but with two qualifications. First, not everything in Paul's undisputed letters counts as "Paul's teachings." Paul himself makes it clear that he "received" (paralambanō) certain teachings (1 Cor 15:3, cf. v. 11), and that his two rather tardy visits to the Jerusalem leaders James and Peter "who were apostles before
me" revealed no serious discrepancy between his gospel and theirs (Gal 1:17-19, 2:2, 6-9). There is no reason to suppose that his personal "revelation of Jesus Christ" of Gal 1:12 is intended to cover his entire knowledge of Christian teaching. And there are a good many passages in the undisputed letters widely agreed by scholars to be of pre-Pauline origin: for example, that just cited from 1 Cor 15, or NT Rom 1:3 f. Such material, though accepted by Paul, cannot be considered characteristically Pauline, and indeed sometimes stands in a certain degree of tension with characteristically Pauline thought. These passages will play a significant role in this thesis: that they are non-Pauline (in origin, and to some degree in content) will be of note in the use of the above criteria to identify mainline teachings; that they are pre-Pauline will be of significance in determining the origin of the mainline faith.

Secondly, these criteria focus exclusively on disagreement between the mainline faith and Paul's positions. And a mainline faith defined entirely in terms of disagreement (even the modified, non-diametrical disagreement just suggested) can only be a construct. As a historical reality, common ground between our authors and Paul is both a priori likely and empirically obvious, as the inventory of our literature will demonstrate. To take one obvious example, everyone involved believed in the

17 Ziesler 19 f., Fitzmyer "Pauline" 1386.
18 Bornkamm 140, E. Sanders Paul 22, 78, Ziesler 92.
19 Bornkamm 116, Barrett Paul 24, Dodd 14, Schoedel 9 n. 54.
resurrection. But the concern of this thesis lies not so much in reconstructing a fully rounded picture of the mainline faith as in enumerating its differences from Pauline thought and accounting for their origin.

Following a brief chapter of introduction to our primary literature (Chapter 2), I shall assemble a rather lengthy inventory of its teachings, in Chapters 3 through 9. The first of these, Chapter 3, will deal with what in our day would be called creedal matters: our authors' positions on God, the status of Jesus, the resurrection and other such subjects, without which no account of the beliefs of any early Christian stream would be complete.

The remaining six chapters of this inventory will focus on more specific topics with respect to which commentators, or I myself, see noteworthy differences between the teachings characteristic of our literature and those characteristic of Paul. In each case I shall cast the net somewhat broadly, so as not to miss anything of relevance, before narrowing the discussion to those teachings which are found to fit the criteria. The topics are:

Salvation (Chapter 4). The word "salvation" is used in a sense broad enough to cover modern as well as ancient understandings, and to embrace our literature's positions on what Christ has to offer, by what means, and to whom.

The role of doctrine (Chapter 5). Our literature is characterized in varying degrees by a strong concern for "doctrine," "sound teaching," "the faith" and other such
expressions, which on examination do not turn out to be exclusively creedal concepts.

The Christian life (Chapter 6). Our literature's vocabulary of Christian living reveals striking contrasts with Paul's undisputed letters, both in frequency of occurrence and in meaning.

Judaism (Chapter 7). One of the major themes of early Christian history is the working out of an understanding of how Christianity relates to Judaism. Here and in later chapters I shall question some standard interpretations as they relate to our literature and to Paul.

Apostolicity (Chapter 8). Our literature is full of apostles, but the concept seems to have come some distance from Paul's use of the term.

The portrait of Paul (Chapter 9). Commentators such as those cited earlier in this chapter often suggest that Paul's person and role, as well as his theology, have been submerged or distorted by our literature.

I shall complete this inventory with a chapter summarizing those teachings that meet the mainline criteria discussed above (Chapter 10). Next, I shall briefly examine and reject three common explanations for the origin of this material (Chapter 11): that it consists merely in what lesser minds make of the "hard to understand" (2 Pt 3:14) religious genius of Paul;\(^2^0\) that it is all a matter of the descent into "early catholicism" with its

\(^{2^0}\) Hanson 50, Roetzel 153, Grant 66 f., all in part.
loss of the imminent expectation of the parousia and its increasing formalization of worship, doctrine and church polity; and that it comes from a Jewish-Christian "Petrine" Christianity which opposed and then compromised with Paulinism, lost out to Paulinism or even triumphed over Paulinism. Instead, I shall argue (Chapters 12 through 14) that the mainline faith had an origin earlier than our literature which was not, however, "Petrine" in a Jewish-Christian sense, but was in fact less Jewish than Paul's own theology: the belief and practice of the Hellenist mission of Acts 11:19 f.

I shall conclude with an Afterword offering a few comments on the significance of my findings for a broader understanding of the history of early Christianity, the role of Paul, and especially the reading of the New Testament as a holy book; and an Appendix comparing the content of Colossians and NT Ephesians to the mainline faith as identified in this thesis.

A few additional notes:

--This thesis accepts what I take to be critical orthodoxy: that the Pastorals and 2 Peter are pseudonymous works produced well after the death of Paul (and of Peter); that Acts, and particularly its account of Paul's career and teachings, is as

---

22 F.C. Baur, cited by Dunn 341.
23 Goulder 185.
25 Hanson 2 ff., Hultgren I-II Tm 17, Sidebottom 99 f., Reicke 143 ff.
fictionalized as the author (whom I shall in traditional fashion call "Luke") found necessary for his purposes;\textsuperscript{26} and that all our literature, but most significantly the Pastorals and Acts, contains purportedly "Pauline" material which is in tension with the theology of the seven undisputed Pauline letters. Only these seven undisputed letters -- NT Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, NT Philippians, 1 Thessalonians and Philemon -- will be treated as reliable sources for Pauline thought. I do not, however, accept that all these assumptions are as unproblematical as they are often portrayed,\textsuperscript{27} and this issue will be touched upon briefly in the Afterword.

\textemdash\textemdash Any originality this thesis may claim is limited to interpretations of our post-Pauline authors, especially as a group, and their link to the Hellenist mission. No claim whatever is made of originality in Pauline studies; for this I have relied on stock interpretations of Paul by acknowledged Pauline scholars such as E.P. Sanders, C.K. Barrett, Joseph Fitzmyer and John Ziesler, and by scholars of our primary literature whose business it is to compare that literature to Paul. This includes, in particular, accepting stock identifications of certain passages in the undisputed letters as pre-Pauline. All comparisons between Paul's undisputed letters and our literature will be made on a case-by-case basis, and no "essence" or "centre" of Pauline theology will be presupposed or identified.

\textsuperscript{26} Haenchen 98 ff., Achtemeier 62 ff., Vielhauer passim.
\textsuperscript{27} E.g. Roetzel 131 for the pseudonymity of the Pastorals.
--I shall not consider in any systematic way the reasons why our authors have chosen to incorporate Paul in the way (or ways) they have done. That question is well worth a thesis of its own. 28

--I shall use the words "Christian" and "Christianity" more freely than is sometimes done in New Testament studies nowadays. The same will occasionally be true with such related words as "church." All our primary literature is more or less self-consciously Christian (even if only Acts and Ignatius actually use the word), so there is no danger of anachronism in referring to it accordingly. There is a danger of anachronism in applying "Christian" to the undisputed Pauline letters and to other very early events and traditions, and I acknowledge that danger, but in view of the main focus of this thesis any alternate term would lose in clarity whatever it might gain in precision.

--The system of abbreviations for the works of the Apostolic Fathers and the canonical Pauline epistles has been chosen for two reasons: to emphasize the identity of the writer of each letter rather than that of the recipient, and to distinguish between canonical and non-canonical letters to the same addressees by some clearer means than the use of italic versus Roman type. Thus, "IgPol" is Ignatius' letter to Polycarp, "Poly" is Polycarp's letter to the Philippians, and "NT Phil" is Paul's canonical letter to the Philippians. A full list of abbreviations may be found following the table of contents.

28 Cf. MacDonald passim, also Babcock passim.
CHAPTER 2: THE PRIMARY LITERATURE
THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

The so-called Pastoral Epistles -- 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy and Titus -- are New Testament letters purportedly written by Paul to two of his protégés. A majority of New Testament scholars deny Paul wrote these letters,\(^1\) while a minority accept his authorship.\(^2\)

Skeptics point to an impressive list of differences between the Pastorals and the undisputed Pauline letters: in vocabulary, both stylistic and substantive;\(^3\) in rhetorical technique;\(^4\) in church structure;\(^5\) and in theological emphasis.\(^6\) In addition, the historical details of the Pastorals, especially a missionary journey by Paul to Crete (Tt 1:5), are difficult to square with the undisputed letters or with Acts.\(^7\) Defenders of Pauline authorship concede much of this, but deny that it is decisive.\(^8\) In particular, nearly everyone agrees there are theological

\(^1\) E.g. Dibelius-Conzelmann 1 ff., Karris xi f., Hanson 11, Hultgren I-II Tm 17.
\(^2\) E.g. Fee 1, Kelly 34, Guthrie Pastoral 55 f.
\(^3\) Hanson 2 f.
\(^4\) Beker 40 f.
\(^5\) Hultgren I-II Tm 15.
\(^6\) Hanson 3 f., Beker 43 ff.
\(^7\) Hultgren I-II Tm 15 ff.
\(^8\) E.g. Fee 1, Kelly viii.
elements in the Pastorals which are not classically Pauline,\(^9\) though on the other hand it is widely agreed that the Pastorals come from an environment influenced by genuine Paulinism.\(^10\) The theological elements in tension with the undisputed letters are the most important aspect of the Pastorals for this thesis. The Pastorals will be treated as pseudonymous, though certain reservations will be mentioned in the Afterword.

Commentators who regard the Pastorals as pseudonymous usually date them between 90 and 110 CE.\(^11\) The conventional dating is accepted here. Ephesus, or at any rate Asia Minor, as an area with a strong Pauline tradition and a known church polity similar to that of the Pastorals, is the likely location for their composition.\(^12\)

ACTS

The Acts of the Apostles is the traditional name given to the New Testament narrative of the spread of early Christianity, which begins with the ascension of Jesus into heaven 40 days after the resurrection (1:1-11) and ends with Paul's arrival in

---

\(^9\) E.g. Fee 14, Kelly 16 ff., though both favor Pauline authorship.


\(^11\) So e.g. Hanson 12 f., Hultgren I-II Tm 29 f.; differently Koester 305, Bauer 222 f., 226 f., suggesting dates as late as mid-second century.

\(^12\) Hanson 19; so also Hultgren I-II Tm 20. I shall not explore Wilson's theory that the Pastorals were written by the author of Acts (and of Luke) (Wilson Luke 1 and passim), though I shall cite Wilson's comments on the comparative theology of the Pastorals, Acts and the undisputed Pauline epistles along with those of other commentators.
Rome and his two-year house arrest there (28:30 f.). Paul is the chief protagonist of 16 of the 28 chapters, including the last 13.

It is agreed by nearly all commentators that Acts was written by the same author as the Gospel according to Luke.\(^{13}\) That author has traditionally been identified as "Luke, the beloved physician" of Col. 4:14, Paul's sole companion at 2 Tm 4:11 and his fellow-missionary in several sections of the Acts narrative (the "we" sections, 16:10-17; 20:5-8, 13-15; 21:1-18; 27:1-28:16\(^{14}\)). While some modern commentators continue to maintain that identification,\(^{15}\) many others reject it;\(^{16}\) the main objection is that the preaching and conduct of Paul in Acts is incompatible both theologically and historically with Paul's own account in his undisputed epistles and hence could not have been written by an eye- (or ear-) witness. That the theological emphasis of Acts is, at the very least, distinguishable from that of the undisputed Pauline letters is a central assumption of this thesis, but what this fact may say about authorship is a separate matter and will not be decided here.

Proposed dates for Acts vary from the early 60s CE\(^{17}\) to around 135 CE.\(^{18}\) It is accepted here that Acts was written after

\(^{13}\) E.g. Haenchen vii, 81, Munck xv, Conzelmann *Acts* xxxiii.

\(^{14}\) List from Dillon 722.

\(^{15}\) E.g. Hengel *Acts* 66; Bruce *Acts* 19.

\(^{16}\) E.g. Haenchen 112 ff., Dillon 723, Lüdemann 6.

\(^{17}\) Bruce *Acts* 22, Munck liv.

\(^{18}\) Koester 310.
Paul's death (leaving it unmentioned for literary and apologetical reasons\textsuperscript{19}) and also after Mark's gospel, but early enough to account for the absence of references to Paul's letters\textsuperscript{20} and the presence of at least possible allusions in 1 Clement and the Pastorals:\textsuperscript{21} in the vicinity of 80 CE.\textsuperscript{22} There is no consensus on the place of writing.

2 PETER

This New Testament epistle presents itself as written by "Simeon Peter" (1:1). It leaves no doubt that the "Peter" intended is the most prominent of the 12 disciples who followed Jesus during his ministry, since the letter refers to what "we" (Peter, James and John) saw and heard at the transfiguration (1:16-18, cf. Mt 17:1-8). The letter refers to Paul as "our beloved brother" and claims that Paul agreed with the writer, contrary to the distortion of Paul's "hard to understand" letters by "the ignorant and unstable" (3:15 f.).

Few present-day scholars accept the disciple Peter as author of 2 Peter. Arguments against authenticity include a number of features suggesting a later date than Peter's death in the 60s: a third-person, apparently past-tense, reference to "your apostles"

\textsuperscript{19} So, e.g., Barrett "Controversies" 234, 240; Dillon 767.

\textsuperscript{20} Cf. Gamble 41, Barrett Acts 2 ff.

\textsuperscript{21} Hanson 13 for the Pastorals, Grant 39 for 1 Clement; differently Haenchen 3 ff., skeptical of all before Justin.

\textsuperscript{22} So, approximately, Conzelmann Acts xxxiii, 80-100 CE; Haenchen 9, 86, estimating 75 CE, both citing theological grounds.
at 3:2, inclusion of Paul's letters as "scripture" at 3:16, and a tense shift in which what is prophesied at 2:1-3 is discussed as current at 2:10 ff. In addition, commentators point to "overdone" touches of authenticity such as the transfiguration scene; use of a variety of known traditions about Peter, with no new information; the letter's concern for the continuity of Peter's message after his death at 1:12-15; a Hellenistic Greek style too erudite for a Galilean fisherman; and a literary relationship, possibly that of dependence, with the epistle of Jude. 2 Peter will be treated as pseudonymous here, with reservations to be considered briefly in the Afterword.

Dating, on the assumption of pseudonymity, ranges from 90 CE to 130 CE. I shall date the letter at c. 100, late enough for the author to know of a collection of Paul's letters (2 Pt 3:16) and matching in argumentation Plutarch's De sera numinis.

23 Sidebottom 100, Neyrey 1017.
24 Sidebottom 99 f.
25 Sidebottom 99.
26 Reicke 143, Neyrey 1017.
27 Reicke 143.
28 Reicke 143 f.
29 Sidebottom 68 f., Neyrey 1018; differently Reicke xxxvi, suggesting Jude and 2 Peter both drew from an earlier source.
30 For contrary arguments see Hillyer 9 ff.
31 Reicke 144 f.
32 Sidebottom 99.
vindicta of slightly earlier date. Rome and Asia Minor have been suggested as places of origin.

1 CLEMENT

The letter usually known as 1 Clement was written from the Christian community in Rome to that in Corinth, to admonish those responsible for an "abominable and unholy sedition" (1:1) whereby certain upstarts had deposed duly-appointed church officials (3:3, 44:3 ff.). It takes 65 chapters to do so, illustrating its argument with numerous examples from Christian, Jewish and pagan sources, including at least two undisputed Pauline letters (see Chapter 9). 1 Clement was sufficiently esteemed in early centuries to have a temporary place in the New Testament canon in Egypt and Syria, but its text was later lost in the West and not recovered until 1628. The current Greek text is based on two Greek manuscripts plus extensive citations by Clement of Alexandria (c. 200 CE), as well as Latin, Syriac and Coptic versions.

The letter did not originally bear the name of an individual (the mention of "Clement" in the final verse in nearly all extant manuscripts is regarded as a scribal interpolation), but there

33 Neyrey 1017 f., cf. Gamble 41.
34 Reicke 14.
35 Elliott 129, Lindeman Altesten 396.
36 Richardson 39 f.
37 Lake 5 ff.
38 Lake ad loc., Richardson ad loc.
is no evidence to dispute its attribution to a certain Clement by
Dionysius of Corinth, Irenaeus and Eusebius.\(^{39}\) This Clement was
likely an important official in the Roman church, but not a
monarchical bishop.\(^{40}\)

1 Clement is usually dated to 96 CE, just after the end of
Domitian's persecution, on the basis that the "misfortunes and
calamities" of 1:1 refer to that persecution;\(^ {41}\) failing that, the
90s remain a probable date for the church setting described,
though possibilities range from about 75 to 110 CE.\(^ {42}\) A 90s date
is accepted here. No serious doubt exists that the letter was
written from Rome.

THE LETTERS OF IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH

Ignatius of Antioch, late first or early second century
bishop of Syrian Antioch, wrote to six churches and one
individual while being taken under guard from Antioch to Rome to
face martyrdom in the arena. The letters stress the importance of
church unity under a single local bishop, and combat docetic and
Judaizing heresies; in addition, Ignatius pleads with Roman
Christians not to attempt to save him from martyrdom.\(^ {43}\)

\( ^{39} \) Brown "Rome" 160 f.; Lake 3.

\( ^{40} \) Brown "Rome" 163 f. Clement appears on Roman Catholic
papal lists as the fourth pope, but neither that claim nor the
parallel claim that 1 Clement was an exercise of Roman
authority over the Corinthian church will be discussed here.

\( ^{41} \) So Brown "Rome" 160, Richardson 33.

\( ^{42} \) Lake 4 f.

\( ^{43} \) Lake 166 f., Richardson 74 ff., Grant 51 ff.
The first collection of Ignatius' letters, not necessarily complete, was evidently made by his friend and colleague Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna in Asia Minor and addressee of the one individual letter. The textual history of the letters since then is a complicated one, involving the creation of six pseudonymous additional letters and interpolation of the genuine ones in the fourth century, further medieval forgeries, and reconstructions from Greek, Latin and other versions. Some scholars in the 19th century and to a lesser extent even today have considered as few as three of the letters to be genuine. Scholarly opinion has favored the genuineness of seven letters since the late 19th century and those letters -- to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Philadelphians and Smyrneans and to Polycarp -- are accepted here.

Eusebius, writing in the fourth century, gives the 10th year of Trajan (107 or 108 CE) as the date of Ignatius' martyrdom, but without stating his evidence. Modern scholars generally accept the reign of Trajan, 98-117 CE, as the time of the letters, some tending toward the later years of the reign. A date in the later years of Trajan, after 108, is accepted here. The letters

44 Richardson 81, Grant 47.

45 Richardson 81 ff., Lake 167 ff., Meier 73 n. 163, all in disagreement with that view.

46 Richardson 82 f.

47 Grant 48.

48 Grant 48, Lake 166, Richardson 75.

49 So Corwin 3, Paulsen 4, Meier 73 n. 163.
to Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, and Rome were written from Smyrna, those to Philadelphia and Smyrna and to Polycarp from Troas;\textsuperscript{50} both are coastal cities in Asia Minor.

Ignatius quotes extensively from undisputed Pauline letters, primarily 1 Corinthians, and is regarded by some commentators as a Paulinist, but with no suggestion of exclusive loyalty or perfect understanding.\textsuperscript{51}

POLYCARP

The letter of Polycarp to the Philippians was apparently written in response to a request from the church at Philippi for advice from him and for copies of Ignatius' letters. Its author, Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, is himself the addressee of one of Ignatius' letters as well as the subject of an extant account of his martyrdom, now generally believed by scholars to have taken place in 155 or 156 CE;\textsuperscript{52} he is quoted in the account of his martyrdom as saying he had then been a Christian 86 years (MarPol 9:3).

The letter is devoid of originality and is largely a pastiche of other early Christian writings, canonical and otherwise. In particular, Polycarp appears to cite almost the entire canonical Pauline corpus including the Pastorals;\textsuperscript{53} he is sometimes called a Paulinist.\textsuperscript{54} The epistle's most distinctive

\textsuperscript{50} Lake 166, Paulsen 3, both citing Eusebius.

\textsuperscript{51} Grant 57 ff., 121 ff., 130, Koester 281 ff.

\textsuperscript{52} Shepherd 121, cf. 144, cf. Lake 280.

\textsuperscript{53} Grant 66 f., Shepherd 125.

\textsuperscript{54} E.g. Turner 10.
feature is its comment on Valens, a Philippian presbyter apparently deposed for theft. The letter has survived in eight defective Greek manuscripts, two lengthy quotations by Eusebius, and a Latin translation, and four of its 14 chapters plus the final sentence of another are extant only in Latin. It is sometimes thought that the present chapters 13 and 14 were written before Ignatius' death and the remainder of the letter after his martyrdom. The debate on this point hinges on the reliability and interpretation of a passage extant only in Latin and has no bearing on this thesis, so no position is taken. A date shortly after that of Ignatius' letters is accepted for all parts of Polycarp's letter, regardless of whether it was originally one letter or two.

---

55 Lake 281.

56 So especially Harrison 311 f., 206, also Lindemann *Altesten* 87, Corwin 9 f.; differently Paulsen 111 f., Shepherd 124 f.

57 So Shepherd 122, cf. Corwin 110; differently Harrison 315, giving a date around 135 CE for the first 12 chapters.
PART II: INVENTORY OF PRIMARY LITERATURE

CHAPTER 3: CREEDAL CONTENT -- GOD, JESUS, THE HOLY SPIRIT

In each of the next seven chapters, I shall survey the positions taken by our authors on a topic on which the mainline faith, as defined in this thesis, might be expected to have something to say. In each case, I shall first concentrate entirely on our literature, with little or no reference to Paul's views. I shall then provide a summary for each chapter which does take Paul into account, in an attempt to identify positions on which our literature is generally agreed over against Paul (at the level specified in Chapter 1), as good candidates to be considered mainline teachings.

The present chapter concerns what I have called creedal matters: what our literature has to say about teachings later included in the classical creeds. This is, of course, only a convenience for organizing these topics; no implication is intended that any of our authors had anything like the systematic outlook of the fathers of Nicaea.

BINITARIAN AND TRINITARIAN FORMULAS

The components of later trinitarian theology -- the Father, Son and Holy Spirit -- can be found in all of our literature, but seldom in that formulation. Binitarian "God and Jesus Christ" formulations predominate.¹ These are found in the greetings of most of the letters (1 Tm 1:1 f., 2 Tm 1:2, Tt 1:4, 2 Pt 1:2, 1

¹ Cf. Hanson 153.
Clem ins.; IgEph ins., IgMag ins., IgRom ins., IgSm ins., IgPol ins.; Poly ins.), as well as occasionally in the concluding blessings (1 Clem 65:2, IgEph 21:2) and elsewhere (e.g. Acts 20:21, 28:31, cf. Schwartz 15; 1 Tm 2:5, IgTr 12:2, Poly 12:2; cf. Poly 2:13).

Trinitarian references are less common. The most spectacular of these is IgMag 13:1, referring precisely to "the Son and the Father and the Spirit," but the reading, though found in nearly all manuscripts, is disputed on various grounds: that the Greek (en huiō kai patri kai en pneumati), by the double use of the preposition en, contrasts Father and Son with Spirit, or even that "Spirit" is a secondary alteration; in the following verse, "to Christ, and to the Father, and to the Spirit," "the Spirit" is rejected by many translators. Other trinitarian references in our literature are 1 Clem 46:6 ("one God, and one Christ, and one Spirit of grace"); 1 Clem 58:2 ("God... the Lord Jesus Christ... the Holy Spirit"); IgEph 9:1 ("God our [the Greek lacks 'our']

---

2 Corwin 116 f.
3 Turner 361.
4 Grant 121, Paulsen 56.
5 Schoedel 131 and n. 13, 4 and n. 23.
6 Schoedel 130 f., Corwin 143; differently Paulsen 56.
7 Schoedel 131.
8 So Paulsen, Richardson.
9 So Lake, Schoedel.
10 Grant 118, Grant and Graham 91.
Father... Jesus Christ... the Holy Spirit";\footnote{11} and, more questionably, IgTr ins.\footnote{12} IgPhd ins. mentions God the Father, Christ and the Holy Spirit within a single verse, but in a less strikingly parallel way than the passages previously cited; similar loose groupings are found at IgPhd 7:2 (Father, Christ, Spirit) and at 1 Clem 16:2, 42:3; IgEph 18:2, and Tt 3:4–6 (all God, Christ, Spirit); the passage in Tt 3 is considered by Hanson to be genuinely trinitarian but to have its origin in liturgical tradition rather than in the theology of the Pastor.\footnote{13}

THE FATHER AND THE HOLY SPIRIT

Of the components of the (eventual) Trinity, God is referred to as Father in all our literature except Polycarp, but the references are not especially frequent. The expression "God the father" (theos patēr) appears in the Pastorals only in the greeting of each letter (1 Tm 1:2, 2 Tm 1:2, Tt 1:4).\footnote{14} It is used once in 2 Peter (1:17, closely tied in with Christ's sonship), and several times by Ignatius: IgEph ins., 9:1, 21:2 (the latter two translated "God our Father" by Lake but still theos patēr in Greek, Schoedel "God the Father"); IgMag ins., 3:1, 5:2; IgPhd ins., 1:1; IgSm ins., IgPol ins. God is also called "father," "the Father" etc. (as distinct from "God the

\footnote{11} Corwin 142 f., Schoedel 65 f. and n. 6.

\footnote{12} So Lake, capitalizing "Spirit" in translation; however, the Greek en sarki kai pneumati suggests a parallelism of flesh and spirit as common nouns rather than a trinitarian meaning of "spirit," so Schoedel 137.

\footnote{13} Hanson 40.

\footnote{14} Cf. Guthrie \textit{Pastoral} 47.
Father") three times in Acts, all early and never placed in Paul's mouth (1:4, 7; 2:33); seven times in 1 Clement (7:4, 8:3, 19:2, 23:1, 29:1, 35:3, 56:16);\(^{15}\) and more than 40 by Ignatius, nearly all of which are in close association with Christ as opposed to independent action by the Father.\(^{16}\)

The expression "God the (Holy) Spirit" is unknown in our literature, though it might be argued to be supported by the strongest of the trinitarian formulas cited earlier: 1 Clem 46:6, 58:2; IgEph 9:1, IgMag 13:1. Nothing in our remaining authors is suitable for demonstrating the divinity of the Spirit, though some passages associating the action of the Spirit with that of God lend themselves to such interpretation in the light of later doctrinal definitions: Tt 3:4 f., in which "God our Savior" saves us through renewal by the Holy Spirit, and 2 Pt 1:21, in which those "moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God." Acts refers to "the Spirit of the Lord," 8:39;\(^{17}\) "the Spirit of Jesus," 16:7; and as a distinct entity unknown to certain disciples at Ephesus but received by them upon baptism "in the name of the Lord Jesus," 19:1-6 (pneuma anarthrous, however, except at v. 6). Polycarp's sole apparent reference to the Holy Spirit is at Poly 5:3, translated by Lake as "every lust warreth against the Spirit (Greek kata tou pneumatos)," with a capital S; Lake treats the

---

\(^{15}\) Cf. Grant 116.

\(^{16}\) Corwin 117 f., cf. Schoedel 18.

\(^{17}\) So NRSV, so also Haenchen, Conzelman Acts ad loc., but anarthrous in Greek, pneuma kuriou, so perhaps better "a spirit of the Lord," cf. BDF 134; articular, however, at 8:29, to pneuma, in the same narrative and with the same referent.
verse as a citation of 1 Pt 2:11, which pits the flesh against the soul (*psuchē*), as well as of Gal 5:17, which pits the flesh against the (Holy) Spirit.\(^{18}\)

**JESUS AND HIS TITLES**

Jesus is called "son" once in 2 Pt (1:17), quoting the voice from heaven in the transfiguration story; twice unequivocally in Acts (9:20, 13:33, the latter an appropriation of Ps. 2:7), both placing this characteristically Pauline expression in Paul's mouth;\(^{19}\) plus "Son of Man" at 7:56, and possibly "son" at 8:37 (NRSV mg.), generally, however, rejected as a later addition to the text;\(^{20}\) once in 1 Clem (36:4, a citation of Ps 2:7 and/or Heb. 1:5, plus "child," *pais*, at 59:2, 4;\(^{21}\) and six times by Ignatius: IgEph 4:2, 20:2 (counting "the Son of Man and the Son of God" as one); IgMag 8:2, 13:1; IgRom ins. (twice); IgSm 1:1. Jesus is never called "son" in the Pastorals\(^{22}\) or by Polycarp. The expression "God the Son" is unknown in our literature, but the substance may be taken to be implied by IgRom ins. and IgSm 1:1, in each of which Jesus is separately called "God" and "son" in the same verse, and by IgMag 13:1, in which "son" is used in a trinitarian (or at any rate triadic) formulation.

---

\(^{18}\) Fitzmyer "Galatians" 789.

\(^{19}\) Marshall *Acts* 173, Wilson *Acts* 75 f., cf Lüdemann 116; however, though characteristically Pauline, this usage is not distinctively Pauline. See summary of this chapter.


\(^{21}\) So Lake *ad loc.*, Richardson *ad loc.* (but "son" at v. 4), Grant 117; differently Grant and Graham *ad loc.*, "servant." BAGD leans tentatively to "son" over "servant."

\(^{22}\) Hanson 3.
That Jesus is God is most clearly stated in our literature by Ignatius, as noted in the preceding paragraph and in several other passages, e.g. IgEph ins., "Jesus Christ our God"; IgEph 18:2, "our God, Jesus the Christ" (Ignatius having inserted an attribution of divinity into what otherwise closely resembles the probably pre-Pauline "descended from David" formula at NT Rom 1:3 f.); IgRom 3:3, "our God, Jesus Christ." The Pastorals, 2 Peter and Polycarp have one disputed reference each. Tt 2:13, tou megalou theou kai sōtēros hēmōn Iēsou Christou, is usually translated "our great God and Savior Jesus Christ," but sometimes "the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ." 2 Pt 1:1, tou theou hēmōn kai sōtēros Iēsou Christou, is similarly translated "our God and Savior Jesus Christ" by NRSV, but here the placement of the possessive adjective after "God" rather than after "Savior" seems to separate the two elements. Poly 12:2,

23 Grant 125 f., Corwin 130 ff., Schoedel 39.
24 Lindemann "Apostolic" 37.
25 So NRSV, NIV, NEB/REB, TEV, JB/NJB, NASB, NKJV; NAB mg.; so also Hanson 184 f., Guthrie Pastoral 212, Hultgren I-II Tm 165, Fee 196, all relying in various ways on the most natural reading of the immediate Greek phrasing, so also Brown, Jesus 17; but cf. BDF 145, "two phrases in apposition," noting, however, that the phrases may be separated.
26 So KJV, NAB, NRSV mg., NEB/REB mg., TEV mg., JB/NJB mg., NASB mg.; so also Karris 117, Kelly 246 f., Dibelius-Conzelmann 143, on the basis of the general low christology of the Pastorals.
27 So also NIV, JB/NJB, NAB, TEV, NEB/REB, NASB, NKJV, Sidebottom 104 f., Reicke 150, Hillyer 158, Neyrey 1018.
28 So KJV, NRSV mg., NAB mg., "our God and the Savior Jesus Christ," cf. Brown Jesus 15, 22, noting the separation but nevertheless translating "our God and Savior" on the
"our Lord and God Jesus Christ," contrasted moreover with the Father, is dependent on the Latin text in the absence of the chapter in surviving Greek manuscripts. Some Latin MSS omit the crucial et deum; Grant supports the inclusion of et deum on the basis that its removal is a scribal harmonization of Polycarp in Latin manuscripts also containing inauthentic/interpolated Ignatian letters with a lowered christology.

Acts, though of generally subordinationist/adoptionist/exaltation christology, e.g. 2:36, might be argued to imply divinity at 3:15, where Jesus is called ho archegos tēs zōēs, NRSV "the Author of Life," but BAGD prefers "leader, ruler, prince" for archegōs, and Marshall equates "life" with salvation rather than with the result of creation, so such a Nicene reading will hardly stand up. Divinity could also be implied at 20:28, in which God has obtained the church dia tou haimatos tou idiou, most literally "blood of his own" but analogy of 1:11, tou kyriou hēmōn kai sōtēros, "our Lord and Savior."

29 A text "recht ungenau und fehlerhaft," Paulsen 111; differently Shepherd 124, "trustworthy."

30 Grant 68, so also Lake, ad loc., while noting the omission in some manuscripts; differently Paulsen, ad loc., Shepherd, ad loc., both omitting "and God" without comment.


32 So also NIV, NAB; NASB mg.

33 Cf. JB/NJB, KJV/NKJV, NASB, REB "prince of life," TEV "one who leads to life," NEB "him who has led the way to life."

34 Marshall Acts 91 f.

35 So NRSV mg., NAB mg., NEB/REB mg.
possibly "with his own blood," though sometimes translated "with the blood of his own Son." Many manuscripts also attribute this action to the Lord rather than to God, which would eliminate the claim of divinity for Christ at this point.

1 Clement has no explicit statement attributing divinity to Christ, and offers only such support for the doctrine as may be inferred from the previously-cited trinitarian formulas at 46:6 and 58:2, but, while suggestive, these stop well short of calling Jesus "God."

Ignatius explicitly describes Christ as pre-existent: IgMag 6:1, "from eternity with the Father" (pro aiônôn para patri). Various passages in the Pastorals are taken by some commentators to imply pre-existence: grace given us in him before the ages (2 Tm 1:9 f.), his coming into the world (1 Tm 1:15), his being revealed in the flesh (1 Tm 3:16). But the author does not develop the point, and because of his use of various formulas

---

36 So NRSV mg., so also NIV, NASB, NAB, NEB/REB, KJV/NKJV, JB; cf. TEV mg., "his own death."

37 So NRSV, NJB, so also Marshall Acts 334, more tentatively Conzelmann Acts 175; cf. TEV, "sacrificial death of his Son."

38 So UBS mg., so also NEB/REB, NIV mg., NJB mg., NAB mg., TEV mg.

39 Cf. Grant 117.

40 Schoedel 114, Corwin 137.

41 Kelly 163.

42 Hanson 61.

43 Fee 93.
with "no sign of theological reflection," it is not to be assumed that he is consciously promoting this doctrine. Similar is the only likely reference in Polycarp, "Jesus Christ has come in the flesh," (7:1), a citation moreover of 1 Jn 4:2 f, 2 Jn 7 and like those passages more concerned with Christ's flesh than with his coming. Clement seems to imply pre-existence in attributing Psalm 34 to him "through the (Lake, 'his') Holy Spirit" (1 Clem 22:1 ff), but his statement that God "chose out the Lord Jesus Christ" (ho ekleixamenos ton kurion Iēsoun Christon) at 64:1 would seem to go better with an adoptionist Christology. The only possible references to pre-existence in 2 Peter are thin in the extreme: his "eternal kingdom" at 1:11 and his "coming" at 1:16, both emphasizing future rather than past. Jesus is not presented as pre-existent in Acts.

Jesus is called Lord (kurios) by all our authors, e.g. Acts 2:36, 16:31, 1 Tm 1:2, 6:3, 2 Pt 1:8, 2:20, 1 Clem ins., 12:7, IgEph 7:2, IgPhd ins., Poly 1:1, 7:2; "Lord" is also used of God (the Father) by all our authors except Polycarp and possibly Ignatius, e.g. 2 Pt 3:15, 1 Tm 6:15, Acts 2:39, 1 Clem 60:1, and possibly IgEph 17:2. Jesus is also called Christ by every author and in every document. "Jesus Christ" (or "Christ Jesus,"

45 Hanson 61, 123.
46 Cf. Paulsen 120.
48 Sidebottom 125.
as is more common in the Pastorals\(^49\) outnumbers plain "Jesus" throughout in our literature except for Acts, where it is also fairly plentiful. "Jesus" is never found alone in the Pastorals or Polycarp, only once (1:2) in 2 Peter and three times in Ignatius.\(^50\) On the other hand, "Christ" is never found standing alone as a proper name (as frequently in Paul's undisputed works) in 2 Peter or Acts,\(^51\) and only once in the Pastorals (1 Tm 5:11). "Christ" standing alone slightly outnumbers "Jesus Christ/Christ Jesus" in 1 Clement but is rare in Ignatius and Polycarp and far outnumbered by "Jesus Christ/Christ Jesus," also as a proper name.\(^52\) Jesus is called "the Christ" in Acts (9:22, 17:3 etc.),\(^53\) 1 Clem 42:1 f. and IgEph 18:2.\(^54\) The sole Ignatian reference to "the Christ" (the "anointed one") is explained by Corwin as a reference to his anointing, which had just been mentioned (IgEph 17:1); by Schoedel as reflecting "an older (perhaps adoptionist) tradition."\(^55\)

Jesus is associated with salvation by all our authors, and called "savior" explicitly by all except Clement, typically in the present tense and often as a conventional-sounding title: e.g


\(^{50}\) Grant 124.

\(^{51}\) Conzelmann Acts 74.

\(^{52}\) Corwin 110 f., Schoedel 84.

\(^{53}\) Cf. Schwartz 17 f.

\(^{54}\) Grant 124.

\(^{55}\) Corwin 110, Schoedel 84.
2 Tm 1:10, Tt 1:4 etc., 2 Pt 1:11 etc., Acts 5:11, 13:23, IgEph 1:1, IgMag ins., IgPhd 9:2, IgSm 7:1, Poly ins.\textsuperscript{56} 1 Clem 58:2 does, however, say the elect are saved through Jesus Christ, again a present, ongoing work (hoi sōzomenoi dia Iēsou Christou). Clement's only use of the title sōtēr applies the term to God (59:3), and the majority of uses in the Pastorals including all three in 1 Timothy also apply to God. Jesus is associated with judgement by all our authors, explicitly at 2 Tm 4:1, Acts 17:31 and Poly 2:1, with looser attributions at 2 Pt 3:7, 1 Clem 13:2 and IgSm 6:1. His humanity is mentioned in various ways by all our authors except 2 Peter, with the inclusive human anthrōpos at 1 Tm 2:5, the male anēr at Acts 17:31,\textsuperscript{57} and references to his flesh at 1 Clem 32:2, 49:1 and Poly 7:1,\textsuperscript{58} while Ignatius stresses his humanity frequently in varied and insistent language, e.g. IgEph 7:2 "both flesh and spirit, born and yet not born... God in man...," IgEph 20:2 "the Son of Man and the Son of God," and IgTr 9:1 "truly born."\textsuperscript{59} Christ's Davidic descent is mentioned by the Pastor at 2 Tm 2:8, in Acts e.g. at 13:22 f.,\textsuperscript{60} and several times by Ignatius (e.g. IgRom 7:3),\textsuperscript{61} but not by 2 Peter or Polycarp, and remarkably not by Clement, who devotes a

\textsuperscript{56} According to Paulsen (25, 114), in Ignatius and Polycarp it is a traditional designation out of keeping with their own theology.

\textsuperscript{57} Wilson \textit{Luke} 78, 88.

\textsuperscript{58} Paulsen 120.

\textsuperscript{59} Grant 123, 126, Corwin 92.

\textsuperscript{60} Cf. Schwartz 17.

\textsuperscript{61} Grant 122 f., Schoedel 186.
lengthy chapter (18) to David without designating him as an ancestor of Christ.

DEATH AND RESURRECTION

Jesus' death is referred to by all our authors, but the references seem less numerous and prominent than one might expect. References to Christ's death are missing in unexpected places, so to speak: the Areopagus speech in Acts 17\(^{62}\) and the creedal summary at 1 Tm 3:16.\(^{63}\) In addition, the reference in 2 Peter is particularly oblique, a criticism of those who "deny the Master who bought them" (2:1: ho agorasas autous despotēs), "bought" being a reference to the crucifixion\(^{64}\) which would be clear enough to those who already knew the story and meaningless to those who did not. The Pastoral references are also somewhat oblique: Jesus "gave himself" (1 Tm 2:6), "risen from the dead" (2 Tm 2:8), "if we have died with him" (2 Tm 2:11). In Acts, he is crucified (2:23, prospēgnumi, 2:36, 4:10 stauroō) or killed (2:23, 13:28 anaireō, 3:15 apokteinō, 5:30 diacheirizomai). In 1 Clem he is "come to death" (16:9), "delivered to death" (16:13) as part of a passage applying Isaiah 53 to Christ. References to the passion are, however, abundant in Ignatius,\(^{65}\) who for example refers to "the death of the Lord" (IgEph 19:1), says Christ "was truly crucified (stauroō) and died" (IgTr 9:2) and was "truly

---

\(^{62}\) Vielhauer 36.

\(^{63}\) Ziesler 139.

\(^{64}\) So also Hillyer 182 f.

\(^{65}\) Corwin 170 f.
nailed" (IgSm 1:2, the cross having been mentioned in the previous verse). Polycarp refers to Christ's "suffering of death" (1:2), "who bare our sins in his own body on the tree" (8:1, an allusion to 1 Pt 2:24). Only Polycarp (7:1) (an antidocetic reference) and Ignatius (several times, e.g. IgEph 9:1) among our authors mention the cross (stauros) as a noun, while Acts three times refers to a tree (dendron) as the instrument of execution (5:30, 10:39, 13:29) and the Pastor, 2 Peter and Clement use neither word.

The resurrection is at least presumed by all our authors, though again 2 Peter is extremely oblique: references to Christ as a present reality, especially 3:18, despite the indirect mention of his death at 2:1 (see preceding paragraph). The remaining authors make it explicit: Jesus was raised from the dead (2 Tm 2:8), God raised him from the dead (Acts 2:24, 13:30, etc., IgTr 9:2), the apostles were reassured by Jesus' resurrection (1 Clem 42:3), the birth and passion and resurrection took place in Pilate's time (IgMag 11:1), God raised Jesus up (Poly 1:2, citing Acts 2:24). God raised Jesus (egeirô or anistēmi first aorist, transitive, so BAGD) in most of these references, but Jesus himself rose (anistēmi, second aorist, intransitive, so BAGD) at Acts 17:3 (edei... anastēnai ek nekrôn,

66 Lake 292, Paulsen 121.
67 Paulsen 120.
68 Corwin 170, cf. Grant 124.
69 So also Hillyer 226 f., Sidebottom 126.
"it was necessary [for the Messiah]... to rise from the dead"), IgRom 6:1 (ton di' hēmas anastanta, "him who rose for us"), and possibly Poly 9:2 (ton... hupo tou theou anastanta).\(^{70}\) At IgSm 2:1 he "raised himself" (anestēsen heauton).\(^{71}\)

SUMMARY: PAUL AND THE MAINLINE FAITH

Our literature's varied positions on trinitarian formulas and the divinity and pre-existence of Jesus, and the spottiness of its references to his Davidic descent and status as "the Christ" exclude all these from further analysis as mainline beliefs in the sense defined in this thesis.

A much greater pattern of agreement is found concerning the use of binitarian formulas, the fatherhood of God, the use of "Christ" as a proper name, Jesus' humanity, Jesus as judge, and the resurrection. In none of these things, however, does our literature differ from the Pauline letters. All seven undisputed letters use binitarian formulas in their greetings (NT Rom 1:7, 1 Cor 1:3, 2 Cor 1:2, Gal 1:1, 3, NT Phil 1:2, 1 Thess 1:1 f., Phmn 3). All call God "father" (e.g. NT Rom 1:7, NT Phil 4:20 and often). All use "Christ" as a proper name (e.g. 1 Cor 1:10, Gal 1:7 and often). Paul also makes Christ truly human (Gal 4:4, "born of a woman"), associates him with judgement (2 Cor 5:10)\(^{72}\) and stresses his resurrection (e.g. NT Rom 6:4, 2 Cor 1:9, Gal

\(^{70}\) So Paulsen "der... von Gott herauferstand," so also Schoedel 182 n. 3; differently Lake, "was raised by God," Richardson, BAGD, BDF 49.

\(^{71}\) So Lake, Richardson, Grant 123; cf. Corwin 118, 255, Schoedel 181 f., 225 and n. 1, Paulsen 92.

\(^{72}\) Ziesler 30.
Perhaps the most striking tension between our literature and the undisputed Pauline letters in creedal matters is in their treatment of the crucifixion. All our authors mention Christ's death and see at least some salvific significance in it. But the emphasis is modest in comparison to Paul. Only Ignatius and Polycarp stress the passion at all, and it is worth asking whether this aspect of their theology is due to Pauline influence (see Chapter 2). Besides, it may be doubted whether even Ignatius gives the passion the significance Paul does; Corwin, for example, sees the crucifixion as somewhat in the shadow of the incarnation as God's saving act in Ignatius' thought. In contrast, Paul's chief letters all stress Christ's death or crucifixion in the most insistent manner.

As already noted, all our authors except Clement refer to Jesus as "savior" in the present tense, and Clement's reference to salvation through Christ is also in the present. While Paul of course regards Jesus as the key to salvation, only once in his undisputed letters does he call Jesus "savior" (NT Phil 3:20, "we are expecting a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ") and on only one

---


74 Corwin 172 f., cf. also Schoedel 182 n. 3 for a somewhat parallel discussion of the relationship between crucifixion and resurrection in Ignatius.

75 Fitzmyer "Pauline" 1395, Bornkamm 158 ff.

76 Hultgren I-II Tm 36.
other occasion does he directly speak of Jesus as saving (NT Rom 5:9, "much more... will we be saved through him [Christ]"); both are future references, and indeed a dynamic, future-oriented concept of salvation predominates in the undisputed letters over the more static concept most characteristic of our literature.  

It is of interest that our literature seldom calls Jesus "son." Ignatius leads the list, using the expression on six distinct occasions. The two clearest uses in Acts (of a maximum of four) are placed by the author in the mouth of Paul. Clement and 2 Peter use the word once each and in both cases in scriptural allusions; Polycarp and the Pastorals, suprisingly to the modern reader at least, not at all. Paul uses the word frequently, calling Jesus "son" 15 times and in five of his undisputed letters (NT Philippians and Philemon are the exceptions). However, as the expression is found in a probably pre-Pauline formula at NT Rom 1:3 f., as Paul makes less of the term than of, for example, "Lord," and as 1 John (absolutely) and Hebrews (proportionately) use "son" more than Paul does, it would be inaccurate to treat the use of "son" as a Pauline distinctive and questionable at best to regard its infrequent use as characteristic of our non-Pauline mainline faith, however much one might wish to know why the Pastor and Polycarp omit so familiar a term.

---


78 Bornkamm 116.

79 Ziesler 41.
Chapter 4: Salvation

Though I have chosen "salvation" as the title and topic of this chapter, I shall not limit its scope to an exegesis of passages where the Greek verb σωζó ("to save") or noun σωτηρία ("salvation") and their cognates are found in our literature, nor even attempt to define exactly what those multifaceted concepts actually mean in their original context. Rather, I use "salvation" in roughly its modern English sense, a good ultimate outcome, which is broad enough to cover the New Testament meanings in addition to such popular modern understandings as "who gets to heaven?" The topic of the chapter, then, is the significance of the Christ-event to humanity: what is being offered, how it comes to be offered, and who will receive it.

For all our authors salvation is tied to Christ, and all of them use the language of atonement or expiation for his work. He gave himself as a ransom (1 Tm 2:6). He is "the Master who bought them" (2 Pt 2:1). He died for us, or for our sins (1 Clem 16:7, 21:6, 49:6; IgRom 6:1, IgSm 1:2, 7:13; Poly 1:2, 9:2). God (or the Lord) obtained the church with "the blood of his own" (Acts 20:28 NRSV mg., see also discussion above, Chapter 3), clearly a

---

1 Cf. Ziesler 73 f.

2 This of course tends to imply a good individual outcome and thus to slight the collective nature of New Testament salvation. But there is plenty of concern for individual outcomes in the New Testament and in our literature (even in Paul, e.g. 1 Cor 5:5, cf. E. Sanders Law 109), and it is the individual element that I am emphasizing here.

3 Schoedel 182 n. 3.
reference to Christ and the crucifixion, however much its details might be affected by divergencies of text or translation; cf. references to Jesus' blood at 1 Clem 7:4, 12:7, 21:6, 49:6.⁴

REpentance and Forgiveness

All our authors make at least an implied link between the Christ-event and forgiveness of or repentance for sin (hamartia), most often in the plural and conceived of as specific transgressions. Forgiveness of sins is explicitly what is on offer in Paul's preaching of the gospel at Acts 13:38 and 26:18. 2 Pt 1:9 refers to the cleansing of past sins. 1 Clem 50:5 ff. and Poly 2:3 speak of forgiveness in the context of current Christian life, but also make being forgiven by God the goal of the Christian life. Ignatius and the Pastor do not mention forgiveness, but they do mention repentance. At 2 Tm 2:25 repentance is linked with coming to know the truth, which is in turn linked with salvation at 1 Tm 2:4; the sin in question seems to be heresy rather than any indulgence of the flesh, but the two are not rigorously distinguished in the Pastorals.⁵ Ignatius has half a dozen references to repentance; most of these are in the context of local church quarrels, but at IgEph 10:1 the discussion concerns non-Christian humanity in general and repentance is made a condition of finding God. Repentance in an apparently salvific sense is mentioned also in Acts (e.g. 11:18, 26:20), 2 Peter (3:9), and 1 Clement (chapters 7 and 8), but not by Polycarp.

⁴ Grant 117.

⁵ Beker 40 f., Hultgren I-II Tm 45.
All uses of *hamartia, sin*, in our literature appear to refer to sins as transgressions, actually or potentially plural (e.g. 1 Tm 5:22, Acts 22:16, 2 Pt 1:9, 1 Clem 59:2, IgSm 7:1, Poly 1:2), with the exception of Poly 6:1 ("we all owe the debt of sin"), an apparent allusion although the source is unknown,⁶ which seems to treat sin as a Pauline reified entity,⁷ and the much more doubtful 1 Clem 16:11 ("an offering for sin"), an allusion to Is 53:10⁸ which could, but probably does not, imply such a reification.

**FUTURE PROMISE**

Salvation (in my broad sense) is roughly equated with eternal life (*zōē aiōnios*) in most of our literature, especially at 1 Tm 1:15 f., Acts 13:46-48, IgEph 18:1, also 1 Tm 6:12, 2 Tm 2:10 (eternal glory), Tt 1:2, 2 Pt 1:11 (eternal kingdom), 1 Clem 35:2 (immortality, *athanasia*), IgPol 2:3.⁹ Polycarp does not use the expression "eternal life"; he does use world or age to come, Poly 5:2 (*aiōn*, Lake "world," Shepherd "age"), cf. 1 Tm 4:7 f., "life to come." All our authors await a future event associated with salvation, most notably 2 Peter, reminding readers of "the promise of his (Christ's) coming" and explaining an apparent delay at 3:1-13. God will send Jesus as Messiah (*Christos*, Acts 3:20). Christ is coming as judge (2 Tm 4:1, Poly 2:1, cf. Acts

---

⁶ Lake *ad loc.*

⁷ So Lindemann "Apostolic" 43.

⁸ Lake *ad loc.*

⁹ Corwin 171, cf. 165.
10:42). God has fixed a day for judgement (Acts 17:31); cf. 2 Tm 1:16 ff., 4:8, "on that day," a stock reference to the parousia. The Lord will come suddenly (1 Clem 23:5, an appropriation of Is 13:22 LXX and Mal 3:1). The saved will be made manifest "at the visitation of the kingdom of Christ" (1 Clem 50:3). These are the last days and we ought to fear the wrath to come (IgEph 11:1). Also in the future is the general resurrection (2 Tm 2:18, 1 Clem chapters 24, 26, IgTr 9:2, Poly 2:2; cf. also Acts 23:6, 24:15, 26:6-8, in which Paul is portrayed as embracing the Pharasaic hope of the resurrection of the dead while only hinting at that of Jesus).

NOT BY WORKS

With the exception of 2 Peter, which does not address the issue explicitly, all our authors at some point make salvation or related concepts a matter of faith or grace as opposed to works (erga): 2 Tm 3:15 (faith), 2 Tm 1:9 (grace rather than works), Tt 3:5 ff. (grace and mercy rather than works); Acts 15:9 ff. (faith and grace as opposed to the Law, a position placed in Peter's mouth, though Lüdemann sees it as a consciously Pauline touch on Luke's part), Acts 26:18 (sanctification by faith, Paul quoting

---

10 Kelly 210.
11 Grant and Graham 49.
12 Grant 112.
14 Corwin 240.
16 Lüdemann 167 f.
Jesus in an account of their Damascus encounter); 1 Clem 32:4 (being made righteous by faith rather than "deeds" -- *erga* -- or any other of a list of virtues\(^\text{17}\)); IgPhd 5:2 (faith\(^\text{18}\)); Poly 1:3 (grace and God's will rather than works, in a confused citation of NT Eph 2:8 f. or possibly of traditional Pauline material\(^\text{19}\)).

**HUMAN EFFORT**

Nevertheless, all our authors make salvation in some degree a matter of human effort. For the Pastor, godliness (*eusebeia*), portrayed as something in which one can train and toil and struggle, holds promise for the life to come (1 Tm 4:7 ff.). The pastor expects a "crown of righteousness" (*dikaiosunē*) at the judgement (2 Tm 4:8), which sounds like a reward for services rendered.\(^\text{20}\) Those who have died with Christ will live with him and those who endure will reign with him (2 Tm 2:11 f.); "dying" with Christ is probably a baptismal reference,\(^\text{21}\) but enduring with him would seem to be a matter of performance. Role-specific virtues, for Timothy himself as a teacher (1 Tm 4:16) and for women (1 Tm 2:15), also conduce to salvation, though as faith is one of those virtues the reference is presumably restricted to Christian women.\(^\text{22}\)

\(^{17}\) Grant 119, Lindemann "Apostolic" 33.

\(^{18}\) Corwin 240.

\(^{19}\) Paulsen 115.

\(^{20}\) So Hanson 156; differently Hultgren *I-II Tm* 139 f., reading *dikaiosunē* here in a Pauline sense as "a gift bestowed freely by God."

\(^{21}\) Hultgren *I-II Tm* 122, Kelly 179 f.

\(^{22}\) Fee 75 f.
For 2 Peter, becoming once again entangled in "the defilements of the world" (2:20), a process involving moral as well as doctrinal faults (cf. 2:13 f.), counts as turning away from "the way of righteousness" and the "holy commandment," with loss of salvation. The point of the delay of the Lord's coming is to provide an opportunity for moral purity (3:14) and hence salvation (3:15).

In Acts, Paul not only calls for repentance for those who wish to stand well when the world is judged (17:30 f.), but also demands "deeds (erga) consistent with repentance" (26:20).

The role of human effort is especially noticeable in 1 Clem, who says God will raise "those who served him in holiness" (26:1), that we are "bound (dei, on compulsion, so BAGD) to please almighty God" (62:2), that we are rewarded for our work (ergon) (34:3, an allusion to Prov 24:12 among other parallels), that those who obey God's "decrees and commandments" will be enrolled among the "saved" (58:2), that we must perform "all the deeds of sanctification" (poiēsōmen ta tou agiasmou panta, let us do all that which is of holiness) (30:1), and roundly that we should be "justified by deeds, not by words" (ergois dikaioumenoi, mē logos) (30:3), though the paranetic context suggests this last reference is probably a criticism of lip service and should not be set in opposition to salvation by faith.25

23 Sidebottom 117.
24 Lake 64.
Polycarp is similar: God will punish the disobedient but raise up those who do his will (2:1 f.); those who please the Lord in this world (aiōn, Shepherd "age") will receive the next world, and reign with him if they are "worthy citizens of his community" (ean politeusōmetha axiōs autou, if we will live [so BAGD] worthily of him), provided, however, we have faith (5:2), combining ideas found at 1 Clem 21:1 and 2 Tm 2:11 ff.; at a more detailed level, almsgiving frees us from death (10:2, a citation of Tob 4:10).

Human effort plays a much smaller role for Ignatius, but he still sees endurance as a means to "attain unto God" (IgMag 1:3) and his forthcoming martyrdom as the key to his own hope to "attain to Jesus Christ" (IgRom passim, esp. 5:3).

FOR BELIEVERS

All our authors connect salvation with belief, though 2 Peter is again oblique: threatening destruction for those who deny the Master (2:1), a "radical rejection" rather than a temporary denial such as Peter's in the synoptic gospels. Explicit links include 1 Tm 1:16, Acts 16:31 and often, 1 Clem 12:7, 32:4 (the former, however, a reference to Rahab the harlot's belief in God as a foreshadowing of Christian

---

26 Paulsen 118.
27 Lake 294, Paulsen 123.
28 Schoedel 105 f., Corwin 255.
29 Sidebottom 112.
redemption), IgTr 2:1 and 9:2, and Poly 1:3 and 2:1 (these last two being somewhat muddy on the nature of the link).

UNIVERSALISM AND ELECTION

Two of our authors make some suggestion that salvation might extend beyond believers, but none of these references stands up strongly on examination.

In the Pastorals, several passages stress a universal aspect of salvation. God's grace brought salvation to all (Tt 2:11); God wants all to be saved (1 Tm 2:3 f.); Christ gave himself as a ransom for all (1 Tm 2:6); God is the savior of all, but especially of believers (1 Tm 4:10). Some commentators see references to "all" as a counterblast to gnosticizing ideas that salvation is only for the enlightened. Hultgren reads "especially believers" as stressing belief but not ruling out universal salvation, construing "especially," malista, as inclusive rather than exclusive; Hanson construes malista as "to be precise," in effect limiting salvation to believers.

1 Clem 32:4 says God has justified "all men [sic as translated, but Greek pantes, better "everyone," so also BAGD]

30 Corwin 240.

31 Hultgren I-II Tm 164, Karris 61; cf. Hanson 61, suggesting also that the author of the Pastorals is less preoccupied with predestination than Paul because he is less Jewish than Paul; cf. also Kelly (63), drawing a contrast with specifically Jewish ideas limiting salvation to the righteous.

32 Hultgren I-II Tm 84, citing 1 Tm 5:8, 17; Gal 6:10, Phil 4:22; so also BAGD.

from the beginning of the world" by faith. The meaning would appear to be, however, that everyone who was in fact justified was justified by faith, not that everyone was justified and it was done by faith.34 At 20:11 God is described as doing good "to all things, and more especially (huperekperissōs, BAGD "quite beyond all measure") to [Christians]," which, however, focuses on beneficence rather than on salvation.

References suggesting predestination are scattered through our literature, but nowhere is great stress laid on the idea. In the Pastorals, the Pastor works so that "the elect" may obtain salvation (2 Tm 2:10). The elect are also mentioned at Tt 1:1. In addition, the Lord knows those who are his (2 Tm 2:19). Hanson sees "elect" as a conventional term for believers, with little implication of predestination.35 The statement that "the Lord knows his own" is a citation of Num 16:5 LXX applied to orthodox believers within the church.36

1 Clem 1:1, 2:4, 6:1, 46:4, 49:5, 58:2 and 59:2 also mention the elect, but at 2:4 the salvation of the elect is still the subject of striving "day and night," and at 46:4 the expression seems more rhetorical than otherwise: the innocent and righteous are God's elect, as if elect due to their virtue rather than virtuous due to their election. All these uses of eklektos seem

34 So also Grant and Graham 58.

35 Hanson 131; differently Guthrie Pastoral 156, Kelly 178.

36 Dibelius-Conzelmann 113, Karris 26, Hanson 137, Kelly 186; but Guthrie Pastoral 162 f. also hears resonances of predestination.
more conventional than doctrinal. In Ignatius, the church at Ephesus is predestined for glory (IgEph ins.), that at Tralles "elect and worthy of God" (IgTr ins.), and his companion Rheus Agathopous is described as an "elect man" (IgPhd 11:1); these references, too, seem merely conventional. Also conventionalsounding is the reference at Acts 13:48 to those "destined for eternal life." God's predestination is also spoken of at Acts 4:28, but this is a predestination of events and not of people.

HEAVEN AND HELL

References to heaven and hell as future destinations are at most implicit in our literature; the place names do not appear with that meaning. At 1 Clem 5, it is said that Peter "went to the glorious place which was his due" (v. 4) and that Paul "passed from the world and was taken up into the Holy Place" (v. 7). Polycarp, too, places Paul, Ignatius and other martyrs "with the Lord in 'the place which is their due'" (Poly 9:2, an allusion to I Clem 5:4). Ignatius hopes to "attain to" God or Christ (IgRom, 2:2 and often), and describes this as "birth," as

37 Differently Grant and Graham 20, following W.C. van Unnik, Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 42 (1962), 237-246, in seeing a reference to God's plan of salvation.

38 Cf. Corwin 191, arguing that the church rather than individuals is called "elect" in Ignatius; she explains the reference to Rheus Agathopous as based on that individual's own impending martyrdom.

39 Conzelmann Acts 106, Lüdemann 156.

40 Grant and Graham 25 f.

41 So Lake 294, Paulsen 122.
"living" and as "receiv(ing) pure light," (IgRom 6:1 f.)\textsuperscript{42} though as he also hopes to rise after falling asleep (IgRom 4:2 f.), those experiences may await not only his martyrdom but the parousia. Ignatius also threatens false teachers with "unquenchable fire" (IgEph 16:2).\textsuperscript{43} In 2 Peter, new heavens and a new earth are awaited after the old ones are destroyed by fire on the "day of God" (3:12 f.), though even so it seems likely the saved will live on the new earth rather than in the new heavens;\textsuperscript{44} other references to heaven or heavens in 2 Peter (e.g. 1:18, 3:5) do not concern a destination. Sinful angels and, apparently, unrighteous humans have been and will be cast into hell (the verb tartaroō, without a noun) to await judgement (2:4, 9), an apparent reference to "interim punishment";\textsuperscript{45} but nothing is said of a continuing role for hell after the judgement. Heaven is mentioned about two dozen times in Acts, as the abode of God (7:49) and of the exalted Jesus (3:21) or simply what is above the earth (2:2), but never as an eternal destination for Christians.

SUMMARY: PAUL AND THE MAINLINE FAITH

Our literature's references to universalism, to predestination, and to heaven and hell are too inconsistent or too weak to be pursued further in this context.

\textsuperscript{42} Schoedel 181 ff., Corwin 252 f.

\textsuperscript{43} Corwin 173.

\textsuperscript{44} Reicke 182.

\textsuperscript{45} Sidebottom 114.
Our literature does have a pattern of agreement concerning eternal life, the awaiting of a future event, salvation by faith or grace as opposed to works, and the necessity for belief, but all these things are also found in the undisputed letters (e.g. NT Rom 2:7, 1 Thess 4:16 f., NT Rom 1:16, Gal 3:22 respectively).

Atonement language such as that found in our literature is also to be found in Paul's undisputed letters, but almost entirely in pre-Pauline formulations like NT Rom 3:25, 1 Cor 15:3 and Gal 1:3 f. His own characteristic thought goes beyond this to expound on how Christians are incorporated into Christ's death as a means of breaking the power of sin (e.g. NT Rom 6:5-11), a concept little pursued in our literature.

And while forgiveness and repentance figure largely in our literature, the sole reference to forgiveness in Paul's undisputed letters is a citation of Psalm 32 at NT Rom 4:7 f., though it may be noted that this is made equivalent to righteousness (dikaiosunē, v. 6), a key concept in Pauline soteriology. Only once does Paul refer to repentance in a

46 Ziesler 73.
47 Meyer 119, Ziesler 92, E. Sanders Paul 78.
49 Hanson 42, Vielhauer 45, Ziesler 142 f.
50 E. Sanders Paul 76.
51 Ziesler 88, Bornkamm 151; cf. Barrett Paul 100, defining Pauline justification as "radical forgiveness." Cf. also NT Rom 3:25, "passed over the sins previously committed," Ziesler 92 f.; differently Barrett Paul 100, suggesting that
general salvific sense (NT Rom 2:4; other uses of the term at 2 Cor 7:9 f. and 12:21 refer to the correction of intra-Christian problems, though both appear to place unrepentant offenders' salvation at stake, explicitly so at 7:10). Strikingly, repentance is not made a condition of reconciliation (katallagē) with God at NT Rom 5:10 f., 11:15, 2 Cor 5:18.\(^{52}\)

"Sin," hamartia, in our literature usually plural and referring to transgressions, is usually in the singular in the undisputed letters and refers to a reified power, as at NT Rom 3:9, 1 Cor 15:56, Gal 3:22.\(^{53}\) Only occasionally does Paul use hamartia in the plural or the singular to mean transgression (e.g. 1 Cor 15:3, probably pre-Pauline;\(^ {54}\) 2 Cor 11:7, Gal 1:4, also probably pre-Pauline.\(^ {55}\) It is this concept of sin as a power which makes repentance somewhat beside the point for Paul, since liberation, rather than mere forgiveness or atonement, is what is needed;\(^ {56}\) the necessary human response involves not only turning from evil, as in repentance, but also a more radical turning from reliance on human goodness.\(^ {57}\)

---

52 Sanders Palestinian 468.
54 Ziesler 20, 92, Bornkamm 113, E. Sanders Paul 78.
55 E. Sanders Paul 80, Dodd 11, Fitzmyer "Pauline" 1386.
56 Ziesler 76, E. Sanders Paul 79 f.
57 Barrett Paul 102.
Our literature's link between salvation and human endeavor is not altogether missing from Paul's teaching: e.g. NT Rom 2:6 ff., where judgement repays "each one's deeds" (erga), and those who do good receive eternal life while those who "obey not the truth" receive "wrath and fury";\(^{58}\) cf also 1 Cor 7:19, where "obeying the commandments of God" (probably God's will, not the Law\(^ {59}\)) is given the importance formerly and/or mistakenly attributed to circumcision. Yet it seems safe to say that such passages are proportionately less frequent in Paul's writings than in our literature, and more decisively outweighed by those stressing salvation as God's delivering action.\(^{60}\)

\(^{58}\) I employ "judgement" here as a correlative term to "salvation," as commonly in 20th century Christianity, so that judgement is the process which determines who achieves or receives salvation (in the English sense of "salvation" in use in this chapter); cf. 2 Pt 3:7, 15 (O'Collins 913). E. Sanders insists that judgement and salvation are never correlatives for Paul and that punishment but not salvation is at stake in judgement (E. Sanders Palestinian 515 ff.); but in NT Rom 2:5-8 it seems clear that eternal life (v. 7) will be at stake when God's judgement is revealed (v. 5). Cf also Fitzmyer "Romans" 836.

\(^{59}\) Ziesler 114 f.

\(^{60}\) Ziesler 73 f., Barrett Paul 56 f.
CHAPTER 5: THE ROLE OF DOCTRINE

One of the most striking characteristics of our literature is its abundance of expressions showing a strong concern for doctrinal orthodoxy. Pre-eminent among these is ἡ pistis, "the faith," used by all our authors (2 Pt 1:1 lacks the definite article but appears to have the same meaning\(^1\)). Pistis and the cognate verb pisteuō are occasionally used in our literature in a manner at least superficially resembling the classical Pauline sense of definitive trust in Christ,\(^2\) e.g. 2 Tm 3:15, "salvation through faith in Christ Jesus;" Acts 26:18, "sanctification by faith in me [Jesus];" 1 Clem 32:4, "[we] are not made righteous by ourselves... [or by any of various virtues] but through faith"\(^3\); IgTr 9:2, "his Father shall raise up in Christ Jesus us who believe (pisteuō) in him."\(^4\) Pistis is also used, more often, to denote one virtue among others:\(^5\) e.g., 1 Tm 4:12, 1 Clem 35:2, IgEph 3:1,\(^6\) Poly 13:2; cf. 2 Pt 1:5,\(^7\) Acts 14:9.

Of interest here, however, is the frequent use of pistis, found in all our authors, to denote either the content of

---

1 Sidebottom 104.
3 Grant and Graham 58.
4 Corwin 240.
5 Hultgren I-II Tm 15, Bultmann 112.
6 Corwin 240 n. 23.
7 Sidebottom 107.
Christianity or allegiance to it: e.g. 1 Tm 4:1, "some will renounce the faith"; 1 Tm 4:6, "words of the faith and sound teaching;" cf. e.g. Acts 13:8, 14:22, 16:5; 2 Pt 1:1; 1 Clem 22:1; IgEph 10:2, cf. 16:2; Poly 3:2, 4:2 f.10

Nearly a score of other words are used to much this same effect, alone or in various combinations. Thus we have αλήθεια, "truth," 1 Tm 2:4 and often in the Pastorals, IgEph 6:2 (an explicit contrast with heresy); θόδος, "way," Acts 19:9; λόγος, "word," Poly 7:2;11 θόδος τῆς αλήθειας, "way of truth," 2 Pt 2:2,12 1 Clem 35:5; λόγος τῆς αλήθειας, "word of truth," 2 Tm 2:15, cf. Poly 3:2; πίστος ὁ λόγος, "the saying is sure," 1 Tm 4:9. Other such words include διδαχή, "teaching," Acts 17:19, Tt 1:9, of false teaching at IgEph 9:1; διδακταία, "doctrine" or "teaching," 1 Tm 6:3, of false doctrine at IgEph 17:1; ἐπιγνώσις, "knowledge," 1 Tm 2:4, 2 Pt 1:2, 1 Clem 59:2; παράδοσις, "tradition," and its cognate verb παραδίδωμι, "hand down," 2 Pt 2:21; 1 Clem 7:2, cited in Poly 7:2;13 σοφία, "wisdom," 2 Pt 12

---

8 Hanson 41, Conzelmann Acts 112.
9 Corwin 239 f.
10 Paulsen, 116, equates the "faith given you" of Poly 3:2 to the "faith that was once for all entrusted" of Jude 3.
11 The many uses of λόγος in Acts are omitted from this study since the predominant meaning in that book is the initial preaching of the gospel, and no use in Acts appears to correspond to a body of authoritative doctrine as in other instances cited in the present chapter (e.g. Poly 7:2, 2 Tm 2:15). The uses of λόγος in 2 Peter, variously denoting a prophetic word (1:19), deceptive words (2:3), and an act of divine power (3:5), are also outside the scope of this thesis.
12 Sidebottom 113, Hillyer 183.
13 Grant and Graham 28.
3:15, Poly 3:2, both attributing wisdom to Paul (the only reference to wisdom in 1 Clement not tied to a scriptural quotation, 38:2, appears to refer to a human virtue without specific Christian content); gnōsis, "knowledge," 2 Pt 1:5, 1 Clem 36:2, negatively at 1 Tm 6:20; mustērion, "mystery," 1 Tm 3:9, IgMag 9:1; oikonomia, (divine) plan or dispensation, 1 Tm 1:4, IgEph 20:1;\footnote{Schoedel 96.} kanōn, "standard," 1 Clem 7:2;\footnote{Grant and Graham 28.} parathēkē, "what has been entrusted" (traditionally often "deposit," so BAGD), 1 Tm 6:20; christomathia, "teaching of Christ," IgPhd 8:2. Also on this list are the negative term hairesis, "heresy," 2 Pt 2:1, IgTr 6:1;\footnote{Schoedel ad loc. and n. 58 translates "faction," as at NT 2 Cor 11:19 NRSV, but says Ignatius' meaning is intermediate between the Pauline meaning of discord and the false doctrine referred to in 2 Peter.} the adverb akribōs, "accurately" (of teaching), Acts 18:25 f, Poly 3:2; the participle hugiainōn and adjective hugiēs, "sound," used of doctrine or faith, 1 Tm 1:10, Tt 2:8; ta athikta archeia, "the inviolable charters,"\footnote{Lake's singular, "charter," has no apparent justification in the Greek.} used with irony by Ignatius in setting Christian teaching above Jewish scriptures at IgPhd 8:2; boulē, "purpose," in its specific use at Acts 20:27, where Paul tells his listeners he has shown them "the whole
purpose of God" and entolē, "commandment," used at 1 Tm 6:14 and 2 Pt 2:21 to denote the whole Christian religion.\(^{19}\)

Many of these words are approximate synonyms and used more or less interchangeably, especially in the Pastorals,\(^{20}\) 2 Peter and Polycarp. For example, three such synonyms (didaskalia, logos, didachē), along with the participle hugiainōn and the adjective pístos, are used in a single verse at Tt 1:9.\(^{21}\) Similarly, Polycarp squeezes sophia, akribōs, logos, alētheia and pístis into a one-sentence description of Paul at 3:2.\(^{22}\)

**DOCTRINAL DETAILS**

Though much is made of such concepts, especially in the Pastorals, it is often impossible for the reader to learn any details of the doctrinal content referred to.\(^{23}\) Often the various terms of doctrinal orthodoxy are contrasted with unspecified false teaching, divisiveness or speculation (e.g. 2 Tm 4:3 f., where those with "itching ears" will reject "sound doctrine" and exchange "the truth" for unspecified "myths"); cf. the contrast of "the faith" with unspecified "evil doctrine" in IgEph 9:1-

---

\(^{18}\) So also Wilson *Luke* 63.

\(^{19}\) Hultgren *I-II Tm* 112, Sidebottom 117, so also BAGD; cf. also IgMag 4:1, "according to the commandment," *kat' entolēn*, in the singular, similarly IgTral 13:2, IgSm 8:1, treated, however, as interchangeable with Ignatius' plural usages of entolē by Schoedel 110 and Corwin 106 n. 19.

\(^{20}\) Hanson 182, Guthrie *Pastoral* 130.

\(^{21}\) Guthrie *Pastoral* 198 f.

\(^{22}\) Cf. de Boer 52.

\(^{23}\) Fee 180.
10:2. At other times orthodoxy is praised in general terms with no specific content at all (e.g. 2 Tm 1:13 a, "hold to the standard of sound teaching that you have heard from me").

In some cases, however, specific doctrinal conclusions can be drawn from the context in which such terminology is used. In the Pastorals, the creedal fragment at 1 Tm 2:5 f. ("one God... one mediator... ransom for all") is identified with "the truth" (v. 4). A similar fragment at 1 Tm 3:16 ("revealed in flesh... taken up in glory") is identified with "the mystery of our religion" and with "the truth" (v. 15). (Grammatically, Christ is the mystery through the use of the relative pronoun hos.) At 2 Tm 2:17 f., Hymenaeus and Philetus have "swerved from the truth" and are "upsetting the faith of some" by preaching that the resurrection has already occurred; thus, it is sound doctrine that the resurrection is still to come. Similarly, one may infer from 1 Tm 4:1-5 that it is "the truth" (v. 3) and specified by "the faith" (v. 1) that marriage and food are good, and from Tt 1:13b-15 that those "sound in the faith" (v. 13) will reject "Jewish myths" and purity laws. These latter two references are, however, moving away from doctrine as it is usually understood and toward morals.

A unique feature of the Pastorals that also provides some doctrinal content is the occurrence of five "sure (i.e. trustworthy) sayings" introduced or confirmed by pistos ho logos, literally "faithful is the word." These five, based on NRSV punctuation and paragraphing, are: (1) that Christ came to save sinners (1 Tm 1:15); (2) that aspiration to be bishop is a desire
for a noble task (1 Tm 3:1); (3) that godliness holds promise both for the present life and the life to come (1 Tm 4:8 f.); (4) that if we die with Christ we shall live with him, and so on through a creedal fragment (2 Tm 2:11); and (5) that having been justified by Christ's grace, we are heirs to the hope of eternal life (Tt 3:7 f.). Some of these sayings, especially 1 Tm 3:1, have a very marginal claim to be considered "doctrinal." Moreover, the "sure saying" at 1 Tm 3:1 could apply rather to the previous remark about women being saved by childbearing at 1 Tm 2:15, and the Greek punctuation and UBS Greek paragraphing points the sure saying at Tt 3:8 to the remainder of the verse's request that the recipient "insist on these things," though this seems poor material for a sure saying. These sayings appear to have no common element in content and are not necessarily restricted to pre-existing material used by the author; rather, *pistos ho logos* is simply a device used to give added seriousness to the author's comments and perhaps cannot even be specifically tied to any one passage preceding or following it.\(^{25}\)

In Acts, Paul gives explicit responses to actual or implied questions about his teaching (*didachē*), 17:19, and about "the Way" (*hē hodos*), 24:14. In the Areopagus speech in Athens, chapter 17, his teaching is that God made (and encompasses) the world and all peoples, needs nothing, is not appropriately worshipped with idols or in temples, and has left it to humanity

---

\(^{24}\) So NRSV mg., Dibelius-Conzelmann 28 f.

\(^{25}\) Hanson 63 f., 91, Fee 79.
to seek him, but has now made a new revelation confirmed by Jesus' resurrection, to be followed by judgement (17:24-31). Before the governor Felix, chapter 24, he says that according to "the Way" he worships the God of Israel, believes in the content of the Law and the prophets, and expects God to raise the dead (24:14 f.).

Hints of doctrinal content may also be seen in three other passages: (1) At Acts 18:24-28, Apollos' knowledge of the "Way of the Lord" (hē hodos tou kuriou) and teaching "accurately" about Jesus (v. 15) seems to include preaching that "the Messiah is Jesus" (v. 28); when the Way is explained to him "more accurately" (v. 26) by Priscilla and Aquila, he seems to learn of the need for baptism in the name of Jesus, and perhaps also the role of the Holy Spirit (v. 25, "he knew only the baptism of John": cf. 19:1-7, in which "disciples" also knowing only the baptism of John are baptized in Jesus' name and learn of and receive the Spirit, though unlike these Apollos does not require rebaptism). (2) At Acts 19:8 f., "the Way" which meets resistance (v. 9) seems to include Paul's teaching on the kingdom of God (v. 8); no elaboration is given. (3) In Acts 20:17-35,

---

26 Jesus is not mentioned by name in this passage, but it has already been made clear in v. 18 that Paul preached "Jesus and the resurrection" in Athens.

27 Cf. Lüdemann 191 f.

28 Conzelmann Acts 158. Haenchen, 554 ff., argues that "accurately" and "more accurately" are contradictory in the context and are part of a deliberately misleading attempt to subordinate Apollos to Paul via Paul's co-workers Priscilla and Aquila.
Paul's farewell speech at Miletus, elements which might be included in "the whole purpose of God" (v. 27) include the need for "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus" (v. 21), the role of God's grace (v. 24), God's purchase of his church with "the blood of his Own" (v. 28 NRSV mg.; Greek dia tou haimatos tou idiou), and perhaps even the future coming of heresy (vv. 29 ff.). All this material, however, is rather thin doctrinally, and Conzelmann sees the reference to "whole counsel" as a contrast to the Gnostic practice of telling the whole story only to initiates. 29

From Ignatius' letters, one can infer that the "mystery" is that Christ's death brought us life (IgMag 9:1), that Christ's cross, death and resurrection are absolute articles of faith ("inviolable charters," IgPhd 8:2), and that it is the "truth" that the fleshly reality of Christ's death and resurrection is also essential to Christianity (IgSm 5:1 f., cf. his chapters 1-8 passim); 30 references to heresy at IgEph 6:2 and IgTr 6:1 are also linked to subsequent anti-docetic polemic (IgEph 7:2; IgTr ch. 9-11 31). Similarly, Polycarp makes the fleshly reality of Christ an essential part of "the word which was delivered to us in the beginning" (ho ex archês hēmin paradothenta logos, Poly 7:1 f.). 32

30 Schoedel 124, 209, 233 f.
31 Corwin 54.
32 Cf. Paulsen 120 f.
DOCTRINE AS CONDUCT

Results of such a survey of what I have identified as doctrinal expressions seem meager as long as its scope is restricted to the sort of ontological and creedal matters I have been considering. However, a remarkable feature of all our literature is that much of the content associated with such expressions, including ἡ πίστις, αλήθεια and even ἡ αἵρεσις, involves not doctrine in the creedal sense, but rather conduct. For example, at 1 Tm 1:9 ff., a long list of vices, from lying to parricide, are described as "contrary to the sound teaching (ἡ ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία)" that conforms to the gospel; at 1 Tm 5:8, those who do not take care of their relatives are said to have "denied the faith" (ἡ πίστις). These examples may indeed illustrate the Pastorals' much-remarked tendency to give a Christian rationalization for ordinary "bourgeois morality"; nevertheless, the tendency to relate "the faith" and other such terms to conduct, as distinct from dogmatic theology, is found in all our authors, and the content is by no means always bourgeois.

2 Peter uses a long string of the doctrinally-charged words already discussed. These begin with πίστις at 1:1 -- lacking the definite article in this construction, but as something one "receives" (λαγχανῶ), equivalent in meaning to ἡ πίστις as discussed already.34 Others include εἰπιγνώσις (1:2 and often), a

---

33 Dibelius-Conzelmann 74 f.; Bultmann 118 f.; Karris 63 ff., 84 f., Kelly 17, Fee 17 f., all using the expression with reservations.

34 Sidebottom 104, but noting that the verb used stresses God's grace rather than "handing down"; so also Hillyer 157, BAGD.
word used for a particularly strong form of knowledge of religious or moral things\textsuperscript{35} which may be said to form the chief theme of the epistle;\textsuperscript{36} gnosti\textsuperscript{1} (1:5, 3:18), alētheia (1:12), hairesis (2:1), hodōs tēs alētheias (2:2), entole (2:21, 3:2, in the former case "handed down," paradidōmi); and sophia, 3:15. It would also seem probable that hodōs tēs dikaiosunēs, "way of righteousness" (2:21) is intended to be interchangeable with hodōs tēs alētheias.\textsuperscript{37} Nevertheless, the doctrinal content of the letter is minimal, confined largely to an insistence that the day of the Lord will come despite any delays or doubts (3:3-10); beyond that, we have only the characterization of the heresy as "bombastic nonsense" (2:18) and other such abuse. Clearly the point of the letter, and the ultimate content of "commandment," "wisdom," "knowledge" and the rest, is that the believers should be found "without spot or blemish" (3:14) when the Lord's day destroys all things with fire (3:10). The way of righteousness and truth is the life of "holiness and godliness" (3:11).\textsuperscript{38}

At Acts 24:14 ff., Paul makes much the same point, though far more briefly, as part of his explanation of the Way: he expects the resurrection, therefore (en toutō) he tries to maintain a clear conscience (aproskopos suneidēsis) toward God and other people (v. 16).\textsuperscript{39} His failure to give any just cause

\textsuperscript{35} Hillyer 159, so also BAGD.
\textsuperscript{36} Sidebottom 105.
\textsuperscript{37} Hillyer 208.
\textsuperscript{38} Sidebottom 123 f., Hillyer 220.
\textsuperscript{39} Schwartz 20 f.
for offence (vv. 12, 18), as well perhaps as his observance of Jewish piety (vv. 12, 17), are presented as examples of appropriate behavior according to a good conscience in the light of the coming resurrection and judgement. Similarly, the real point of Paul's "teaching" in the Areopagus speech is that it is time to foresake idols, turn to the true God, and be prepared for the appointed judgment day (Acts 17:29-31).

Clement offers several such examples. At 22:1, "the faith which is in Christ" is said to "confirm" an exhortation to virtues of various kinds (ch. 21-22). At 35:5, the "way of truth" is contrasted to a catalogue of vices. And in a passage which is anything but bourgeois, the "immortal knowledge" (hē athanatos gnōsis, 36:2) is equated with an apprehension of the majesty of God and of Christ so overwhelming that our only response can be total loyalty and obedience (ch. 36-37).

Ignatius, warning against heresy at IgTr 6:1 ff., devotes two chapters to contrasting such heresy with obedience to the bishop and the "ordinances of the Apostles" (ch. 7) and with peaceful and inoffensive behavior toward Christians and non-Christians alike (ch. 8) before attacking its docetic doctrinal content (ch. 9-11).

---

41 Grant and Graham 62.
42 Cf. Grant and Graham 63 f.
43 Cf. Schoedel 146 ff., esp. 147, 152.
Polycarp's letter, as he himself says, is about "righteousness" (3:2), to be taken in a moral rather than a classically Pauline sense,⁴⁴ and indeed the letter is almost entirely an exercise in moral paranesis, with its limited doctrinal content, e.g. references to Jesus' resurrection at 2:1, used primarily to intensify moral admonitions. Even its most doctrinally significant passage, the anti-docetic 7:1, is aimed not merely at the denial of "Jesus Christ come in the flesh" but also at the morally pernicious consequences of the denial of resurrection and judgment -- "whosoever perverts the oracles of the Lord for his own lusts." Yet what I have classified as doctrinal expressions are used freely and almost interchangeably with "righteousness" (3:1, 3; 4:1), e.g. "wisdom," "word of truth," (3:2), "the faith" (3:2, 4:2,3), "the commandment" (4:1, 5:1).⁴⁵ "Knowing then that 'God is not mocked,' we ought to walk worthily of his commandment and glory" (5:1) would be as good a summary as any of the letter.

SUMMARY: PAUL AND THE MAINLINE FAITH

While there is no pattern of agreement in our literature as to what creedal details count as "doctrine," there is agreement that correct doctrine is important and that this has behavioral as well as creedal implications.

---

⁴⁴ Lindemann "Apostolic" 44.
⁴⁵ Cf. de Boer 52.
Doctrinal expressions are not unknown in Paul's undisputed letters: "the faith" at Gal 1:23, NT Phil 1:25, NT Phil 1:27; "the form of teaching to which you were entrusted" (hos paradothēte tupos didachēs) at NT Rom 6:17; "traditions" at 1 Cor 11:2, cf. 15:3; "knowledge" (gnōsis) positively at NT Rom 15:14 (though negatively at 1 Cor 8:1), "word" in a sense stressing accurate content at 2 Cor 4:2 ("we refused to... falsify God's word"), Gal 6:6 ("taught the word"), "obeying the truth" at NT Rom 2:8, Gal 5:7, "follow this rule" (kanōn) at Gal. 6:16, "mystery" at 1 Cor 4:1 ("stewards of God's mysteries," mysteries because newly revealed rather than because esoteric). Paul also insists on the inviolability of his own gospel at Gal 1:8 f. But these expressions, and especially this use of "faith," are proportionately rare in Paul's undisputed letters, and indeed it has been argued that such systematization is foreign to Paul's whole method of argumentation.

---

46 NRSV "faith," but Greek hē pistis, RSV rightly "the faith."
47 Hultgren I-II Tm 15.
48 Guthrie Pastoral 49 f.
49 Ziesler 20, Fitzmyer "Romans" 849.
50 Ziesler 20, Fitzmyer "Pauline" 1386.
51 Ziesler 35.
52 Beker 85 f.
Paul, is most classically a trusting "yes" to God,\textsuperscript{54} not a creed or theological system.

The tendency in our literature to equate or conflate doctrinal concerns with conduct is also not unknown in the undisputed letters, as seen in the above references to obeying the truth (NT Rom 2:8, Gal 5:7). But this is a proportionally lesser concern in Paul than in our literature, and the dynamic is quite different. In our literature Christian morals are often portrayed as part and parcel of the gospel ("a new law," Ziesler says, somewhat unkindly, in reference to our non-canonical authors,\textsuperscript{55} cf. also 1 Tm 1:9 ff., 6:14, 2 Pt 2:21), or at most as an essentially human response to the holiness of the revelation through Christ (1 Clem 36, 37). In the major Pauline letters Christian morals are a consequence of a new creation (2 Cor 5:17),\textsuperscript{56} a transfer from the dominion of other powers to that of Christ (e.g. Gal 4:3-7),\textsuperscript{57} a liberation from the power of sin (NT Rom 6:14)\textsuperscript{58} and as such essentially the work of Christ.\textsuperscript{59} As a result, the human role approaches a vanishing point, so much so that it becomes a problem both for Paul and for modern commentators to describe it without fatally overstating it (e.g.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{54} Ziesler 84, cf. Bornkamm 144 ff., Fitzmyer "Pauline" 1407.
\item \textsuperscript{55} Ziesler 142.
\item \textsuperscript{56} E. Sanders 102.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Ziesler 83.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Barrett Paul 90.
\item \textsuperscript{59} E. Sanders 103.
\end{itemize}
NT Rom 4:1-6). This is not a problem for our authors, who are simply urging their readers to go out and do what God has told them to do.

---

60 Ziesler 84; cf. Barrett's acknowledgment of the difficulty in defining "the obedience of faith," NT Rom 1:5, (Barrett Paul 135, cf. also E. Sanders' discussion of Paul's difficulties in promoting what amounted to Jewish ethics among Gentile converts while repudiating Law-observance (E. Sanders Paul 89).
CHAPTER 6: THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

In this chapter the contrast with Paul must be drawn at an earlier stage than in preceding chapters, because at many points the use of Pauline vocabulary with a non-Pauline meaning will be specifically at issue. Our literature stresses a variety of concepts for daily living differing noticeably from usage in the undisputed Pauline letters: righteousness (dikaiosunē), "good/clear conscience" (agathos/katharos suneidēsis), godliness (eusebeia), and good works (agatha/kala erga), plus sōphrosunē and its cognates, variously translated in the NRSV as prudence, self-control, decency, modesty, self-discipline and sensibleness.¹

RIGHTEOUSNESS AND UPRIGHTNESS

Dikaiosunē and its cognate verb dikaioō are occasionally used by all our authors in something resembling the classical Pauline sense of "a gift of right-standing with God."² Thus Tt 3:7 describes Christians as "justified (dikaioō) by his grace," apart from works.³ At Acts 13:39, Paul says believers are "set free" (dikaioō) by Jesus where the Law could not free (dikaioō) them, held by many commentators to be a conscious Pauline touch

¹ E.g. Hanson 2 f.

² Fee 24, citing NT Rom 5:17.

³ Hanson 192 f., Hultgren I-II Tm 34, Guthrie Pastoral 218 f., Dibelius-Conzelmann 150, Beker 42; the latter two suggest any Paulinism in this verse may be attributed to its origin in tradition rather than the Pastor's own thought.
by the author. 4 2 Pt 1:1, "through the righteousness (dikaiosunē) of our God and Savior Jesus Christ" may bear a Pauline sense of "God's saving activity," but more likely refers to God's fairness in distributing gifts. 5 1 Clem 32:4 clearly states that we are "not made righteous (dikaioō) by ourselves," but are justified (again dikaioō) by faith; 6 cf. 1 Clem 48:4, Christ is the only gate among the many available which is "in righteousness," followed, however, by a clearly non-Pauline moralizing use of "righteousness" in the same verse. Ignatius says he is not justified by his own sufferings (IgRom 5:1). 7 Polycarp refers to Christ as "the pledge of our righteousness" (Poly 8:1). 8

Nevertheless, dikaiosunē and its cognates in our literature more commonly refer to upright moral behavior. The adjective dikaios is applied to Lot at 2 Pt 2:7 f., to Cornelius at Acts 10:22 and to suitable candidates for bishop at Tt 1:8, while the "way of righteousness" (2 Pt 2:21) is a matter of "right living" rather than of justification by faith. 9 1 Clem describes Peter and Paul as "righteous pillars" (5:2), and equates righteousness

---

4 So Marshall Acts 228, an accurate touch; Conzelmann Acts 106; Lüdemann 154, Haenchen 412, inaccurate; differently Munck 123, pre-Pauline "Jewish-Christian dogma."

5 Sidebottom 104, cf. Hillyer 158.

6 Lindemann "Apostolic" 33, Grant and Graham 58.

7 Differently Schoedel 179, suggesting Ignatius' citation of 1 Cor 4:4 masks a very un-Pauline conviction that he will be justified by martyrdom.

8 Lindemann "Apostolic" 44.

9 Hillyer 208.
with good deeds (30:7). Ignatius praises the "righteous nature" of the church at Ephesus in a context devoted to its members' conduct (IgEph 1:1 f.). Polycarp speaks of the "armor of righteousness" in the context of conventional moral advice (Poly 4:1 ff.). In the Pastorals, the "innocent" (dikaios) are distinguished from those who commit various crimes (1 Tm 1:9 ff.), righteousness can be pursued along with other virtues (2 Tm 2:22), and one can be trained in it (through scripture reading, 2 Tm 3:16).

GOOD CONSCIENCE

All our authors except 2 Peter mention a good or clear conscience as a worthwhile possession. Paul claims it at Acts 23:1, before the Sanhedrin, and at 24:16, speaking to the governor Felix. Before Felix he implies that his clear conscience prepares him for the coming resurrection. Before the Sanhedrin he appears to apply the expression to his entire life to date, covering a Jewish as well as a Christian context.

In the Pastorals, good conscience contributes, along with a pure heart and sincere faith, to love (1 Tm 1:5), and is bracketed with faith as a necessity for fighting "the good fight"

---

10 Cf. Paulsen 25.
11 Cf. Lindemann "Apostolic" 44.
13 Haenchen 637, cf. Lüdemann 243, cf. also 2 Tm 1:3, in which Paul or pseudo-Paul applies the expression to his ancestors' worship as well as his own; differently Marshall (Acts 362), who says the claim before the Sanhedrin is intended to cover only Paul's Christian phase.
(1 Tm 1:18 f.); it is the proper state in which to "hold fast to the mystery of the faith" (1 Tm 3:9). By contrast, false teachers' consciences are deadened (1 Tm 4:2, "seared with a hot iron")\(^{14}\) or abandoned altogether (1 Tm 1:19), and the minds and consciences of the corrupt and unbelieving are themselves corrupted (Tt 1:15).

Clement praises a pure (hagnos) conscience in wives (1 Clem 1:3)\(^{15}\) and a good conscience in all members of the congregation (41:1). Polycarp likewise enjoins a pure conscience on virgins (Poly 5:3), while Ignatius says anyone who disobeys church authorities is "not pure in his conscience" (IgTr 7:2).

The word "conscience" does not appear in 2 Peter, but a similar idea seems to be implied in the author's concern to be found "without spot or blemish" (aspiloi kai amômêtoi) at the judgment (3:14).\(^{16}\) The cognate amômos is found modifying "conscience" at 1 Clem 1:3.

**GODLINESS**

**Eusebeia,** godliness, is a way of living pleasing to God (1 Tm 2:2, 2 Pt 1:6 f.), "putting loyalty to God above all else."\(^{17}\) Use of the word eusebeia is limited in the New Testament

\(^{14}\) So Hanson 87, Guthrie Pastoral 104.

\(^{15}\) Gunaike\(s\), Lake, Richardson, Grant and Graham "women," but contextually almost certainly "wives."

\(^{16}\) Cf. Sidebottom 124, citing a "morality of 'blamelessness'" here and at 1 Tm 6:14 and in the Pauline 1 Thess 3:13, 5:23, NT Phil 1:10.

\(^{17}\) Hillyer 166; Dibelius-Conzelmann 39.
precisely to our literature — the Pastorals, Acts and 2 Peter.\textsuperscript{18}

In the Pastorals, it has both explicitly religious connotations (translated "religion" in "the mystery of our religion" at 1 Tm 3:16) and moral connotations (the cognate 
\textit{eusebe}ö, otherwise "worship," used at 1 Tm 5:4 for performing one's "religious duty" to one's family). It is something one can work at (1 Tm 4:7) and pursue along with other virtues (1 Tm 6:11), and is valuable for the sake of the life to come as well as for this life (1 Tm 4:8).

In 1 Clement \textit{eusebeia} (translated "piety" by Lake) is bracketed with sobriety and gentleness (1:2), peacefulness (15:1), and righteousness (62:1). Acts uses the noun only deprecatingly (3:12, Peter and John's denial that their own piety had made the lame man walk), but applies the adjective (NRSV "devout") with approval to Cornelius (10:2) and one of his soldiers (10:7) — characteristically, before they have heard the gospel: while \textit{eusebeia} is most often given a nominally Christian context in our literature, its specifically Christian content is seldom stressed.\textsuperscript{19} "Ungodly," \textit{asebēs}, is used in the Pastorals (1 Tm 1:9), 2 Peter (e.g. 2:5) and Clement (e.g. 1 Clem 14:5) as a straightforward term of opprobrium. Neither \textit{eusebeia} nor \textit{asebēs} appears in Ignatius or Polycarp.

\textsuperscript{18} Dibelius-Conzelmann 39, Sidebottom 105.

\textsuperscript{19} Wilson \textit{Luke} 50 f., cf. Ziesler 136; cf. also Grant 38, noting that for Clement, as at 1 Clem 55, pagan virtues are genuinely commendable.
GOOD WORKS

The Pastorals in particular are surprisingly enthusiastic about good works (\textit{kala erga}) for Pauline or purportedly Pauline documents.\textsuperscript{20} Christians are expected to perform good works (2 Tm 2:21, Tt 3:14), especially women (1 Tm 2:10, 5:10); it is noted with approval that good works are conspicuous (1 Tm 5:25). Still, as in the undisputed Pauline letters, salvation is not earned by works (2 Tm 1:9, Tt 3:5).\textsuperscript{21}

A similar outlook is found in 1 Clem, who urges "good deeds" (\textit{erga}) (21:1, 33:1) and even speaks of being "justified by deeds" as opposed to words (30:3), but still insists on justification by faith (32:4).\textsuperscript{22} At Acts 26:20 Paul calls for "deeds consistent with repentance," and Ignatius makes works part of getting one's eventual reward (IgPol 6:2).\textsuperscript{23} Polycarp's sole reference to works, however, is negative, a citation of NT Eph 2:8 f.\textsuperscript{24} against salvation by works (Poly 1:3). 2 Peter's only reference to \textit{erga}, if relevant here at all, is at best dismissive: on the

\textsuperscript{20} Dibelius-Conzelmann 47.

\textsuperscript{21} Dibelius-Conzelmann 99, Hultgren \textit{I-II Tm} 169, Guthrie \textit{Pastoral} 216; Hanson 191 agrees in substance but says Paul would not have used the language of Tt 3:5.

\textsuperscript{22} Grant 119, Lindemann "Apostolic" 33, Grant and Graham 59.

\textsuperscript{23} Differently Corwin 234 f., suggesting the details of the elaborate military metaphor in this last passage should not be pressed contrary to what she sees as Ignatius' "characteristic usage," in which works are a consequence rather than a cause of the Christian's relationship with God.

\textsuperscript{24} Or Pauline tradition, Paulsen 115.
day of the Lord, "everything done on [earth] (ḡē kai ta en autē erga, earth and the works in it) will be disclosed" (3:10).

PRUDENCE AND BOURGEOIS MORALITY

Sophrosunē and its cognates, variously translated, are used nine times in the Pastorals compared to only two in Paul's undisputed letters.25 This virtue is recommended for Christians in general (Tt 2:12, "self-controlled"), for Timothy himself (2 Tm 1:7, "self-discipline"), for bishops (1 Tm 3:2 "sensible", Tt 1:8 "self-controlled"), for older and younger men (Tt 2:2 "prudent," 2:6 "self-controlled"), and three times for women (1 Tm 2:9 "decently," 2:15 "modesty"; Tt 2:5 "self-controlled"). In 1 Clement it is used of the whole Corinthian congregation (1:2, "sobriety") and of Clement's representatives to Corinth (63:3, "prudent"), and recommended for wives (1:3, "circumspection") and for the congregation as a whole (62:2, "sobriety"). Ignatius also recommends it to Christians at large (IgEph 10:3, "sobriety") and Polycarp to widows (Poly 4:3, "discreet") and to everyone (Poly 10:3, preserved only in Latin, sobrietas, "sobriety"). The term sometimes has a connotation of sexual self-control, especially for women26 but possibly also for men.27 In more general terms, and considered as "prudence," it may be seen as part of a move to a less eschatological and more lasting Christian ethic, as also in Luke's writings and the Apostolic Fathers.28

25 Dibelius-Conzelmann 40, Kelly 160.
26 Dibelius-Conzelmann 46, Kelly 66.
27 Kelly 76.
28 Dibelius-Conzelmann 40 f.
Vocabulary aside, Christians are expected in our literature to live according to what is often described as "bourgeois morality."\(^{29}\) Dibelius-Conzelmann describe the Pastoral outlook as citizenship in this world, though on Christian principles, as opposed to citizenship elsewhere, as in the undisputed letters;\(^{30}\) Reicke sees 2 Peter and related literature as concentrating less on the events of salvation and more on how to get along in society while waiting for the parousia;\(^{31}\) Brown cites Clement's appeal to the orderliness of the created universe (ch. 20), the levitical cult (ch. 41), Roman society (ch. 61) and even the army (ch. 37) as examples for an orderly, lasting Christian church.\(^{32}\) Accordingly, older men should be temperate, serious and prudent, older women sober in speech and in drinking habits, younger women good housewives and mothers and submissive to their husbands, younger men self-controlled, slaves respectful and obedient to their masters (Tt 2:2-10); 1 Clem 1:3, 21:6 ff., Poly ch. 4, 5 offer similar lists. Families should take care of their own members (1 Tm 5:4,8). No one should seek riches (1 Tm 6:9 f.) and those who are already rich should be generous with their wealth (1 Tm 6:18). Everyone should be useful rather than clever or disputatious (Tt 3:8 f.). A quiet life is desireable, and civil rulers should be supported by prayer and obedience to bring this

\(^{29}\) Bultmann 118 f.; cf. Karris 63 ff., 84 f.; Kelly 17, Fee 17 f., all with reservations.

\(^{30}\) Dibelius-Conzelmann 39.

\(^{31}\) Reicke xxxvi ff.

\(^{32}\) Brown "Rome" 171 ff.
about (1 Tm 2:2, 1 Clem 60:2, the latter actually bracketing the need to please earthly rulers with the need to please God);\textsuperscript{33} 2 Pt 3:14 "at peace," may be a similar quasi-political reference.\textsuperscript{34} Food, wine, and marriage are all good (1 Tm 4:3-5, 5:23). Nothing should be done to make Christianity look bad to outsiders (Tt 2:5, 8, 10; IgTr 8:2, cf. Acts 2:47a).\textsuperscript{35}

**SUMMARY: PAUL AND THE MAINLINE FAITH**

The use of *dikaiosunē* and its cognates in a moralizing sense, found in all our authors, draws especially heavy fire from Hanson as utterly contrary to the Pauline concept of righteousness or justification as a gift of God's grace: "It is hard to imagine a more un-Pauline phrase than training in righteousness [2 Tm 3:16]."\textsuperscript{36} Yet even for Paul, *dikaios* can refer to moral righteousness, as at NT Rom 5:7,\textsuperscript{37} NT Phil 4:8 (NRSV "just"),\textsuperscript{38} just as the "Pauline" meaning may be found in our literature. Indeed, it is arguable that Paul means the word to connote justification and uprightness simultaneously.\textsuperscript{39} Nevertheless, the order of frequency in our literature unquestionably does reverse that of the undisputed Pauline

\textsuperscript{33} Cf. Grant and Graham 94.

\textsuperscript{34} Reicke xxiv.

\textsuperscript{35} Kelly 239, Fee 184, Schoedel 150 f., Corwin 226.

\textsuperscript{36} Hanson 152, also 109 f. and often.

\textsuperscript{37} Fitzmyer "Romans" 844.

\textsuperscript{38} Cf. also Kelly 140, 204.

\textsuperscript{39} So Barrett *Paul* 136.
letters, in which moralizing uses of dikaiosunē and its cognates are rare.

The expression "good conscience" is not found in the undisputed letters. Paul does appeal to the testimony of his conscience, which is evidently in his favor, at NT Rom 9:1, 2 Cor 1:12, but he treats conscience as fallible at 1 Cor 8:7 ff., cf. 4:4. 40 Paul also recommends that his flock be blameless (amemptos) at Christ's coming, 1 Thess 3:13, cf. 1 Thess 5:23, NT Phil 1:10, the latter reminiscent of 2 Pt 3:14, where I have treated the idea of blamelessness as equivalent to good conscience. 41 The best summary of the matter would be that conscience is significant for Paul, but not to be relied on humanly speaking after the manner of our literature.

Eusebeia does not appear in the undisputed Pauline letters. 42 Like certain of our authors, Paul does use asebēs in a negative sense, but he does so in a paradoxical manner entirely at odds with that of our literature: "Christ died for the

---

40 Differently Bornkamm 132, "an unerring witness to the truth," though still distinct from God's judgement; cf. also Barrett Paul 83. Dibelius-Conzelmann (20) see in the Pastoral-style conscience a principle of obligation almost diametrically opposite to the concept of conscience as a principle of freedom found in the undisputed letters, but it is not clear to me that the opposition is diametrical.

41 Cf. Sidebottom 124; Collins 779 notes that for Paul such blamelessness comes from God, a point consistent with my previous discussion of the relationship of morality to the gospel in our literature and in Paul.

42 Hanson 90, suggesting the frequent mention of eusebeia is the epitome of the Pastorals' un-Pauline theology, cf. Sidebottom 105, referring to 2 Peter: "piety has replaced the glorious liberty of the children of God."
ungodly," NT Rom 5:6, cf 4:5. While our literature stresses a human relationship to God, Paul stresses God's relationship to humanity.

Paul is capable of referring positively to "every good work" (2 Cor 9:8) and to linking judgement to erga (NT Rom 2:6, NRSV "deeds," RSV "works"), and indeed positive or neutral uses of erga predominate even in the undisputed letters; even so, it is generally thought that erga for Paul are most classically "works of the Law" (e.g. Gal. 2:16), implicitly or explicitly, and as such discounted by him.

The much-remarked "bourgeois morality" of our literature has its counterpart in Paul, in his appeal to commonly accepted ethical standards (e.g. pagan condemnation of incest, 1 Cor 5:1, the teachings of "nature" about hair length, 1 Cor 11:14 f.), his vice lists (Gal 5:19-23, 1 Cor 6:9 f.), his concern for obedience to civil authority (NT Rom 13:1-7), his approval of marital sex (1 Cor 7:1-7), and his concern that nothing be done to make Christianity look bad to outsiders (1 Cor 10:32 f.). However, it seems fair to say that there is less of this sort of thing in the undisputed letters than in our literature. As with erga,

---

43 Käsemann 249.
44 Dibelius-Conzelmann 47.
45 Fitzmyer "Romans" 841.
46 Ziesler 117 and elsewhere, cf. Fitzmyer "Romans" 841, "Pauline" 1406.
47 Ziesler 20, 118 f., 121, Fitzmyer "Pauline" 1386, Schoedel 150.
48 Ziesler 20.
the opposition here is far from diametrical, but as so often, the undisputed letters assign a lesser role to human effort than is usual in our literature.
CHAPTER 7: JUDAISM

Our literature takes for granted Christian ownership of all that is of value in Judaism; some of our authors are sharply critical of any failure on the part of Jews to see the matter in this light.

This attitude is most fully developed in Ignatius' letters, as epitomized at IgMag 10:3: "For Christianity did not base its faith on Judaism, but Judaism on Christianity, and every tongue believing on God was brought together in it."¹ Thus, the (Hebrew) prophets "lived according to Jesus Christ" (IgMag 8:2, cf. IgPhd 9:2).² Patriarchs, prophets, apostles and the church are treated as an unbroken sequence (IgPhd 9:1). Indeed, Ignatius appears to have as little knowledge or appreciation of Judaism qua Judaism as the average modern Christian.³ Accordingly, ongoing Judaism is "the evil leaven, which has grown old and sour" and continued Jewish observance by Christians is "monstrous" (IgMag 10:2 f.). The preaching of Judaism by "the uncircumcised" (presumably Judaizing Christians⁴) is equated with "the wicked arts and snares of this world" and is to be shunned (IgPhd 6:1). Even the Hebrew Scriptures, though said by Ignatius to contain the gospel,

¹ Cf. Wilson Related 168.
² Schoedel 118 ff.; Schoedel suggests, somewhat implausibly, that Ignatius means "the prophets did not even keep the Sabbath" (p. 119).
³ Cf. Grant 106.
⁴ So Grant 97, Corwin 57 ff., Schoedel 202 f.
are somewhat denigrated in comparison with the gospel: "to me the charters (probably the Hebrew Scriptures\textsuperscript{5}) are Jesus Christ" (IgPhd 8:2), that is, what really counts as scripture is Jesus himself.\textsuperscript{6}

The author of the Pastorals, presenting himself as the Jewish Paul of Tarsus, is willing to associate his current Christian worship of God "with a clear conscience" with that of his Jewish ancestors (2 Tm 1:3), an apparent affirmation of the continuity of Christianity with Judaism.\textsuperscript{7} He also praises the Law (not specified as the Mosaic Law, but so read by most commentators) as a useful check on evildoers if used "legitimately" (nomimōs, "lawfully") (1 Tm 1:8). The reference to legitimate use of the Law may be contrasted with its use for esoteric exegesis ("myths and endless genealogies," v. 4);\textsuperscript{8} the passage, however, lacks the paradoxical element in the classically Pauline portrayal of humankind before the Law.\textsuperscript{9}

Finally, despite uncertainties of detail in exegesis, it is clear that for the Pastor, scripture -- in this context Jewish scripture -- is "inspired by God" (2 Tm 3:16).

On the negative side, the Pastorals oppose Jewish elements in certain false teachings, particularly in Titus with its

\textsuperscript{5} So Lake 247, Schoedel 207 f.

\textsuperscript{6} So also Grant 56, Schoedel 209.

\textsuperscript{7} So Hultgren I-II Tm 109, Karris 11 f., Guthrie Pastoral 135, Fee 222; differently Hanson 119, Dibelius-Conzelmann 98.

\textsuperscript{8} Fee 45, Guthrie Pastoral 70 f.

\textsuperscript{9} Dibelius-Conzelmann 22.
reference to "Jewish myths" and purity (Tt 1:14 f.; cf. Tt 1:10, singling out "those of the circumcision" for criticism, and 1 Tm 1:7, Tt 3:9, referring to misuse of the Law). The mention of purity could be an allusion to normal Jewish food laws whose practice, tolerated in Paul's time (NT Rom 14), is now a mark of heresy in the Christian community;\(^\text{10}\) on the other hand, it could refer not to Law-observant Jewish Christians but to the gnosticizing Jewish ascetics attacked elsewhere in the pastorals, since the accusation that they "reject the truth" (Tt 1:14) seems overly harsh to apply to the merely Law-observant.\(^\text{11}\)

The "sincere faith" of Timothy's grandmother and mother, Lois and Eunice (2 Tm 1:5), is likely to be Christian rather than Jewish faith since it is unlikely they were observant Jews, Eunice having married a Gentile and Timothy not having been circumcised as a child (Acts 16:1 ff.).\(^\text{12}\)

Polycarp and 2 Peter have few references to Judaism, but continue the pattern of appropriating Jewish background for Christian use. 2 Peter cites good examples (Noah and Lot, 2:5 ff.) and a bad example (Balaam, 2:15 f.) from the Hebrew Scriptures. He also refers to what appear to be Hebrew prophecies to make a Christian point (1:19 ff., 3:2).\(^\text{13}\) Polycarp speaks of

\(^{10}\) Hanson 178.

\(^{11}\) Kelly 236.

\(^{12}\) Hanson 120.

\(^{13}\) Hillyer 181, 209, 211, Reicke 173; differently Sidebottom 118, 120 f., suggesting Christian prophecies may be meant.
the prophets as foretelling the coming of the Lord, and brackets them with the apostles (6:3).  

14 He also uses "Gentiles" (gens) as a synonym for non-Christians (10:2, 11:2).

1 Clement is noteworthy for its extensive citations of the Hebrew Scriptures ("sacred Scriptures," hiera graphai, 45:2, 53:1), possibly in a sloppily-compiled anthology.  

15 Forty-nine of the letter's 65 chapters allude to books of the Hebrew Scriptures or deuterocanonical books included in the LXX;  

16 at least 16 chapters are dominated by or entirely taken up with such references.  

17 These are used not only as examples of edifying behavior (e.g. Abraham, ch. 10, or David, ch. 18), but as normative for current Christian practice, as in chapter 43, in which the story of the rod of Aaron (Num 17) is cited as an example for the need for orderliness in choosing ministers. In chapters 40 f., the practice of the Jerusalem Temple cult is given as an example for emulation in Christian worship, and the word there translated "sacrifices" (proshorai, 40:2) shortly reappears in cognate form (prosenekontes ta döra) to refer to the blameless offering of sacrifices by the elders who have now been improperly deposed by the Corinthian Christians (44:4 f.).  

14 Paulsen 119.

15 Grant and Graham 10.

16 Based on citations identified in Lake's marginal notes.

17 As "dominated by" is to some degree a subjective judgement, I shall list the chapters I have so identified: 4, 8–12, 18, 22, 26, 31, 43, 45, 51–53, 55. Cf. also Brown "Rome" 169, Richardson 37, Grant 96 ff.

18 Brown "Rome" 169 ff.
Clement feels free to use what is to be done "only in Jerusalem" (41:2) as a model for what is to be done in Corinth. Also appropriated for Christian use are the prophecy of Is 60:17 LXX, "I will make thy princes peaceable, and thine overseers (episkopous) righteous," restated as "scripture says in one [unspecified] place, 'I will establish their bishops in righteousness, and their deacons in faith,'" at 1 Clem 42:5; and the blessing of Ps. 32:1 f. (LXX 31:1 f.), a blessing on the forgiven, applied to Christians at 1 Clem 50:7. These citations are made in a classically Jewish manner, and the author shows not one scrap of negativity toward anything Jewish; indeed Clement is often considered an exemplar of Jewish Christianity.

But it is not to be thought that Clement makes Judaism, as Judaism, normative for Christianity. His extensive quotations of the Hebrew Scriptures represent, not obedience, but the same sort of proof texting common in Christian pulpits of our own day. Clement, Bultmann rightly says, "quite naively claims the Old Testament as a Christian book," "a book of ethical models," whose ritual prescriptions are disregarded "as a matter of course" (except, as noted above, when ritual material can be clumsily appropriated for use in Christian worship as at 41:2). He quotes scripture as blithely as he does, for example, the myth of the

---

19 Grant and Graham 71 f.
20 J. Sanders 219 f., cf. Grant 97.
21 E.g. J. Sanders 219, Brown "Rome" 159 ff.
22 Bultmann 112.
Phoenix (ch. 25 f.), to which in fact he subordinates scriptural citations in his argument for the resurrection. There is no suggestion in 1 Clement that Judaism has any other continuing value than to be used in this fashion.

Acts also paints Christianity as in full continuity with Judaism, though with certain complications not found in the rest of our literature. Both Peter and Paul preach Christ on the basis of Jewish expectations: for example, Peter cites Joel (Acts 2:16 ff.) and Psalm 16 (Acts 2:25 ff.) in the Pentecost speech, while Paul makes Jesus a savior of David's line (13:23) and a fulfilment of promises to Israel (13:32 ff.) in his sermon in Pisidian Antioch. The redirection of preaching to Gentiles is attributed to God's intervention (esp. 10:1-11:18, Peter's conversion of Cornelius) and to Jewish rejection of Paul's preaching (13:46, Pisidian Antioch; 18:6, Corinth; 28:26 ff., Rome); even then, there are "thousands of [Christian] believers" among the Jews of Jerusalem (Acts 21:20).

Paul himself is portrayed as an observant Jew who always preaches first to the Jews of each community visited (9:20, 13:5 and often). He is willing to have Timothy circumcised to avoid offending potential Jewish hearers (16:3), an action widely

---

23 K. Aland 97.
24 Haenchen 113, 362 f.
26 Lüdemann 117 and elswhere, Marshall 230, Munck 126.
regarded as unthinkable for the real Paul.\textsuperscript{27} He goes along with
James' plan to join in a rite of purification with four poor
Nazirites as proof of his own observance (21:23-26), an account
which presents some difficulties with respect to known Jewish
procedures of the era, though these difficulties are not
insurmountable.\textsuperscript{28} He claims before the high priest to have a
lifelong clear conscience before God (23:1), an affirmation of
continuity between his pre-Christian and Christian life;\textsuperscript{29} he
denies all offence against the Law or the Temple (25:8).

Continuity between Jewish and Gentile Christianity is
provided by the so-called apostolic decree (15:20, 29), a
compromise permitting Jewish-Gentile table fellowship without
imposing the Law on Gentile Christians.\textsuperscript{30} The elimination or
easing of the requirements of the Law through Christ is based on
human inability to keep the Law (15:10 f., 13:39).\textsuperscript{31}

SUMMARY: PAUL AND THE MAINLINE FAITH

Despite striking differences in tone, as between for example
Clement and Ignatius, all our authors, with the partial exception

\textsuperscript{27} So Haenchen 480 ff., Conzelmann \textit{Acts} 125; differently
Marshall \textit{Acts} 259 f., Lüdemann 176 f.

\textsuperscript{28} Conzelmann \textit{Acts} 180, Haenchen 611 f.

\textsuperscript{29} Haenchen 637; differently Marshall \textit{Acts} 362, arguing --
in my view most improbably -- that the claim covers only his
Christian life.

\textsuperscript{30} Conzelmann \textit{Acts} 118 f., Marshall \textit{Acts} 242 ff., Munck
140 f.; differently Haenchen 469, arguing that Gentile converts
were subjected precisely to those provisions of the Law which
have always applied to Gentiles living among Jews, as recorded
in Lev 17 and 18; similarly Segal 197 ff.

\textsuperscript{31} Schwartz 10 and 313 n. 35, Haenchen 113.
of Acts, treat Judaism as a back number. Everything of any value in it -- scriptures, prophets, the Jewish observance of Paul's ancestors, even the Temple cult -- is entirely and unproblematically owned by Christianity and to be used for its benefit, while Christianity is not answerable to its Jewish heritage at all. From the Christian point of view, the progression from Judaism has been smooth and natural, and any trouble has come from intransigent Jewish authorities, as in Acts, or gratuitous troublemakers associated with Christian communities, as in Ignatius.

E. Sanders sees in Paul's writing the "nucleus" of just such an appropriationist treatment of Judaism, which has of course dominated Christianity down the centuries.\(^{32}\) That Paul's writings lend themselves to such an understanding may be admitted (the verdict of history seems clear); but what Paul was actually doing seems to me almost diametrically (for once) opposite to the approach of our literature. Paul devotes two of his undisputed letters, NT Romans and Galatians, to debating the relationship between the old and the new covenants\(^{33}\) -- that is to say, to considering, in striking contrast to our literature, precisely in what way Christianity might be answerable to its Jewish heritage; and while the results can hardly have been satisfactory to non-Christian Jews, they are a far cry from the benign or hostile dismissiveness of our literature. "The Jews" (NT Rom 9:24, 1 Cor

\(^{32}\) E. Sanders \textit{Law} 209 f.

\(^{33}\) Cf. E. Sanders \textit{Paul} 44, 117 ff. and \textit{passim}; Barrett \textit{Paul} 41 ff.
9:20) — real Jews whose religiosity he understands well -- are so important to Paul's thought that he must construct what amounts to a theodicy rather than leave God under suspicion of injustice to Israel; indeed, his entire work has been described, in Käsemann's characteristically colorful phrase, as "a colossal detour to the salvation of Israel." The Jewish scholar Boyarin describes Paul as "an important Jewish thinker... [who] lived and died convinced that he was a Jew living out Judaism"; such a description applied to any of our authors, at least on the strength of their attributed extant writings, would be preposterous.

A particularly striking example of divergency between our literature and the undisputed Pauline letters lies in the attitude toward the Law found in the Pastorals (1 Tm 1:8 ff.) and Acts (15:10). In these citations, humans are, regrettably, unable to meet the demands of the Law for obedience; in the central Pauline letters (e.g. Gal 3:19 ff.), the Law is, designedly, unable to meet the needs of humans for salvation.

As noted, Acts provides a partial exception to the general trend of our literature. The apostolic decree, whether it be an implementation of the Law or a compromise with the Law, is certainly an instance of Christianity being held answerable to its Jewish heritage. The same position seems to be implied by

34 Käsemann 241.
35 Boyarin 2.
Paul's portrayal in the later chapters as an observant Jew\textsuperscript{37} who is willing to demonstrate publicly that he has done nothing to undermine the Law (21:21-26)\textsuperscript{38} and whose near-lynching over outrages to Judaism is based on error or falsehood. Acts remains generally within the approach described for the remainder of our literature, with its smooth transition from Judaism to Christianity so different from Paul's veritable agony over the matter in Romans,\textsuperscript{39} and its Pastoral-like attitude to the Law at 15:10. Nevertheless, the decree and the issue of Paul's observance will require explanation when the time comes to account for the origin and survival of the mainline faith, of which, according to this thesis, Acts forms part.

\textsuperscript{37} Beker 57, Barrett \textit{Paul} 164.

\textsuperscript{38} Vielhauer 39 f.

\textsuperscript{39} E. Sanders \textit{Paul} 117.
CHAPTER 8: APOSTOLICITY

In our literature, to be an apostle is to hold unchallengeable authority. This remains true whether the apostle is Paul alone, as in the Pastoral; the Twelve, as often in the early chapters of Acts; Peter and Paul as special cases in 2 Peter, Clement and Ignatius; Paul as a special case in Acts and Polycarp; or all apostles without specification, as at times in 2 Peter, Clement, Ignatius and Polycarp. Their unanimity is affirmed implicitly, as when they are treated as an undifferentiated collectivity, and also explicitly, by special argument, as in 2 Peter (3:2, 15) and perhaps in their portrayal as a deliberative body in Acts 15; and it is never contradicted — even the Pastoral, which use "apostle" only in the singular and only to refer to Paul (1 Tm 1:1, 2:7; 2 Tm 1:1, 11; Tt 1:1), have nothing to say of rivalry for apostolic status.

APOSTLES AS COLLECTIVITY

With the exception of the Pastoral, the apostles are most often portrayed in our literature as a collectivity. This is most striking in Acts, where "apostle" never appears in the singular, even where the plural is awkward from a narrative

1 I find Jervell and others persuasive that Paul does indeed count as an apostle in Acts (Jervell 378 ff., cf. Lüdemann 159). See footnote 9, this chapter.

2 Dibelius-Conzelmann 1, 8, 98.


4 Cf. Farkasfalvy, 124 and elsewhere.

5 Lüdemann 159.
point of view: e.g. 5:29, where "Peter and the apostles" all answer the high priest,\(^6\) and at 8:1, where all the Christians "except the apostles" are driven out of Jerusalem by persecution.\(^7\) "The apostles" are nearly always identified with what are often called "the twelve,"\(^8\) their number made up by the appointment of Matthias to replace the traitor Judas Iscariot, 1:21-26. The only exception, the designation of Paul and Barnabas as apostles at 14:4, 14 is often dismissed as an importation from a source used by Luke in contradiction to his own theology; I accept, however, that the designation is genuine.\(^9\)

The author of 2 Peter claims to be the apostle, singular, "Simeon Peter," but also treats the apostles as a collectivity,

\(^6\) Haenchen 251.

\(^7\) It is often thought "except the apostles" at Acts 8:1 really means "except the Hebrews," i.e. Aramaic-speaking Jewish Christians in contrast to the Greek-speaking "Hellenists" associated with the just-martyred Stephen: Hengel Between 13; cf. Lüdemann 93; Conzelmann Acts 61, Haenchen 297, Marshall Acts 151; differently Munck 71, suggesting that the apostles were unwilling to flee because of Jesus' command to wait in Jerusalem for "the promise of the Father," 1:4. See discussion, Chapter 12.

\(^8\) Hengel (Between 4) correctly notes that only at 6:2 are they actually called "the twelve" in Acts.

\(^9\) So Marshall, Acts 233, Lüdemann 159, both suggesting that Luke may have used both a narrower and a broader concept of apostleship. Lüdemann adds that Luke's custom of using "apostles" only in the plural may preclude use of the title when Paul is acting without Barnabas, as is the case in the bulk of Paul's exploits. Similarly Jervell 378 ff., who says Acts makes of Paul an "Überapostel" by showing him as fulfilling all requirements of apostleship -- seeing the risen Lord, being called, hearing the word of God -- plus holding other qualifications not shared by the twelve, such as a unique personal revelation and key parallels between himself and Jesus' career. Differently Conzelmann Acts 108, Haenchen 114 f. and n. 5, denying that Paul is an apostle in Luke's eyes.
explicitly at 3:2 and implicitly at 1:16-19 ("we"); he apparently regards Paul (3:15, "our beloved brother") as a colleague.\footnote{Hillyer 210.}\footnote{Beker 40.}\footnote{Grant and Graham 78.}\footnote{Schoedel 72.}\footnote{Haenchen 161, Munck 10, Conzelmann \textit{Acts} 12.}\footnote{Sidebottom 110.} 1 Clement uses "apostle" three times in the plural to refer to the undifferentiated group (42:1 f., 44:1)\footnote{CONTACT WITH JESUS} plus twice more to refer to Peter and Paul (5:3, 47:4), and only once in the singular, referring to Paul (47:1).\footnote{CONTACT WITH JESUS}\footnote{CONTACT WITH JESUS}\footnote{CONTACT WITH JESUS}\footnote{CONTACT WITH JESUS}\footnote{CONTACT WITH JESUS} Ignatius' sole singular usage is generic, denying he is an apostle at IgTr 3:3; he uses the plural 13 times, of which all are general (e.g. IgEph 11:2)\footnote{CONTACT WITH JESUS} except IgRom 4:3, a reference to Peter and Paul. Polycarp uses the word twice only, both in the plural: apostles in general at 6:3, Paul and "the other apostles" at 9:1.

CONTACT WITH JESUS

Several of our authors stress direct contact with Jesus as a criterion for apostolicity, above all Acts 1:21-26, in which it is required that the replacement apostle have been present from the beginning of Jesus' ministry,\footnote{CONTACT WITH JESUS} but also in 2 Pt 1:16 ff., in which presence at the transfiguration confirms the apostles' authority.\footnote{CONTACT WITH JESUS} The parallel with Paul's criterion for his own apostolic claim (e.g. 1 Cor 9:1, "Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?") is suggestive, and indeed Munck argues
that the author of Acts has combined Paul's criterion with the concept of the twelve.\textsuperscript{16}

Some sort of direct contact also seems to be indicated at 1 Clem 42:1 ff., at which the apostles receive the gospel from Christ with the assurance of the resurrection,\textsuperscript{17} and may be more distantly implied by the putative Paul's account of his call at 1 Tm 1:12-16, 2:7 and the subjection of the apostles to Christ (but also to the Father) at IgMag 13:2, but these latter two references seem tenuous. No reference to such contact between Christ and the apostles appears in Polycarp, though of course the apostles must have gotten the gospel (6:3) somewhere.

**TEACHING AUTHORITY**

Throughout our literature, apostolicity is equated with authority and with teaching. In the Pastorals the author calls himself "an apostle... a teacher of Gentiles" (1 Tm 2:7) and demands that Timothy "hold to the standard of sound teaching that you have heard from me" (2 Tm 1:13, after claiming apostolicity at v. 11), among many other instructions he obviously expects will be obeyed.

In Acts, the apostles' authority from Jesus and the Holy Spirit is immediately made clear at 1:2,\textsuperscript{18} their teaching is likewise treated as authoritative at 2:42,\textsuperscript{19} and they are shown

\textsuperscript{16} Munck 11 f., cf. Lüdemann 36, Marshall \textit{Acts} 66.

\textsuperscript{17} Grant and Graham 71.

\textsuperscript{18} Haenchen 139.

\textsuperscript{19} Conzelmann \textit{Acts} 23, Marshall \textit{Acts} 83.
exercising supervision of outlying churches and initiatives in various ways: inspecting Philip's conversion of the Samaritans in person (Peter and John, 8:14 ff.) and the Antioch congregation by the delegate Barnabas (11:22) and issuing the apostolic decree in conjunction with the "elders" (15:22 f.).

For 2 Peter, it is the apostles who gave "the commandment of the Lord and Savior" (3:2). For Clement, the apostles are the intermediaries of the gospel from Christ (42:1 ff.) and also exercised authority of appointment of church officials (44:1 f.); they have "perfect foreknowledge" (prognōsis) of future church strife (44:2). Ignatius calls on his readers to obey "the ordinances of the apostles" (IgTr 7:1, cf. IgMag 13:1); current church authorities are to be obeyed as the apostles (IgTr 2:2, IgSm 8:1); and the apostles possessed an authority Ignatius himself does not have or at least will not presume to claim (IgTr 3:3, IgRom 4:3). The apostles even share honor with the Father and Christ at IgTr 12:2. Polycarp speaks of the apostles as having "commanded us," along with Christ himself (6:3).

Apostles are treated as equivalent to the Hebrew prophets at 2 Pt 3:2, IgPhd 9:1 and Poly 6:3, while 1 Clem 43 includes the

---

21 Grant and Graham 71, 73 f.
22 Corwin 195.
23 Grant 166.
24 Differently Sidebottom 118, Christian prophets.
25 Paulsen 119.
prophets who succeeded Moses (v. 1) in the story of Aaron's rod, proposed as a parallel to references to the apostles in chapters 42 and 44. No such parallel is drawn in the Pastorals, whose sole reference to a "prophet" (Tt 1:12) is to a pagan poet, either Epimenides or Callimachus,\textsuperscript{26} nor in Acts, which never compares either Hebrew (e.g. 2:16) or Christian (e.g. 11:27) prophets to the apostles.

HANDING ON AUTHORITY

Arrangements for some sort of continuity of apostolic authority are discussed by all our authors except Polycarp, though it is outside the scope of this paper to decide whether or to what degree any of these arrangements amount to "apostolic succession." The author of the Pastorals is much concerned to hand on the faith to his "loyal" (\textit{gnēsios}, literally "legitimate") "children" Timothy and Titus (1 Tm 1:2, Tt 1:4), so that they may in turn pass it on (2 Tm 2:2, cf. Tt 1:5) within a church which is the "pillar and bulwark of the truth" (1 Tm 3:15). In addition, the references to Timothy and Titus' legitimacy may mark them out as authoritative successors.\textsuperscript{27}

2 Pt 1:15 speaks of arrangements to keep Peter's teachings before the readers after he is dead; this could mean the Gospel

\textsuperscript{26} Hanson 176 f.

\textsuperscript{27} Hultgren I-II Tm 53; differently Dibelius-Conzelmann 13, suggesting it may just be a polite way of speaking, differently also Fee 36, noting that Paul uses the same adjective for an unnamed or at least not particularly distinguished fellow-worker at NT Phil 4:3. Dibelius and Conzelmann (8) say the Pastorals have no developed general concept of apostolic authority, still less of succession: apostolicity consists entirely in having the true faith.
of Mark, traditionally associated with Peter, but this is unlikely for chronological reasons if 2 Peter is indeed a late pseudonymous work. Some sort of authoritative mechanism, for interpretation of scripture at least, is suggested by 1:20 ("no prophecy of scripture is a matter of one's own interpretation").

1 Clem 44:2 clearly provides for continuity of some sort in the ministry of those appointed by the apostles, regardless of whether "if they should fall asleep" has as its antecedent the apostles themselves or those previously appointed by them. This continuity allows Clement to clothe his own words with the authority of God (59:1) and the Holy Spirit (63:2). Ignatius credits the presbytery with the authority of the apostles (IgTr 2:2) and the bishop with that of God himself (IgMag 6:1, 13:2)

Acts, too, reflects provision for transfer of authority; the authority is that of Paul, accepted here as an apostle in the context of Acts. (See discussion earlier in chapter.) In his farewell speech at Miletus, Paul charges the elders of the church in Ephesus to guard the teaching he has imparted from the

---

28 So Hillyer 172 ff., accepting Petrine authorship.

29 Sidebottom 109.

30 So Sidebottom 111, Reicke 158 f.; differently Hillyer 181, translating with the NIV "the prophet's own interpretation." This requires supplying an unstated "the prophet's" to go with idios, "own," but this is not altogether implausible.

31 Brown "Rome" 174 ff, Grant 161.

32 Brown "Rome" 175, cf. Grant 42.
"wolves" who will threaten their "flock" with distortions of the truth (20:28-32). Polycarp says nothing about any arrangements of this kind, but he too cites apostolic authority handed down from bygone days (6:3).

SUMMARY: PAUL AND THE MAINLINE FAITH

There is a pattern of agreement in our literature on the authoritative, collective nature of apostolicity, derived from a special relationship to Jesus and passed on (as teaching if not necessarily as personal authority) to successors, though there are many variations from author to author, most notably the Pastor's exclusive concentration on Paul.

Many of the notes of apostolicity to be found in our literature are also to be found in Paul's undisputed letters, but in a less simplistic form. Paul, too, values the apostles as an authoritative collectivity, and emphasizes unanimity of apostolic teaching, including his own, so far as possible (Gal 1:17 ff., 2:2 ff., 1 Cor 15:7, 11). But he is willing to differentiate himself from other apostles (Gal 1:11 f., 17; 1 Cor 15:8 ff.) and even to disagree with them (Gal 2:11 ff.). He is also unable simply to cite his apostolicity, but must argue for it (e.g. 1 Cor 9:1 f.).

The undisputed letters, however, show no interest in the handing on of authority via approved human channels; rather, Paul

---

33 Conzelmann Acts 175.
34 Ziesler 3, Bornkamm 21, 36 f.
35 Beker 38, Barrett Paul 126, Ziesler 3.
insists that his own apostleship and gospel are from God rather than from any human authority (Gal 1:1, 11 f.). Thus, Käsemann regards our literature's treatment of Paul as a participant in "apostolic succession" as a totally non-Pauline fiction invented to justify changes -- appropriate enough in themselves -- made by later church leaders when Paul's own purely lay, purely charismatic church government proved impractical. Beker suggests that the Pastor accomplished this by means of exaggerated stress on those passages in the undisputed letters where Paul presents himself as "an uncompromising, orthodox figure," of which Gal 1:8 f., the cursing of those who proclaim a gospel contrary to his own, is perhaps the most spectacular. To be sure, it is also possible to exaggerate Paul's independent-mindedness; it seems likely, for example, that it is his understanding of the relationship between Christians and the Law, rather than the entire Christian message, which he claims not to have received from human authority. Nonetheless, it is obvious that, at a minimum, the concern in our literature for the handing on of authority is not paralleled in anything like the same degree in Paul's undisputed letters.

36 Bornkamm 166 ff.
37 Käsemann 245 ff., esp. 247.
38 Beker 85 f.
CHAPTER 9: THE PORTRAIT OF PAUL

Paul, or an image of Paul, plays a dominant role in the Pastorals and in Acts, a lesser one in the rest of our literature. Paul is always shown in a positive light, though that tribute is sometimes thought grudging in the case of 2 Peter.¹

The author of the Pastorals presents himself as Paul, appointed apostle by God (1 Tm 1:1, 2 Tm 1:1, Tt 1:3), especially to the Gentiles (1 Tm 2:7, 2 Tm 4:17). He is the only apostle mentioned. The author has always worshipped (latreuō, BAGD "serve") God with a clear conscience, like his Jewish ancestors (2 Tm 1:3), but before his call was a blasphemer, persecutor and man of violence (1 Tm 1:13). He has since undergone much suffering and persecution (2 Tm 3:11) as well as desertion by his friends (2 Tm 4:16), and expects to be martyred soon (2 Tm 4:6).

Sixteen of Acts' 28 chapters are devoted entirely or predominantly to Paul's career. Initially referred to as Saul, he is a young Pharisee present at the stoning of Stephen (7:58, 23:6) and becomes a leader in the persecution of Christians (9:1 f.) until a preternatural encounter with Jesus on the road to Damascus leaves him blinded (9:3-9). Through a Damascene Christian, he is healed and receives a commission to preach Jesus' name to the Gentiles and to Israel (9:10-19), and commences doing so at once. After years of extensive missionary activities and travels he is arrested in Jerusalem on false

¹ E.g. Koester 297.
charges (21:27 ff.), and following defences before Jewish and Roman authorities he appeals to the emperor and is sent to Rome by ship for trial (25:12, 27:1 ff.). He is last seen under house arrest in Rome, preaching the gospel freely for two years (28:30 f.).

The Paul of Acts is an observant Jew who preaches first to the Jews in each community he visits (see discussion above, Chapter 7). He is an impressive orator (21:40 and often). He closely resembles Peter in the content and number of his speeches, and in other exploits such as miracles of healing (14:8 f., 3:2 f.), raisings from the dead (20:10, 9:40 f.), exorcisms (16:16, 5:16), miraculous escapes from prison (16:23 f., 12:2 ff.), conflicts with magicians (19:13 ff., 8:14 ff.) and visions from God (22:17 ff., 10:10 ff.). Nevertheless he is called "apostle" only in two verses of chapter 14 (but see discussion above, my Chapter 8).

In 2 Peter, Paul is "our beloved brother" (3:15) who wrote the same thing as the author, i.e. that it is important to await the parousia "without spot or blemish" (v. 14), despite the fact that his "hard to understand" writings were being distorted to imply a different position (v. 16). The author knows of several Pauline letters ("all his letters," v. 16). Paul is not explicitly called an apostle, but as a "brother" of one who does make the claim (1:1), whose advice is represented as the same as that of "your apostles" (v. 2) and whose writings are equated

---

2 Beker 51; in each pair of citations Paul's exploit is cited first, then Peter's.
with "the other scriptures" (v. 16), it seems likely that he is included.  

Clement brackets Paul with Peter as apostles and "pillars" (5:2 ff.), the latter expression a notorious homogenization of Paul's image in view of Paul's own ironic use of the word to describe leaders with whom he was on somewhat prickly terms at Gal. 2:9.  

Clement's account of his career follows: "Through jealousy and strife Paul showed the way to the prize of endurance; seven times he was in bonds, he was exiled, he was stoned, he was a herald both in the East and in the West, he gained the noble fame of his faith, he taught righteousness to all the world, and when he had reached the limits of the West he gave his testimony before the rulers, and thus passed from the world and was taken up into the Holy Place,—the greatest example of endurance." (5:5-7). Clement, writing to rebuke strife in the Corinthian church of his own day, also cites Paul's criticism of partisanship from 1 Cor 1 (47:1-4), again calling him an apostle (v. 1) and implicitly bracketing him with Peter (v. 4). Clement's citation of this and other passages from 1 Corinthians demonstrates that he knows or is confident the Corinthian Christians have a copy of that letter and will not be surprised that he, too, has a copy; it also demonstrates that he regards Paul's admonitions as having continuing validity (as well as apostolic authority) three decades after his death.  

---

3 So Sidebottom 125.  
4 Brown "Rome" 123.  
5 Lindemann "Apostolic" 30 ff.
quotes NT Romans and possibly 2 Corinthians, Galatians and NT Philippians, and among disputed Pauline letters possibly NT Ephesians, Colossians, 1 Timothy and Titus as well as the account of Paul's career in Acts.

Ignatius describes Paul (with Peter) as an apostle (IgRom 4:3) and as a model for Christian martyrs (soon to include Ignatius himself), "fellow-initiates of Paul, who was sanctified, who was right blessed, in whose footsteps may I be found when I shall attain to God, who in every Epistle makes mention of you [the church at Ephesus] in Christ Jesus" (IgEph 12:2). His own allusion to himself as the least of the church in Syria, unworthy and "born out of time" (IgRom 9:2) is also an apparent allusion to (if not identification with) Paul's comment regarding his own status as an apostle at NT 1 Cor 15:8 ff. It is clear from IgEph 12:2, "in every epistle," that he is aware of multiple Pauline letters. He quotes extensively from 1 Corinthians ("Ignatius must have known this epistle almost by heart," says W.R. Inge), and with some probability from NT Romans, Galatians, NT Philippians, and possibly 2 Corinthians, 1 Thessalonians and Philemon, as well as NT Ephesians, all three Pastorals, and possibly Colossians and 2 Thessalonians among disputed letters.

---

6 NTAF 37 ff., 137 f.
7 Grant 39.
8 Grant 59.
9 Grant 57.
10 NTAF 67.
11 NTAF 63 ff., 137 f.
Ignatius' two mentions of Paul by name, in his letters to Ephesus and Rome (IgEph 12:2, IgRom 4:3), suggest that he is aware of traditions concerning Paul's doings in those cities.\(^\text{12}\)

Polycarp credits "the blessed and glorious Paul" with teaching "accurately and steadfastly the word of truth" in person and with writing letters to enable readers to "build yourselves up into the faith given you" (3:2). His wisdom is far above that of Polycarp himself and his colleagues (3:2).\(^\text{13}\) Polycarp singles Paul out among "the other apostles" when praising them and current martyrs for their endurance (9:1). Paul is cited from 1 Cor 6:2 as teaching that "the saints shall judge the world" (11:2) and Polycarp notes that Paul worked among the Philippians, to whom Polycarp is writing (11:3). In addition to 1 Corinthians, Polycarp probably cites NT Romans, 2 Corinthians and Galatians and possibly NT Philippians, plus NT Ephesians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Timothy and possibly Colossians among disputed Pauline letters.\(^\text{14}\) However many Pauline letters he may know, Polycarp's statement that Paul wrote "letters [plural] to you [i.e. second-century Philippian Christians]" (3:2) indicates that he considers Paul's writings to be of continuing validity entirely apart from their historical addressees and situations.\(^\text{15}\)

\(^{12}\) Schoedel 73, 176 f.

\(^{13}\) Paulsen 116.

\(^{14}\) NTAF 84 ff., 137 f.; Grant (67) thinks Polycarp knew all the Pauline epistles except Philemon, and possibly also knew Acts.

\(^{15}\) Lindemann "Apostolic" 41 f.
SUMMARY: PAUL AND THE MAINLINE FAITH

Throughout our literature, Paul's authority is above serious question. There are echoes of controversy: the Paul of the Pastorals blurs out that he is not lying (1 Tm 2:7), and tells of his allies' desertion (2 Tm 4:16). In Acts, the genuineness of his conversion and the validity of his missionary methods are questioned by certain Christians (9:26 ff., 15:2 ff., 21:20 ff.). His letters are "twisted" by "the ignorant and unstable" at 2 Pt 3:16, and he is the victim of "jealousy and strife" (likely enough among Christians) at 1 Clem 5:7. But the intra-Christian disputes in Acts are settled in the most irenic fashion, while repudiating Paul's "difficult" and evidently inconvenient letters is obviously not an option for 2 Peter; the "not lying" protest is far outweighed by the calm general assertion of Paul's authority throughout the Pastorals, and Clement is using Paul's name without hesitation to call the Corinthians to heel. Paul, too, claims the authority of an apostle, but his exercise of the claim is by no means untroubled,

16 Brown "Rome" 124 ff.
17 References to Paul's martyrdom by Ignatius (IgEph 12:2) and Polycarp (9:1) do not count as "controversy" in this context since they presumably involve non-Christian persecutors.
18 The subsequent trouble in Chapter 21 is blamed on the presumably non-Christian "Jews from Asia" (v. 27) and not on the "believers among the Jews" of v. 20.
19 Koester (297) is convinced the author of 2 Peter would have preferred Paul had written no such letters, but still he had no choice but to treat them as authoritative.
as he is well aware (e.g. 2 Cor 10-13, especially 12:11 f.; Gal 1:1).²⁰

Paul is presented as at one with the other apostles in all our literature except the Pastorals, which mention no other apostles.²¹ He is bracketed with Peter in a stereotyped fashion by Clement (1 Clem 5:2 ff.) and Ignatius (IgRom 4:3), by explicit argument in 2 Peter (3:15 f.), and by a tour de force of literary parallels in Acts,²² while Polycarp does not mention Peter but lists Paul with "the other apostles" (9:1). As already noted, Paul accepts the collective nature of apostolicity to some degree (1 Cor 15:11), but he is, naturally enough, well aware of his own individuality (see examples above, Chapter 8, also 1 Cor 9:5 f.).

²⁰ Barrett Paul 34 ff., Ziesler 3.
²² Beker 51.
CHAPTER 10: THE MAINLINE FAITH -- RESULTS OF THE INVENTORY

The criteria for mainline teachings specified in Chapter 1, for use in the inventory of our literature, were that they should be

1) general or recurrent in our literature, and
2) in discernible contrast or tension with Paul's teachings.

A high percentage of the items noted in the preceding seven chapters are excluded from further discussion by one or the other of these criteria. The divinity or otherwise of Jesus would thus be excluded under criterion 1: there is no agreement in our literature, at least on the level of unequivocal explicit statement. There is agreement about the resurrection, but that would be excluded under criterion 2: Paul believes in it too.

But there are still a number of points where our authors, though not in unanimous diametrical opposition to Paul, are mostly grouped near one end of a continuum while Paul is much nearer the other end. The use of dikaiosuné, righteousness, and its cognates will serve as an example (see above, chapters 4 and 6). The word can mean "a gift of right-standing with God,"⁴ or mere moral uprightness; our literature uses it both ways, and so does Paul. But for Paul the former meaning is overwhelmingly dominant, the latter rare and uncharacteristic; in our literature the latter, moralizing meaning is common and found in all our

---

⁴ Fee 24, cf. E. Sanders Palestinian 544, (essentially) "saved."
authors, while the former or classically Pauline meaning (or even a superficial approach to it) is rare.

The following teachings from our literature seem to be grouped at the opposite end from Paul in much the same way:

Creedal matters (Chapter 3): Our authors all mention the crucifixion, but they place noticeably less stress on Christ's death, and especially on the cross, than Paul does in his undisputed letters, where Christ's death and the cross are given a central and well-defined role.

All our authors call Jesus "savior" except Clement, who makes the same point with a verb instead of a noun. For all, the expressions are used in the present tense and often in a static and conventional manner. Paul's single reference to Jesus as "savior" (NT Phil 3:20) and his sole additional reference to Jesus as saving (NT Rom 5:9) are in the future tense.

Salvation (Chapter 4): Atonement, repentance and forgiveness of sins (in the plural and conceived of as transgressions), are characteristic concepts in our literature. Atonement language of various kinds is found in all our authors, repentance in all except Polycarp, and forgiveness in all except Ignatius and the Pastorals. All habitually refer to sin as transgression, and only Polycarp, once, uses the term in an apparent reference to a reified power. For Paul sin, in the singular, is usually a reified entity, and in his characteristic soteriology it is not so much forgiven or atoned for as broken in its power by Christ's action on the cross, in which the believer participates. Atonement language is found mainly in pre-Pauline passages, and
references to repentance and especially to forgiveness are minimal.

All our authors cite human effort as a factor in salvation;\(^2\) such effort plays only a minor part in Paul's undisputed letters.

The role of doctrine (Chapter 5): Expressions referring to sound doctrine, and especially the use of "the faith" to refer to doctrinal content, are found in all our authors; they are much rarer in Paul's undisputed letters. Paul ordinarily means something very different by "faith."

Our literature often uses doctrinal terms to refer to conduct. The difference from Paul's undisputed letters is not only quantitative but qualitative: our literature tends to make the call to moral, indeed holy, living a central element in the gospel, while for Paul, Christian morals are a consequence of the gospel, made possible by the cross.

Christian life (Chapter 6): Our literature's characteristic use of dikaiosunē to mean moral uprightness is quite different from Paul's characteristic use of the word to mean right-standing with God, although both Paul and our authors occasionally adopt the opposite usage. Godliness, referred to positively by four of our authors, appears in the undisputed letters only in a paradoxical sense ("Christ died for the ungodly," NT Rom 5:6) entirely different from its use in our literature. Conscience, mentioned by all our authors (implicitly in 2 Peter); good works or deeds, referred to positively by the Pastorals, Acts, Clement

\(^2\) Defined, as in Chapter 4, as "a good ultimate outcome."
and Ignatius; and the rules of bourgeois morality, found in all our authors, all play a much larger role in our literature than in Paul's undisputed works.

Judaism (Chapter 7): In our literature, Judaism has been unproblematically superseded by Christianity. This is not so much a formal theory of supersession, except to some degree in Acts, as a casual assumption of supersession. Judaism's only importance is as a precursor of the gospel, and its contents are available to Christian thinkers to disregard or to appropriate, as they see fit. For Paul, at least in NT Romans and Galatians, Judaism is a major continuing concern which remains normative for him in a very real sense despite his radical critique and reinterpretations.

Acts, while generally fitting into this characterization of our literature, forms a partial exception, in that the apostolic decree and the emphasis on Paul's observance do appear to give Judaism some normative status. Any theory explaining the origin and transmission of the mainline faith will have to take account of this apparent anomaly.

Apostolicity (Chapter 8): Apostles appear in varying configurations in our literature, but their authority and unanimity are beyond argument. In Paul's undisputed letters, their authority and unanimity are valued and cited where possible, but he does not hesitate to argue with his counterparts where he thinks it necessary.

Arrangements for continuity of apostolic teaching are mentioned by all our authors except Polycarp, and presumed by
Polycarp. Paul acknowledges having "received" certain teachings, apparently from predecessors, but he stresses his individual commissioning by Christ, and he shows no interest in handing on his teaching by means of approved human channels.

The portrait of Paul (Chapter 9): The Paul of our literature is an apostle whose authority is unquestionable and who stands in unanimity with the other apostles. The Paul of the undisputed letters is well aware that his authority is not universally accepted, and sometimes opposes his fellow apostles.

THE MAINLINE FAITH: A SUMMARY

I return now to the questions posed in Chapter 1. Is it possible to find a mainline faith in our literature that unites these highly varied writings -- and unites them over against Paul? If so, what is its content? Where did it come from? And when did it arise -- before Paul, in Paul's own time, or after his death?

The foregoing list of inventory results provides an answer to the first of these questions: Yes, there is such a mainline faith, provided we don't use too demanding a standard for what counts as "united" or "over against Paul." Our literature is not homogenous, and it does not radically contradict Paul; nevertheless, I submit that there is enough material of enough consistency across our literature and in enough tension with the characteristic teachings of the undisputed letters to be worth further discussion under the title of the mainline faith.

The inventory results also provide an answer to the second question: what is the content of the mainline faith? The answer
is, of course, provided strictly in terms of differences between the mainline faith and Paul's characteristic theology; it is obvious that our authors also agree on numerous points with Paul (for example, the resurrection), but that will not be our concern here.

The foregoing inventory of our primary literature was broken down into seven topics, based on types of questions to which the literature naturally gives rise. The answers to those questions, however, overlap somewhat, and from now on I shall arrange the content in natural groupings suggested by the answers.

The role of Christ: Christ is (present tense) the savior. He has brought about atonement for sins; his death is a key element in that, but there is no very detailed awareness of how his death brought about such results, or how it relates to other aspects of the gospel. In any event, forgiveness of sins is now offered, and may be appropriated by repentance.

The role of the Christian: what might be called Christian morals, or holiness of life, is preached as a central part of the gospel. This is shown especially by the association of good conduct with "the faith" and other doctrinal terms, and even with "the gospel" itself (1 Tm 1:11); but also by the tying of salvation to human effort (without, however, going so far as to proclaim salvation by works); the frequent use of dikaiosuné in a moralizing sense; and the many references to conscience, works or deeds, and the rules of bourgeois morality.

The role of Judaism: with the two noted exceptions from Acts (the apostolic decree and Paul's insistence on his own faultless
observance), Judaism plays about the same role it does in modern Christianity: it has served its purpose and Christians need no longer concern themselves with it, except as they may find it edifying to do so.

The role of Paul and the apostles: In our literature the apostles, including Paul, always act in concert. They are the continuing guarantors of the true faith (in the sense of "faith" most common in our literature), and arrangements have been made to enable that guarantee to survive their deaths.

In general, our literature clusters near the commonsensical, general and anthropocentric end of the continuum (or as commonsensical and anthropocentric as a religion of crucified Messiah and risen Lord can be), while Paul in his undisputed letters favor the paradoxical, specific and theocentric end. To reduce it all to a single clumsy sentence, the picture of the mainline faith as found in our literature is of belief in a Christ whose crucifixion and resurrection are loosely understood as leading to forgiveness of sins and calling for a great holiness of life, as unceremoniously superseding Judaism (with the exceptions noted in Acts) and as preached in a trustworthy manner by the unanimous consent of the apostles and those subsequently entrusted with their work.

Still outstanding are the remaining questions from Chapter 1: Where did the mainline faith come from? When did it arise -- before Paul, in Paul's own time, or after his death? The next four chapters will be devoted to answering those questions. I shall first consider three influential theories about what is
happening in our literature, to see what light they may shed on
the mainline faith (Chapter 11); I shall then present my own
proposed explanation, and deal with objections to it (Chapters 12
and 13); and I shall complete the process by returning to the
summary of the mainline faith just given, to see what has been
learned about each of its tenets (Chapter 14).

THE QUESTION OF PRE-PAULINE TRADITION

First, however, one more consideration should be dealt with
in a systematic way. I have referred several times to passages in
the undisputed letters which a scholarly consensus regards as
"pre-Pauline," either because Paul himself says he is handing on
what he received (e.g. 1 Cor 15:3) or because they stand out from
their surroundings for literary or theological reasons. Since
one of our questions is whether all or some of the mainline faith
arose before Paul, it will be well to have a list of mainline
teachings which can be found in such passages.

This list, however, is a very short one, encompassing only
atonement (and perhaps forgiveness) and, to a much less
impressive degree, the call to holy living and human effort.
Atonement language is found in NT Rom 3:25, "whom [Christ Jesus,
v. 24] God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement\(^4\) by his blood"
and "passed over the sins previously committed;" NT Rom 4:25,
"[Jesus, v. 24] was handed over to death for our trespasses;" 1
Cor 15:3, "Christ died for our sins;" and Gal 1:4, "[Jesus

\(^3\) Cf. Fitzmyer "Pauline" 1386, Ziesler 19 f., 93.

\(^4\) See more detailed discussion below, Chapter 13.
Christ, v. 3] gave himself for our sins.\(^5\) The call to holy living and human effort is most clearly found at 1 Thess 4:1-8, a paranetic passage and vice list with a reference to pleasing God (v. 1) and a statement that "God did not call us to impurity but to holiness. Therefore whoever rejects this rejects not human authority but God..." (v. 7-8a). Gal 5:19-21 contains a vice list with a warning that "those who do such things will not inherit the kingdom of God."\(^6\) That these two points of the mainline faith originated before Paul is of course useful information, but it does not yet tell us where they originated, nor either when or where the remaining tenets originated. That work still lies ahead of us.

\(^5\) Barrett Paul 24, Bornkamm 113, 116, Dodd 13 f., Fitzmyer "Romans" 843, "Pauline" 1386, Schoedel 9 n. 54, Ziesler 20, 92.

PART III: EXPLANATIONS

CHAPTER 11: DECLINE AND PAUL?

If a mainline faith -- a theological stream characteristic of our literature and distinguishable from classical Paulinism -- is indeed to be discerned in our literature, as I have argued, the next task is to determine its origin. I shall first devote this chapter to examining three influential theories on this subject, at least two of which tend to see the characteristic content of our literature -- what I have called the mainline faith -- primarily as a decline from the purity of Pauline thought.

OUR BELOVED, DIFFICULT BROTHER

Paul was a religious genius. If his successors have misunderstood him, well, that is what lesser minds make of genius. The mainline faith is solely a matter of development -- downhill development -- from Paul himself, via poor understanding of his writings and/or overenthusiastic appropriation of the "positive Pauline legend."¹ I present this explanation as a sort of ideal type, one obvious logical possibility and one which has had a sizeable influence on many theories about our literature, but I should stress that few if any serious scholars actually hold it in quite so simplistic a form, i.e. as explaining without remainder what I have called the mainline faith.

¹ Barrett "Controversies" 243.
Negative characterizations of the fall from Paul abound in the secondary literature. Barrett describes the authors of Acts, the Pastorals and other canonical deutero-Pauline works as "epigoni" (Webster, "undistinguished imitators"), a term also applied by Baus to the Apostolic Fathers including all three of our non-canonical authors. In addition, Barrett attributes the relative theological timidity of Acts, the Pastorals and 1 Clement in large part to "the lower potential of his [Paul's] successors." Dunn speaks almost contemptuously of "the Paul of the Pastorals, the Paul of Acts" in comparison to the real Paul. Corwin cites the Pastorals, Clement, and to a lesser degree her own subject, Ignatius, as examples of "the general decline from Paul's use of faith as trust in God." Beker describes Acts as "an acute deformation and distortion of the historical Paul," and says the Pastorals have made a simple and straightforward Paul out of the author of so many difficult letters.²

A similar point is often made in a less pejorative way. "Development" from Paul, in a more or less neutral though seldom flattering sense, is a standard category in analysis of our literature and of other canonical deutero-Pauline works. Koester's principal discussion of all our literature except Acts is to be found in a chapter entitled "The Transformation of Pauline Theology into Ecclesiastical Doctrine." Beker treats all canonical deutero-Pauline works plus Acts as adaptations of Paul's message to later circumstances, and his evaluation is

² Barrett "Controversies" 245, 242, Baus 137, Dunn 296, Corwin 240 n. 3, Beker 92, 107.
partly positive in all cases except that of Acts. Ziesler speaks of the deutero-Paulines and Acts as "a second wave of Paulinism." Roetzel's chapter on the deutero-Pauline canonical books is entitled "The First Interpreters of Paul."\(^3\) To the extent that this approach considers "development" to be a response to external factors (including the mere passage of time), its merits will be largely those of the "early catholicism" explanation to be considered later in this chapter; for the present, however, what I am discussing is the possibility that decline or development from Paul to the mainline faith is entirely a matter of factors internal to Pauline Christianity.

The assertion that our literature embodies a decline from Paul is really two assertions, one of which is more relevant to this thesis than the other. "Decline" is a value judgement which lies outside the scope of this discussion, and in any case I don't intend to argue that any of our authors, even Luke or Ignatius, is as profound a theologian as Paul.\(^4\)

But while "decline" is a value judgement, "from Paul" is a factual judgement, and as such more relevant to the present thesis. That, at a minimum, all our literature has some teaching

\[\text{3 Koester 261 ff., Beker passim, Ziesler 127, Roetzel 131 ff.}\]

\[\text{4 Indeed, the Pastorals are of such a theological character that those who support Pauline authorship often explain their differences from the undisputed letters by reference to Paul's loss of fire in his old age or to their being drafted by a secretary (e.g. Kelly 25 ff.); even Guthrie, an ardent defender of authenticity, suggests that Paul "descended from his formative thinking" to write them (Guthrie Pastoral 46 f., emphasis added).}\]
"from Paul" can scarcely be denied. Acts 13:38 f. and Tt 3:7, among other passages, are clearly influenced by Pauline theology even if that theology is poorly understood;\(^5\) Paul does indeed teach ethics as well as eschatology, as 2 Pt 3:14 ff. claims;\(^6\) and all three of our non-canonical authors quote freely from the undisputed Pauline letters. But if "from Paul" be taken in a maximal sense -- implying that their raw material, as it were, is from Paul alone -- it is inaccurate. So taken, it would mean that, while the gospel as our authors understand it is a garbled or debased version of what Paul taught, still they owe it entirely to Paul that they know anything at all about it.

As already noted, it is questionable whether any serious scholar does hold this position in so maximal a form. Most of those cited earlier who interpret our literature as a development from Paul also acknowledge Paul's dependence on earlier Christian teaching,\(^7\) as demonstrated by the existence of pre-Pauline material in the undisputed letters. Add to that the fact that, at least, Ignatius' Antioch and Clement's Rome were evangelized before Paul ever set foot there,\(^8\) and a theory making Paul the only source of the gospel for our authors becomes not so much an ideal type as a straw scholar.

---

\(^5\) Ziesler 135, Barrett *Paul* 158.

\(^6\) Sidebottom 125.

\(^7\) E.g. Koester 92, Ziesler 19 ff., Roetzel 72 ff., Barrett "Controversies" 24, 105, Beker 124.

\(^8\) E.g. Koester 91 ff., 93 f.
But while the development/decline-from-Paul approach to our literature does not necessarily imply that the gospel in the form in which it came down the centuries originated with Paul, it does seem to imply in a loose sort of way that the gospel as it survived in historical Christianity (i.e. not in an observant Jewish form, not in a gnosticizing form) passed entirely through Paul, reaching its high point or at least its classical statement in his principal letters, and ever afterward counted as "Pauline" Christianity even when found in a debased or distorted condition. On this showing, then, our literature would stand, awkwardly to be sure, in an entirely Pauline stream, and any development or deformation such literature might show would be attributable to causes entirely internal to that stream. This is obviously contrary to the claims noted in Chapter 1, which imply the existence of an external theological force deforming or submerging Pauline theology -- a force I have called the mainline faith; but of course those claims, or some of them, remain to be proved. So it will be appropriate to see how this explanation serves to account for the chief features of the mainline faith as identified in Chapter 10.

The role of Christ, and the role of the Christian: I have characterized the gospel of the mainline faith as a proclamation of a Christ whose crucifixion and resurrection are imprecisely

---

9 Cf. Dunn 239, Koester 281.

10 I have argued (Chapter 10) that something worth calling the mainline faith can be found in our literature, but I have not yet argued that it can be attributed to an outside force.
understood as atoning for sin, and as a call for lives lived in great holiness. As Paul's theology is at no point anything like diametrically opposed to this form of preaching, there is some plausibility in explaining this aspect of the mainline faith in accordance with a fall-from-Paul theory, more or less as follows: The original preaching or tradition was imprecise and moralistic; the theological genius Paul provided a far more precise account of the working of Christ's death and resurrection, plus an explanation of Christian morality deeply undercutting the commonsensical "this is what we have to do to be saved"; but his explanations were so profound and so paradoxical that they were largely lost on his successors, so that in our literature characteristically Pauline ideas are inserted awkwardly and without comprehension (e.g. at Acts 13:33 f.) in works that have for the most part fallen back to a pre-Pauline understanding.

I would argue myself that this is true up to a point. Atonement language and the call to holiness do appear in pre-Pauline passages; Paul did modify that understanding in the direction of greater profundity and paradox; and our authors, though all influenced in some measure by Paul, did "fall back" to a largely pre-Pauline position in these areas. But if the "hard to understand" Pauline formulations could not command assent (or even comprehension) across time, it seems unlikely that they would have done so across space. There were Christian communities like Antioch and Rome that Paul did not evangelize, as well as other areas where he was unwilling to "build on someone else's foundation" (NT Rom 15:20); he had no real authority in such
communities, which probably made up the majority of Christians of the day.\textsuperscript{11} There is no reason to imagine that Christians in these places, even those who took theology seriously, had ever abandoned whatever "pre-Pauline" understanding they had to become Paulinists. It seems more probable that the mainline faith reflects not only an understanding returned to, but an understanding that was always alive and influential.

The role of Judaism: The development or decline hypothesis is much less plausible here. Opposition between the mainline faith and Pauline theology is spectacular. Judaism still means everything to Paul, no matter how obnoxious his views might be to Jews who did not share them; with the exceptions noted in Acts (see Chapter 7), Judaism qua Judaism means nothing in our literature. That Paul's passion for his people should diminish in influence after his death, in a church increasingly Gentile and increasingly estranged sociologically from both Judaism and Jewish Christianity, would not in itself be surprising. But it is difficult to see how Paul's attitude could have come to be so stood on its head if the mainline faith were entirely a development within a Pauline stream; much more plausible is the hypothesis of an external tradition which had always been very casual about its Jewish heritage.

The role of Paul and the apostles: There would seem to me to be no possibility whatever that a tradition developed entirely within a Pauline stream could have come to put so much weight on

\textsuperscript{11} Koester 91 ff., 93 f., 106 f., 139 f., Baus 111, Conzelmann \textit{History} 68, cf. 112.
Paul's grudging references to apostolic agreement and so little (in fact, none at all) on his lively disputes with other apostles or apostolic claimants, not to mention treating Peter with the deference shown by all our authors except the Pastor. A "development" explanation that allows for external factors could, however, offer better results in this area, and to this I now turn.

PAUL AS ROCK: EARLY CATHOLICISM

A special case of the development/decline explanation is the "early catholicism" hypothesis. Kasemann defines "early catholicism" as "that transition from earliest Christianity to the so-called ancient church, which is completed with the disappearance of the imminent expectation [of the parousia]." Dunn associates early catholicism with three central points: the end of imminent expectation, the formalization of church structure, and the formalization of doctrine.\(^{12}\) All our literature is frequently held to exemplify early catholicism,\(^{13}\) and while this thesis has not focused on Dunn's first two points, it is clear that our literature displays more of all these characteristics than the undisputed Pauline letters.

In contrast to the mere failure of Paul's successors to understand his theology, which might be an internal phenomenon, the early catholicism explanation suggests that Christianity modified itself in response to external factors such as the

---

\(^{12}\) Kasemann 237, Dunn 344.

\(^{13}\) E.g. Kasemann 239, 246 f., Dunn 346 ff., 358, 361 f.
apparent delay of the parousia, heretical teachings, and lack of
good order in the church. Nonetheless, any deutero-Pauline
early catholicism would count as a development of Pauline
thought, and most commentators (with the exception of later
Catholics) consider early catholicism to be a decline from
Pauline purity. The question for this thesis, however, is
whether early catholicism, or the forces that produced it, can
stand as a sufficient explanation of the origin of the mainline
faith described in Chapter 10. I shall once again consider the
chief features of the mainline faith, in reverse order this time
for reasons of emphasis.

The role of Paul and the apostles: It could, perhaps, be
argued that the formal understanding of apostolic teaching found
in our literature had a primitive or at least very early origin,
and that Paul does not mention this in his undisputed letters
because he had no particular reason to do so, or because he
disagreed with it. Early catholicism theorists seem, however, to
have a stronger case, that the dying out of imminent expectation
and the conviction that "the faith" must be buttressed against
heresy for the long haul was the decisive factor in bringing
about the degree of formalization visible in our literature. And in a society lacking our own easy acceptance of the
inevitability and propriety of change, such development could

14 Dunn 344, Käsemann 247 f.
15 E.g. Käsemann 249 f.
16 Käsemann 241 ff., 247.
only be justified by a one-sided emphasis on its continuity (if even that is not too modern a term) with Christianity's roots as embodied in Paul and the other apostles. Consequently, it seems most likely that this feature of the mainline faith — the emphasis on apostolicity and sound doctrine, with its conforming picture of Paul — is of relatively late origin and best explained as part of the phenomenon of early catholicism, rather than as part of a pre-Pauline or extra-Pauline stream of Christianity.

The role of Judaism: There is much less to go on here, as the central features of early catholicism have little to do with Judaism as such. But as with the development/decline explanation in general, the very sharp opposition between our literature and the undisputed Pauline letters on the matter of Judaism speaks against the likelihood that the attitude in our literature is simply the result of the action of after-the-fact trends on the teaching of Paul; an extra-Pauline stream with a different view of Judaism from his seems a far more likely candidate. At any rate there is no evidence that early catholic trends produced our literature's characteristic attitude.

The role of Christ and the role of the Christian: The early catholic drive toward what might be called safety of doctrine would in all likelihood have favored what I have described as our literature's commonsensical attitude toward atonement for sins and Christian ethics over Paul's much more paradoxical approach.

17 Käsemann 247 f., cf. Meyer 23 f.
But as these same attitudes are also reflected in the pre-Pauline formulas cited in Chapter 10, it seems abundantly clear that they were not created by early catholic trends, which are by definition post-Pauline. Here in particular, it is necessary to look for a pre-Pauline or extra-Pauline source for the content of the mainline faith.

An exception to this is the shift from the undisputed letters' portrayal of Jesus as future savior to our literature's use of "savior" as a conventional, present-tense title (see Chapters 3 and 10, above). Such a shift would go naturally with the dying out of active expectation of the parousia, and as such may indeed be accounted for as an instance of early catholicism. One could also imagine "bourgeois morality" getting more bourgeois as the passage of time motivated Christians to come to terms with society, but that is only a matter of degree. As the pre-Pauline 1 Thess 4:1-8 and Gal 5:19-21 suggest, the ethical emphasis was already there at an early date.

"PETER AND": PAUL AND "PETRINE CHRISTIANITY"

If the question is "what happened to Paul," part of the answer has been "Peter" since the time of the Tübingen school of the 19th century, when F.C. Baur and his followers explained historical Christianity as a compromise between Pauline and Petrine, that is to say Gentile and Jewish, Christianity.¹⁸ Variations on this theme remain current.

¹⁸ Dunn 341 f.
Not all neo-Baurian theories are relevant here. Goulder, for example, argues that the Pauline-Petrine conflict ended in the almost total triumph of Paulinism, a position refuted, in my view, by the very existence of our literature. More to the point for the present thesis is the work of scholars who see the Petrine or Jewish Christian stream as a force which actually succeeded in modifying Paul's influence on later Christianity. Dunn takes something of a Baurian stance, except that he sees James, not Peter, as exemplifying the Jewish Christian antithesis to the Pauline thesis, with Peter working successfully to bring about the synthesis. Brown and Meier, and Achtemeier, go further: they hold that Peter and his followers largely "won out." This circumstance the Protestant Achtemeier treats as a crushing defeat for Paul and for true Christianity, a defeat which endured until the Reformation, while the Catholic Brown and Meier regard it as a valid modification which remains normative today via the New Testament canon.

Brown identifies Peter with the "liberal" end of a branch of "Jewish Christians and their Gentile converts" who insisted on

19 Goulder passim.

20 Dunn 356, so also Bruce Peter, Stephen 42 f., cf. also Barrett "Controversies" 235.

21 Brown and Meier vii f., cf. Achtemeier 63 f.

22 Achtemeier 62, 64.

23 Brown and Meier viii.

24 Brown and Meier write jointly at times and separately at times in their joint book, Antioch and Rome, and each takes responsibility only for his own contributions (Brown and Meier
some Jewish observance, short of circumcision, for Gentile converts to Christianity. This position Peter agreed to only under pressure from the more conservative James -- at least, at the time of the Antioch incident of Gal 2:11 ff.\(^{25}\) -- but his unenthusiastic support for such observance still places Peter to the "right"\(^{26}\) of Paul, who required no Jewish observance of Gentile converts.\(^{27}\) Brown and Meier give various evidence for Petrine Christianity's partial triumph over Paul, including Paul's probable defeat in the Antioch incident\(^{28}\) and Paul's modification of his previous views on Judaism in his letter to the community in Rome, which although not founded by Peter was "Petrine" in the sense of espousing moderate Jewish Christianity.\(^{29}\)

For Achtemeier, the view that Peter was right to go along with James at Antioch, while Paul was wrong to refuse, was held as "orthodox" in subsequent Christian history, and the victory of Petrine Christianity meant the "virtual disappearance" of Paul's gospel. The apostolic decree of Acts 15:20, which in Achtemeier's chronology predated the Antioch incident and formed the basis for the conduct of James and Peter, was influential at least to the

\(^{25}\) Brown "Rome" 3 f. and 2 n. 2.

\(^{26}\) Brown and Meier viii.

\(^{27}\) Brown "Rome" 4.

\(^{28}\) Meier 39.

\(^{29}\) Brown "Rome" 98, 111 ff.
time of Tertullian and is mentioned in a late second-century account of martyrdoms in Gaul preserved by Eusebius, while the importance of "salvation by grace through faith" was disregarded (Eusebius 5.1.26, see also Chapter 13). Post-Pauline writings, including all our literature plus the canonical Catholic epistles, treat Christianity "more as a system of doctrine and especially an ethical code than as an acknowledgement of God's redemptive act in Jesus Christ."^{30}

Achtemeier's characterization of our literature differs only in the harshness of its wording from the summary presented in Chapter 10, and he is not alone in thinking that recognizably Jewish Christianity, orthodox as well as heretical, lasted far longer than we are accustomed to imagine.\^{31} But as a source for the mainline faith taken to have submerged Paul, Petrine Christianity, at least in the moderate Jewish sense perhaps best articulated by Brown, will not do. Once again to review the principal features of the mainline faith, in an order once again selected for emphasis:

The role of Judaism: The Petrine explanation posits a force dragging Pauline Christianity to (in Brown and Meier's terminology) the right.\^{32} But our literature has on the whole

^{30} Achtemeier 63 f., 58, 65 f., 62.

^{31} Cf. Wilson Related 155 f., Koester 201 f.

^{32} This appears to be true even for Barrett, who acknowledges that the "sub-apostolic Christianity" he credits in part to Peter's influence was "not judaizing," but still juxtaposes it with "the radicalism of Paul" (Barrett "Controversies" 235), by which he means the vehemence of Paul's refusal to compromise with any sort of judaizing (Barrett "Controversies" 232 f.).
moved to the left, away from Judaism to a degree never contemplated by Paul. This is most evident in Ignatius and the Pastorals, less obtrusive in 2 Peter and Polycarp. 1 Clement and Acts are more complex cases. But as argued above (Chapter 7), Clement's "Jewishness" is only superficial. Acts, by contrast, does reflect some normative status for Judaism, as reflected in the apostolic decree and Paul's observance. My own account of these anomalies will be given in Chapter 13, and I shall simply reaffirm at this point that they are anomalies, outweighed by the general tendency of Acts to make Judaism an unproblematic (and hence un-Pauline) ancestor of Christianity, even to the point of brushing aside the Law as, in effect, too much trouble to keep (Acts 15:10). 

Acts and 1 Clement are perhaps not so far to the left of Paul on the issue of Judaism as, for example, Ignatius, but it is not reasonable to attribute them to a pull to the right.

The role of Paul and the apostles: It is clear that Peter was a significant figure in early Christianity, influential enough to give rise to a "Cephas party" in Corinth, to be cited as the authority behind 2 Peter, to figure prominently in Acts (often as spokesman for the apostles as a collectivity) and to merit special mention from Clement and Ignatius, as well as holding a high profile in all four gospels. He indeed became a

---

33 Cf. Haenchen 113.
34 Bruce Peter, Stephen 39 ff.
35 Goulder 188.
one-man, or with Paul a two-man, personification of the concept of apostolicity discussed earlier.

The key issue for the "Petrine Christianity" hypothesis, however, is whether this prominence is owed to the influence of views peculiar to or at least chiefly characteristic of Peter. The only worthwhile information we have on any distinctively Petrine views is Gal 2, where Peter's conduct at Antioch can be given a more generous interpretation than Paul in fact gives it.\textsuperscript{36} This account strongly suggests that Peter was, at least at that point, just the sort of Jewish Christian Brown and others have claimed: willing to go along with some requirements of observance for Gentile converts, but not overly enthusiastic about it. But whatever the immediate outcome in Antioch, Peter's position did not "win out," either in the long run or in the middle run reflected in our literature. Whatever may be the source of Peter's enduring fame in Bible and church, it is not this.

The role of Christ and the role of the Christian: While it is hardly enough to save the Petrine Christianity hypothesis as an overall explanation of the mainline faith, it is worth noting that the emphasis on repentance, forgiveness and human effort found in our literature is at home in a Jewish theological milieu not much influenced by the Pauline notion of sin as a cosmic power.\textsuperscript{37} This will be worth bearing in mind in the search for a

\textsuperscript{36} E.g. Meier 41, Bruce \textit{Peter, Stephen} 35 ff., Goulder 3 f.

\textsuperscript{37} Ziesler 76.
hypothesis that is capable of explaining the origin of the mainline faith -- the task of the next two chapters.
CHAPTER 12: THEY CAME TO ANTIOCH

In Chapter 11, I considered and (for the most part) rejected three possible explanations of the origin of the mainline faith. The theory that this faith marks a decline from, or development of, Pauline thought through processes internal to the Pauline stream is unable to account for the apparent continuity of a gospel of loosely-understood atonement for sins from pre-Pauline to post-Pauline times and the likelihood that this gospel continued to be current during Paul's ministry, at least in areas outside the range of his personal evangelistic influence.\(^1\) It is also unable to account for the dramatic difference in attitude toward Judaism between our literature and the undisputed Pauline epistles, or the stereotyped equation of Paul with the other apostles.

The theory that the mainline faith is part of the post-Pauline trend to consolidation and formalization known as "early catholicism," a form of development due in part to external causes, may well account for the stereotyped concept of apostolicity and the concern for sound doctrine found in our literature, and also for its conventional, present-tense use of "savior" to describe Jesus. But it cannot account for doctrinal content which appears to predate Paul. Nor does it offer any convincing explanation of the contrast between our literature and the undisputed letters on the subject of Judaism.

\(^1\) Conzelmann History 68, cf. 112, Haenchen 299.
The theory that Pauline Christianity was pulled to the right by a moderately observant "Petrine Christianity" may have something to offer in terms of the apparently Jewish emphasis on repentance, forgiveness and human effort found in our literature, but it can hardly account for a stream which on the whole stands markedly to the left of Paul with respect to its overall attitude toward Judaism.

Thus the bulk of the content of the mainline faith, as outlined in Chapter 10, remains to be explained. What remains, specifically, is our literature's loose, anthropocentric (by Pauline standards) understanding of atonement and repentance, and its unceremonious appropriation of a poorly-appreciated Jewish heritage. It is that explanation I now hope to provide.

THE HELLENIST MISSION

On the face of it, just such an explanation might be provided by a widely-held interpretation of events reported in Acts, chapters 6 to 11. The Jewish Christian "Hellenists," distinguished from the Jewish Christian "Hebrews" at 6:1, differed not only linguistically (as Greek-speakers) but theologically from the Aramaic-speaking Hebrews, in that they were less attached than the Hebrews to the Law and the Temple; this is demonstrated when one of their leaders, Stephen (6:5), faces certain accusations (6:11, 13 f.) before the Sanhedrin and gives a speech (7:2-53) prior to his martyrdom by stoning (7:58-60). A persecution follows (8:1) in which these very Hellenists are singled out, and they leave Jerusalem as a result, travelling
to various places until, in Syrian Antioch, they begin for the first time to preach the gospel to Gentiles (11:19-21).

Not every element in this account can actually be documented from the text of Acts, which for example says nothing about a theological distinction between Hellenists and Hebrews, and which does explicitly say "all [Jerusalem Christians] except the apostles" (8:1), i.e. not just the Hellenists, were driven out by the persecution. Nonetheless, the interpretation I have sketched enjoys the support of a broad spectrum of commentators, from F.F. Bruce on the right to Ernst Haenchen on the left and also including Helmut Koester, James Dunn, Ernst Käsemann, Michael Goulder, John Meier and Hans Conzelmann.²

These same commentators, and others, paint a picture of this Hellenist mission which would make it a promising source for those elements of the mainline faith still in need of an explanation.

The role of Christ: a number of commentators hold that it is precisely from the Hellenists that Paul first learned of the gospel, and further that the Hellenist gospel continued to have a life of its own apart from Paul and his elaborations of it.³

It is no easy matter to lay out in detail a pre-Pauline Hellenistic theological program; Bruce is gently mocking of Bultmann's confidence in producing a 120-page chapter on the

² Bruce Peter, Stephen 57 f., 60 f.; Haenchen 266, 365, cf. 370 f.; Koester 91; Dunn 267 f.; Käsemann 238; Goulder 8; Meier 32 f.; Conzelmann History 58 f.

³ Meyer 78, Koester 92, Bultmann 63, Conzelmann History 67 f., Haenchen 299.
subject. Nonetheless, commentators suggest that certain elements parallel to the mainline faith as found in our literature do appear to emerge at this stage. The significance of Christ's death is not well-defined, and there is an emphasis on forgiveness of sins that falls short of Paul's profundity, though he did incorporate it in his teaching.

The role of the Christian: Commentators have less to say about any specifically Hellenistic approach to Christian ethics, once this topic is divorced from issues of ritual Law-observance (see the role of Judaism, below). Hengel does, however, speculate that "the optimistic confidence in man's capacity to do God's will" found in post-apostolic literature (and already noted at some length in Chapters 5, 6 and 10 above) may also be traceable to the Hellenists, and if that is so it would fit well with the centrality of morals in our mainline faith.

The role of Judaism: most commentators see the Hellenists as well to the left in terms of Jewish observance and loyalties. Meyer speaks of "hostility to Torah and temple" in a movement for whom "the exalted Jesus is already the universal Lord." Koester says the Hellenists were demanding freedom from the Law before

4 Bruce Peter, Stephen 57, Bultmann 63-183.

5 Bultmann 81; cf. Dodd 25, suggesting "the school of Stephen and Philip" as an intermediate step between a still vaguer "Jerusalem kerygma" and Paul's eventual understanding.

6 Meyer 117 ff., 163.

7 Hengel Between 56.

8 Meyer 68, 81.
their departure from Jerusalem, but were thwarted by the forces of observance, and first put their program into practice in Antioch.⁹ These are both somewhat extreme positions, but there is widespread agreement that the Hellenists were critical of the Temple¹⁰ and at least implicitly of the Law.¹¹ At any rate it is probable that the Hellenistic Jewish Christians at such places as Antioch and Damascus were no longer observing the Law themselves, never mind demanding observance of Gentile converts, because Paul's pre-Christian persecution out of zeal for the Law (Gal 1:13 f., NT Phil 3:5 f.) could reasonably have targeted only non-observant Jewish Christians, rather than observant Jewish Christians, or Gentile Christians.¹² Some commentators see this non-observance as pragmatic rather than ideological in nature,¹³ and if this is so it could well reflect a more dismissive attitude toward Judaism than that shown by Paul's agonized theological justifications.

THE GREAT OMISSION?

The prima facie case, then, is attractive. But before the beliefs of the "Hellenist mission" can be pursued any further, I must define more closely who and what I am talking about. An

---

⁹ Koester 91.

¹⁰ Bruce Peter, Stephen 55; Conzelmann History 58; Dunn 270 ff.

¹¹ Haenchen 267 f., Bruce Peter, Stephen 52, Dunn 272 f., Conzelmann History 58.


¹³ E.g. Hengel Between 56, citing Acts 15:10; cf. Conzelmann History 66 f.
impressive case has been made that there was no such mission, and for that matter no such people, at least as the commentators cited portray them.

Our received story of the Hellenist mission may be schematized as follows: (1) the "Hellenists," or Greek-speaking Jewish Christians of the original Jerusalem community, (2) were theologically distinct from the "Hebrews" or Aramaic-speaking Jewish Christians, (3) in that they were critical of the Law and the Temple, (4) as is shown by the trial and defence speech of the Hellenist leader Stephen. In consequence, (5) the Hellenists were singled out for persecution following Stephen's death. Some of those thus scattered (6) launched the first real Gentile mission by preaching the gospel to Gentiles in Antioch, where (7) a congregation was founded in which neither Jewish nor Gentile Christians observed the Law.

In a detailed and careful 200-page study of the issue, Craig Hill has denied five of these seven assertions. He is willing to accept numbers 1 and 6 in somewhat reduced form: that there were "Hellenists" distinguished by their mother tongue and Diaspora background (but distinguished in no other way) in the Jerusalem community, and that such Hellenists, in this exclusively linguistic and geographical sense, did found the mixed Jewish-Gentile Christian congregation of Antioch.\(^14\)

Concerning the remaining five points, Hill argues as follows:

\(^{14}\) Hill 22 ff., 105 f.
(2) The notion that Hebrew and Hellenist Christianity were theologically distinct is based in part on an uncritical assumption that Palestinian (Aramaic-speaking, "Hebrew") and Diaspora (Greek-speaking, "Hellenist") Judaism were themselves theologically distinct. But recent scholarship has undermined belief in any clear-cut distinction between Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism in the first century CE.  

(3) Although the Gentile mission was Law-free in not requiring circumcision or observance for Gentile converts, it does not follow that it was Law-critical from the perspective of Jewish Christianity, and indeed the Law-observant "Hebrew" Jerusalem community approved the Law-free mission. And even if Stephen's speech in Acts 7, often used to demonstrate Law- and Temple-critical views, is a historical or traditional Hellenist "manifesto" (see item 4), it is not truly Temple-critical and not even superficially Law-critical.

(4) Stephen's purported speech does not in any event embody either a historical record of such an address or a Hellenist tradition, but is entirely a creation of Lukan theology and is critical, not of Law or Temple, but of Judaism for rejecting Christ. Nor are the accusations against Stephen of threatening

15 Hill 1 ff.
16 Hill 45 f. and n. 23.
17 E.g. Conzelmann History 58.
18 So e.g. Bruce Peter, Stephen 56.
19 Hill 69-81, 68 f.
the Law and Temple (6:11-14) likely historical, in Hill's view; but if they are to be believed historically, Luke himself has told us that they are false accusations (v. 13). 20

(5) If Hellenist Christians (in the linguistic sense) were indeed singled out for persecution, it was likely by non-Christian Hellenist Jews whose synagogues they had been disrupting, and who would have had neither motive nor power to persecute Hebrew Christians. If such a selective persecution was carried out by higher Jewish authorities such as the chief priests, these in any event also persecuted the Hebrews on other occasions. But it is also possible that such a persecution was "against the [whole] church," as Luke says (Acts 8:1), or even -- and in Hill's view very likely -- that there was no such "severe persecution" other than as a Lukan literary device to get missionaries moving out of Jerusalem. None of these scenarios provides evidence that the Hellenists were singled out because of theological distinctives not shared with the Hebrews. 21

(7) There is no evidence that Jewish Christians of the Antioch congregation were non-observant from the beginning. Hill takes it as likely that the level of observance there diminished in the wake of Jerusalem approval of the Law-free mission, but he argues that this did not come about because of any important principle, and so the Antiochenes (except, of course, Paul) were willing to return to a certain level of observance when that was

20 Hill 81, 66, 57 f.
21 Hill 32 f., 36, 37 f., 38, 40.
demanded by "people from James" at the time of the so-called Antioch incident (Gal 2:11 ff.).

Hill's arguments seem to me to vary in their cogency. At the high end, he is surely right that finding explicit criticism of the Law in Stephen's speech is desperate work, as shown by its positive references to Moses, and by the number of commentators who prefer to argue that Law criticism is implicit in Stephen's Temple criticism or in his whole approach to preaching, or who seek evidence of it in the accusations against him, or who merely infer that Stephen and his party were probably anti-Law. At the low end, Hill's argument concerning observance in the early stages of the Antioch mission seems weak (see discussion later in this chapter), and I see no reason why the fact that the chief priests persecuted the Hebrews at other times would rule out a specific persecution of the Hellenists on theological grounds in the wake of the Stephen incident; in a parallel case Hill himself acknowledges that Paul and James were liable to persecution in different degrees, essentially on theological grounds, even though they both ultimately suffered from persecution.

---

22 Hill 137, cf. 106, cf. also 146 f. and n. 173; 140 f.
23 Hengel Between 22.
24 Dunn 272 f.
25 Hengel Between 23.
26 Meyer 68, Goppelt 57 f.
27 Bruce Peter, Stephen 52, 56.
28 Hill 151.
But Hill's arguments, cogent or otherwise, are mainly aimed at the binary oppositions often thought to be entailed in the received account of the Hellenist/Hebrew distinction: that early Christianity was thereby "neatly divided," that the division constituted a "schism," that the Hebrews actually "shunned or opposed" the Hellenists, that the distinction justifies "the customary tendency to minimize (if not to vilify) the role of the [Hebrew] Jerusalem church in early Christianity." No such binary oppositions are required by this thesis, and indeed they are not always insisted upon by commentators who stress the role of the Hellenists in church history.

For example, Meyer, though arguing for a linguistic, cultural and theological distinction between Hebrews and Hellenists from the earliest days of the Jerusalem community, insists that the distinction is between two self-understandings, not two gospels, so that there was never a schism; both Hebrews and Hellenists agreed that the Hellenist mission to the Gentiles should go forward. Hengel shares Hill's view that "Hellenist," as such, is entirely a linguistic designation, but argues that the linguistic distinction led inevitably to separate meetings for worship and that theological consequences flow from the Greek language's superior "power of expression" in comparison to Aramaic. Goppelt also uses "Hellenist" as by nature a linguistic term. He says the eventual theological division was not based on "theological schools of thought" but on different responses to

---

29 Hill 4, 193 (quoting Dunn 275), 104, 196.
Jewish reaction to the preaching of Stephen: one group retreated into a Law observance which was not part of the immediate post-Easter practice while the other, most though not all of whom were Hellenists, developed a universalist approach. Both groups were persecuted in the wake of Stephen's martyrdom, but only the latter were "scattered" permanently, because their new approach did not permit them to make their peace with the authorities. Even so, there was no schism; Hebrews and Hellenists (Goppelt does sometimes use the terms in a theological sense) were not opponents but "lived together as two very different brothers."  

Hengel, Meyer and Goppelt do, however, stick to this much of the received account: all hold that it was Hellenists, in a sense of the word that carries at least some theological implications, who began evangelizing Gentiles in Antioch; and all hold that those evangelists were themselves not Law-observant.  

And so much, I think, the present thesis does require: that a distinct group which there is some rough basis for calling "the Hellenists" (regardless of its exact relationship to the Hebrews, to Stephen, or to Stephen's speech) did both evangelize Gentiles and brush aside the Law, prior to Paul's involvement. Let us now examine whether this position can be defended in the light of Hill's criticism.

---


31 Hengel Between 12 f.; Meyer 68 f., 89 ff., 105; Goppelt 61.
Hill himself concedes that Antioch's first Gentile Christians were most likely evangelized by Hellenists in the linguistic and geographical sense. But were they distinct in any other way? Luke, at least, seems to connect them to an identifiable group within the church. The two subsequent references to those "scattered" by the persecution of Acts 8:1 (8:4, 11:19) are both loosely tied to the Hellenists of 6:1 ff.: 8:4 ff. tells of the exploits of Philip, one of the seven Hellenist leaders selected in 6:5, while the evangelists of Antioch are "men of Cyprus and Cyrene" (11:20), or in other words Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews, i.e. "Hellenists," even in Hill's lexicon. These stories, showing the Hellenists carrying the gospel in a widening spiral to Samaritans, God-fearers and

32 Hill 105 f.

33 Goppelt 58.

34 Like Hill (25 ff., 46 ff.), I take it that the "seven" of Acts 6:3-5 are leaders of the "Hellenists" referred to in 6:1, both in Luke's intention and historically, though of course this does not settle the question of who exactly the Hellenists might be.

35 Those to whom these evangelists spoke are in my view not "Hellenists," Hellēnistai (so NRSV, UBS) but "Greeks" Hellēnes (RSV JB NAB NRSV mg. UBS mg.; KJV "Grecians"), or in other words Gentiles (so TEV), as required by the contrast with "Jews," Ioudaioi (not "Hebrews"), of v. 19 (so Haenchen Munck Conzelmann Acts Bruce Acts ad loc., Hengel 8, Hill 23 and n. 15, Meyer 92, cf. Metzger Textual 342, accepting Hellēnistai but defining it as "Greek-speaking persons" in contrast to Ioudaioi).

36 Hill (94, 105) notes justly that none of the Hellenist leaders of 6:5 is mentioned at 11:19 ff. or in the list of Antiochene leaders at 13:1, but this does not seem to be a definitive consideration; there is no reason to assume that only seven Hellenists had leadership ability or missionary zeal.
Gentiles (8:5 ff., 26 ff., 11:19 ff.),\(^{37}\) suggest that Luke means to attribute a missionary consciousness to his Hellenists that the Jerusalem church can only catch up to after the fact (8:14 ff., 11:22, 15 passim, cf. 11:1 ff.). This might, of course, be nothing more than Luke's schematization, but there is independent evidence from Paul's day that the sort of missionary work represented in Antioch remained controversial from Jerusalem's point of view, or at any rate was very different from what was going on in Jerusalem (Gal 2:1-10\(^{38}\)). Whether this was so before Paul's day, I shall discuss in a moment.

If Luke is indeed telling us that the Hellenists were ahead (to use a loaded term) of Jerusalem in terms of moving beyond standard Jewish expectations and practices, that would also fit well as an early counterpart to the loose attitude toward Judaism identified in the mainline faith. Again, we could be dealing with Luke's schematization. But Galatians supplies independent evidence that the evangelists of Antioch, or at any rate their successors, took the Law more lightly than the Jerusalem community: the so-called Antioch incident of Gal. 2:11 ff. There, delegates from Jerusalem ("certain people from James") turn up,

\(^{37}\) Cf. Goppelt 68 f.; the involvement of Peter in this process in the story of Cornelius, Acts 10, complicates the matter and raises issues well beyond the scope of this thesis, but it does not contradict the general role of the Hellenists.

\(^{38}\) Gal 2:1 does not actually say that Paul and Barnabas go to Jerusalem from Antioch, but commentators normally understand it so (e.g. Haenchen 464, Goppelt 75). Nor does the passage necessarily make the Jerusalem "pillars" opponents of the Gentile mission, like the "false believers;" but still they obviously need some convincing, for it is a matter of "when they saw..." (v. 7), "when [the pillars] recognized..." (v. 9).
and at their arrival first the visiting Peter ("Cephas"), and then the local Jewish Christians (except Paul), withdraw from table fellowship with Gentile Christians.

This incident reads most naturally as a reversal of a longstanding policy in which the Law has been routinely disregarded at table. Contrary explanations do not seem convincing. An extreme case is the suggestion of Downey that Gentile and Jewish Christians had always eaten separately and that the incident arose when Peter visited a Gentile table; but since Paul complains of the defection of "the other Jews" (Gal. 2:13), including Barnabas who was clearly a local fixture (Gal. 2:1, cf. Acts 13:1), there must have been previous table fellowship for them to defect from. Hill's own guess is that early Antiochene practice was more or less observant with respect to table fellowship, but this seems unlikely; Paul, who had spent 14 (or 11) years in "the regions of Syria and Cilicia" and stood high enough in the Antioch congregation to represent it in talks in Jerusalem (Gal 1:21, 2:1 ff., cf. Acts 13:1), takes non-observant table fellowship for granted in his account of the incident.

But is the Antiochene attitude toward the Law Paul's own contribution, perhaps from a date very early in that 14-year period? This too seems unlikely. For one thing, this far-from-

---

39 Downey 277, 280.

40 Hill 140 f.

41 Cf. Goppelt 61.
self-effacing apostle makes no hint of a claim in Galatians that he instituted mixed table fellowship or other Antiochene practices. He does not hesitate to refer to "the gospel that was proclaimed by me (hup' emou)" (1:11), but he describes the practices in Antioch only as "the freedom we have (tēn eleutherian hēmōn hēn echomen, our freedom which we have) in Christ Jesus" (2:4). More decisive, however, is his previous history as a persecutor. He refers three times to his persecuting activities in the undisputed letters. One, 1 Cor 15:9, gives no reason for his actions; the other two, Gal 1:13, cf. v. 23, and NT Phil 3:6, are closely juxtaposed to references to his zeal for the Law (Gal 1:14, "traditions of my ancestors;" NT Phil 3:5, "as to the law, a Pharisee," v. 6 "as to righteousness under the law, blameless"). Most likely, then, he persecuted those Christians who would have outraged him in that respect, that is, non-observant Jewish Christians, rather than observant Jewish Christians or Gentile Christians who had not taken on Jewish obligations. From this it would follow that such non-observant Jewish Christians existed prior to Paul's Damascus road experience. To be sure, none of this evidence deals directly with Antioch. But Gal 1 tells us Paul "returned to Damascus" after his call (v. 17) and was "unknown by sight" to Judean Christians (v. 22); so his hostile encounters with non-observant Jewish Christians seem to have taken place primarily if not entirely in

---

the widening spiral of missionary activity which Luke associates with the Hellenists, and which did eventually reach Antioch.\(^43\)

I have said above that my "Hellenist mission" explanation entails this much of the received view: that a distinct group which there is some basis for calling "the Hellenists" both evangelized Gentiles and brushed aside the Law, independently of and prior to Paul's involvement. In attempting to demonstrate this, I must acknowledge many gaps in the evidence. We do not, for example, know whether Luke himself was still thinking in terms of "Hellenists" when he narrated Philip's mission to Samaria or that of the "men of Cyprus and Cyrene" to Antioch (he never says so explicitly);\(^44\) and supposing that he was, we do not know to what degree these Hellenists were an after-the-fact construct,\(^45\) as opposed to a self-conscious sociological reality. We do not know that Paul's pre-conversion problem with the Jewish Christians was non-observance as opposed to, say, the "blasphemous"\(^46\) claim of a crucified Messiah; there is more in his letters to support the former than the latter (see discussion

\[\text{\footnotesize 43 According to some commentators, all (Goppelt 61) or some (Bruce Peter, Stephen 78) of the early Damascus Christians were observant Jews; cf. Ananias of Damascus as "a devout man according to the law and well spoken of by all the Jews living there," Acts 22:12 (Bruce Peter, Stephen 78). But Conzelmann's argument that there must have been non-observant Jewish Christians for Paul to persecute (Conzelmann History 65) seems to me conclusive.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 44 Cf. Hill 197.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 45 Which would not make them a fictionalization, any more than early catholicism or mainline faith are fictionalizations.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 46 Ziesler 25.}\]
above), but his language is suggestive, not explicit. We do not know that the Christians Paul seems to have been persecuting in Damascus (which we also do not quite actually know\textsuperscript{47}) were the same sort of people or part of the same missionary movement found later in Antioch. We do not know whether Paul regarded non-observant table fellowship as an integral part of "the gospel that was proclaimed by me" and thus original to him.

But we do know that some early Jewish Christians spoke primarily Aramaic, and some primarily Greek. We do know that some took Law-observance more seriously and others less seriously (Gal 2:11 ff.). We do know that some stayed in Jerusalem and others spread the message far and wide, even at an early date. These alternatives are not necessarily binary oppositions; they may merely be the ends of continua. But it is the latter alternative in each case -- Greek-speaking, less observant, mission-minded -- that turns up in Antioch; and it is the most natural reading of Paul's own words that this came about in the first instance without his help. This is "Hellenist mission" enough for my purpose: a not very observant group of Greek-speaking Jewish Christians who ended up preaching to Gentiles. I shall use "Hellenist" and "Hellenist mission" to mean a group defined in just those terms, with "group" understood in the loosest sense, and no connotation of any additional theological views, still less of "Hellenization" in the broader cultural sense. These are the people to whom I now propose to trace the mainline faith.

\textsuperscript{47} J. Sanders 153.
CHAPTER 13: THE HELLENIST MISSION AS SOURCE

As noted in Chapter 12, the Hellenist mission seems promising as a source of the mainline faith, and despite many reservations and qualifications, its existence stands up well enough historically for further discussion. But does the promised explanation in fact work out? It is time to look once again at the elements of the mainline faith which still need explanation.

The role of Judaism: I have argued that the mainline faith, with its disregard of the claims of Judaism on Christianity, stands (in Brown's terminology) to the left of Paul. I have also proposed to argue that the Hellenist mission is the source of that attitude. On this latter point I can look for no support from most of the commentators I have been quoting.

Hengel, for example, treats the Hellenists as a "bridge" to Paul, historically as well as in the literary conception of Luke. Goulder, in passing, expresses a similar view. Hill, though disputing the very existence of the Hellenists in Hengel's sense, thinks in parallel terms: Paul is the extreme figure who loses out to the more moderate Hellenists in the confrontation at Antioch -- a confrontation specifically about Judaism's claim on Christianity. Marshall, whose doubts about the Hellenists' theological distinctiveness are similar to Hill's, evaluates Hellenist thought entirely on the basis of its influence on Paul. Goppelt and Meyer take more complex positions, but each in effect treats the Hellenists as a transitional movement leading to the full flower of Pauline thought on the relationship of Judaism to
Christianity. Only Brown and Meier, whose overall reconstruction I reject, place the Hellenists to the left of Paul. On the whole, it is fair to say that most commentators who think of the Hellenists at all (whether to affirm or to deny) think of them as Luke does: a stage on the road to Paul, who is the "real goal of the work [Acts]" and "the one true missionary to the Gentiles." 

It is natural, no doubt, to see the Hellenists as transitional and Paul as the finished product. After all, we have no books by the Hellenists in the New Testament, not avowedly anyway; we have at least seven by Paul, with six more claimants. But this proves nothing about the views of early Christian groups not represented (or not directly represented) in the Bible. Hill quite properly demands that Hellenist thought should show up somewhere if we are to take it seriously; but I am arguing that it does show up at a later date, somewhat developed to be sure, in our literature.

More compelling is the argument that the Hellenists must have been more moderate than Paul, because they compromised with

---

1 See above, Chapter 12.

2 Hengel Between 29, 55; Goulder 8; Hill 147; Marshall "Palestinian" 284 n. 1c; Goppelt 66, 70 f.; Meyer 11; Brown "Rome" 6 ff.; Meier 43 f.

3 Hengel Between 2, 3.

4 The existence of a Hellenist Antiochene source in Acts, comprising inter alia a number of the passages discussed in the present chapter, is much disputed: in favor, e.g. Hengel Between 4, 54, Meyer 69; against, e.g. Hill, 93 ff., Haenchen 369. No position is taken here.

5 Hill 46.
the "James gang"\(^6\) while he held out, leading to his defeat in and departure from the Hellenist stronghold of Antioch.\(^7\) But this argument depends upon seeing the difference between the Hellenists and Paul, on this issue, as one of degree: the Hellenists went only so far in their disengagement from Jewish requirements, Paul went farther. I would argue, instead, that the difference is one of kind; Paul and the Hellenists were doing two different things. While Paul almost certainly first heard about the gospel in a "Hellenist mission" setting, hence his persecution of it,\(^8\) he also had or at least believed himself to have had his own revelation,\(^9\) as well as his own history of conflict in Damascus and possibly Jerusalem before ever coming to Antioch (2 Cor 11:32 f., Gal 1:19, 22, cf. Acts 9:23-25, 29-31);\(^10\) he also retained ties with Jerusalem after apparently breaking them with Antioch.\(^11\) He was not, in short, altogether beholden to Antioch or the Hellenists; his approach was his own, and it seems likely enough on the evidence of Gal 2 that Paul's approach was more principled, the Hellenists' more pragmatic.\(^12\)

Pragmatism, of course, implies a certain detachment from the

---

\(^6\) This expression from J. Sanders 160.

\(^7\) Hill 147 among many others.

\(^8\) Conzelmann *History* 67.

\(^9\) Ziesler 26 f., Goppelt 67.

\(^10\) Hill 104 and n. 2.

\(^11\) Hengel *Between* 34.

\(^12\) Hengel *Between* 56; cf. Goppelt 66, Conzelmann *History* 67.
principles to which it is applied; the willingness to compromise at Antioch for the sake of fellowship (Gal 2:13), and the willingness to brush aside the whole matter of Jewish expectations as outdated or even too difficult (Acts 15:10), are two sides of the same coin, equally un-Pauline but not contradicting one another at all. The Antiochene Hellenists are far more credible than Paul as spiritual and intellectual ancestors of Ignatius' patronizing view of Judaism, and of the cheerful appropriationist viewpoint of our literature in general.

The role of Christ: To the extent that the foregoing argument succeeds, it paints a fairly clear picture of the positions taken by the various parties concerning Christianity's ongoing relationship to Judaism: for the Jerusalem church, continuing loyalty and observance; for Paul, a radical critique which nevertheless maintained Judaism as a central issue for the gospel; for the Hellenists, a casualness well on the way to the indifference or patronization found in our literature.

Similar clarity will be difficult to achieve concerning what the various parties had to say about the content of the gospel. This is partly because there is less evidence -- no equivalent of the Antioch incident or the persecution narrative -- and partly because the evidence that does exist suggests that the lines were not so sharply drawn over this issue as over the matter of Judaism.

Our best evidence, already reviewed, is the comparison of primary texts: seven undisputed Pauline letters against the 14 canonical and non-canonical documents by six authors which make
up our literature. And our review has shown a difference which is noteworthy but by no means diametrical: our literature's commonsensical and anthropocentric understanding of atonement, repentance and forgiveness of sins, against Paul's paradoxical and theocentric understanding of the breaking of the power of sin. There are no pre-Pauline primary texts which would permit us to compare the views of the Hellenists and the Jerusalem community on these matters; we have no record of Aramaic-speaking Christianity other than what is mediated through Greek-speaking Christianity, and commentators who try to apportion pre-Pauline material between the two come up with different results. For example, the well-known pre-Pauline kerygmatic formula at 1 Cor 15:3 ff. is attributed to the Hebrews by Meyer, to the Hellenists by Hengel.

It is of interest that one of the more confident delineations of the difference between Hebrew and Hellenist theology, Meyer's distinction between the Hebrew interpretation of Easter as restoration of Israel and the Hellenist interpretation of Easter as transcendence of "the entire old order of things," is a variation on, or perhaps an inference from, his view of the two groups' differing attitudes toward Judaism. Hengel's position that Paul, in his role as a Hellenist, differed from the Jerusalem community in "soteriology and the doctrine of the law," seems to be in the same category, though Hengel does


14 Meyer 131, Hengel Between 27.
not elaborate on what he means by soteriology in this context. Another intriguing reconstruction is that of Goppelt, who suggests that Paul preached much the same message as the Jerusalem apostles (and that therefore his synagogue sermon of Acts 13:16-41, so noted for its resemblance to Peter's sermons in Acts, could well be historical), but differed from them in not requiring circumcision of the Gentiles who responded. When it comes to theological matters not subsumable under "relationship to Judaism," Marshall's suggestion that there is no sign of christological disagreement in Paul's anti-Jerusalem polemic in Gal 2 seems convincing.  

But while the evidence available does nothing to distinguish the Hellenists from the Hebrews in matters not affecting Jewish observance, it does link pre-Pauline material to the mainline faith in certain respects. One of these is the matter of atonement or expiation. In Paul's letters "the theme of expiation is almost wholly confined to the citation of pre-Pauline formulas," and while Paul himself has expanded the significance of the cross to "the whole human dilemma," the familiar preoccupation with sins and forgiveness resurfaces in our literature. Pre-eminent among such formulas is that at NT Rom

\[\text{Hengel } \text{Between 40, Goppelt 74, Marshall "Palestinian" 280.}\]

\[\text{Meyer 119.}\]

\[\text{Meyer 163. To give a rounded picture of Meyer's position, it should be noted that while he sees Paul as having gone beyond pre-Pauline cross-as-expiation formulations, he also sees expiation as remaining central to Paul's thought rather than as in any way peripheral (Meyer 117 ff.).}\]
3:25, which makes Christ a "sacrifice of atonement (NRSV mg. 'place of atonement') by his blood," hilastērion ... en tō autō haimati. Hilastērion can also be translated "mercy seat"\(^\text{18}\) or "propitiatory,"\(^\text{19}\) the lid on the Ark of the Covenant sprinked with blood on the Day of Atonement, so this formula inherited by Paul may be seen as implying that Jesus supersedes the Temple cult;\(^\text{20}\) Meyer describes this implication as "the signature of the hellēnistai,"\(^\text{21}\) but of course this interpretation depends upon his previously-mentioned dichotomy between Hebrews who saw Easter as restoration and Hellenists who saw it as transcendence. That dichotomy has a certain obvious plausibility, but it goes beyond what can be proved from available evidence.

The role of the Christian: Still less can our literature's emphasis on moral uprightness be shown to be specifically Hellenistic, though there is some room for speculation to this effect. Moral uprightness in first century Judaism was of course tied specifically to the Law.\(^\text{22}\) Paul's ethics also remain tied to the Law in practice, as E. Sanders notes, creating some theoretical problems for "the Jewish apostle seeking to win Gentiles, who formally said that they were not bound by the law, but who generally thought that they should do what it says."\(^\text{23}\)

\(^\text{18}\) So both NRSV and BAGD at Heb 9:5.
\(^\text{19}\) So Meyer 79.
\(^\text{20}\) So Meyer 79 f.; Fitzmyer "Romans" 840 f.
\(^\text{21}\) Meyer 88.
\(^\text{22}\) Cf. Ziesler 76, E. Sanders Palestinian 544.
\(^\text{23}\) E. Sanders Paul 105.
Morals are less prominent (though by no means neglected) in Paul's letters, because of his emphasis on divine action in Christ rather than any sort of human effort and because of his unwillingness to point to the Law as a ground of Christian ethics. Our literature, with its anthropocentric approach and its lack of concern for its Jewish heritage, can afford to emphasize the same sort of ethics (i.e. ultimately Law-based), without worrying overmuch about where they come from (e.g. 1 Tm 1:8-11, 2 Pt 2:7 f., 1 Clement passim). There is, to put it no higher, a certain plausibility in suggesting that Jewish ideas with high survivability in a Gentile church were mediated through a Jewish movement that was rather breezily pragmatic about its Jewishness -- in other words, the Hellenists as I have portrayed them above.

In summary, the Hellenist mission, as I have described it, seems a very likely source of the mainline faith's attitude toward Judaism. Evidence on the content of the Hellenists' theological and ethical teaching, apart from the matter of Judaism, is thin, but such evidence as exists is consistent with the chief features of the mainline faith.

A FEW DIFFICULTIES AND THEIR SOLUTIONS

The apostolic decree and Paul's observance in Acts: As noted above (Chapters 7, 10), the picture of our mainline faith as denying normative status to its Jewish heritage is marred

24 E. Sanders Paul 103, 89.
25 Cf. Bultmann 112 for 1 Clement.
somewhat by two aspects of the Acts narrative: the apostolic decree of 15:20, 29 and the book's portrayal of Paul as observant, especially in chapter 21. The decree is the imposition of a fourfold prohibition, originating in the Law or at least in Jewish sensibilities, upon Gentile converts: that they abstain "from things polluted by idols and from fornication and from whatever has been strangled and from blood" (15:20). Paul shows himself willing to undertake an act of Jewish piety designed to refute charges that he preaches abandonment of the Law (21:21-26), as well as to circumcise one of his assistants (16:3) and to proclaim his own belief in "everything laid down according to the law or written in the prophets" (24:14). Is not all this to give Judaism a normative status out of keeping with the rest of our literature -- and out of keeping with my thesis that the mainline faith is to be traced to a group of Jewish Christians who had abandoned normative status for Judaism?

Acts, unlike the rest of our literature, is a narrative; therefore it is always possible in principle to explain anything in it as genuine history rather than as theologically motivated. In practice this is always controversial where Acts is concerned, and the relationship of the apostolic decree to its context in chapter 15, the so-called "apostolic council," is especially so; even the conservative Bruce suggests that the chapter treats two different meetings as if they were one. Nevertheless, there is

26 So, variously, Conzelmann Acts 118, Munck 140 f., Haenchen 469, Segal 197 ff.

27 Bruce "Paul of Acts" 291.
strong independent evidence for historicity of the decree itself, or at least something very like it: references to similar rules are found well into the second century or even the beginning of the third. Justin refers to the prohibition of meat sacrificed to idols (Dialogue with Trypho 34:7) and Minucius Felix (Octavius 30:6) and Tertullian (Apology 9:13 f.) refer to the ban on consumption of blood, as does Eusebius in an account of a late second-century martyrdom (Ecclesiastical History 5:1:26). None of this proves that these rules originated in a formal decree as portrayed by Luke, but at a minimum it seems clear that the rules themselves were already real in Luke's own time; Haenchen's argument that Luke would hardly have attributed the decree to the Holy Spirit (Acts 15:28) if it were not a matter of practice for his own readers seems persuasive.

The survival of such rules for so many decades is in itself good evidence of a non-Pauline Christian mainstream. Paul himself appears not to have enforced any such decree in his own churches; at any rate he does not mention it, even negatively, when he is discussing matters to which it might apply (NT Rom 14, 15, 1 Cor 8, 10). So its survival in later orthodox circles can only be

---

28 Achtemeier 85, Haenchen 471 f., Hill 144 n. 163, Goppelt 78 n. 4.

29 Wilson Gentiles 190, following Walter Schmithals in Paul and James (London, 1965), treats second-century citations as "incidental parallels" to Acts 15 which "do not elucidate the decree in its present context."

30 Haenchen 470, cf. also Wilson Related 61, Gentiles 191.

31 Ziesler 134 f.; Bruce "Paul of Acts" 291 f.; Meyer 106 n. 2. Lüdemann 171 suggests the decree may have been aimed only
explained by the existence of a Christian stream parallel to Paul's, a stream which at least ended up orthodox. The decree nevertheless creates at least a *prima facie* difficulty for my thesis that the mainline faith exemplified in Acts (and, of course, the rest of our literature) had, and came from a source which had, no normative loyalty to Judaism.

While it seems very clear that the decree originated as a matter of normative Jewish observance, many commentators hold that it soon ceased to be regarded in this light. Goppelt says the decree was interpreted as a protest against paganism and "a gnostic, libertine Christianity" as early as the second Christian generation (hence early enough for Acts), as shown by Rev 2:14, 20, 24; while in the second century it was taken in a moral sense to apply to "the three mortal sins: idolatry, murder and adultery," as shown by the "Western text" of Acts which removes "whatever has been strangled" (the most obviously ritual item) from the prohibitions at both vv. 20 and 29 and replaces it with the "Golden Rule."\(^32\)

That the understanding of the decree was solely moral, even in the late second century, cannot very well be maintained, since Minucius Felix, Tertullian and Eusebius' martyr Biblis all stress that they cannot eat animals' blood, though they say so as part of an *a fortiori* argument that they cannot eat human beings or,

---

32 Goppelt 78 f. and nn. 4, 5; cf. Haenchen 449 and n. 6, 471 f., Conzelmann *History* 90, UBS mg.
for Minucius Felix, even "hear of human slaughter" (Minucius Felix 30:6). Tertullian additionally mentions that pagan persecutors offer suspected Christians blood sausage to test them (Apology 9:14).\(^{33}\) Nor is it credible that Luke imagined the origin of the decree to be a matter of morality, since he sets it (accurately or artificially) in the midst of an explicit discussion of Jewish observance. It does seem at least as likely as not, given the lack of Jewish ties of the later writers,\(^{34}\) that their understanding of the decree was indeed anti-pagan, as Goppelt suggests. Acts itself is a more problematic case. It is perhaps just possible that Luke also regarded the enduring significance of the decree as anti-pagan or as moral, notwithstanding its origin; but he does not say so, and as his only subsequent mention of the decree (21:25) is also in the context of a discussion of observance, it seems most unlikely.

A more likely explanation of the role of the decree in Acts is that, first, the content of the decree itself is a historical reality;\(^{35}\) secondly, the decree is one more proof (in Luke's eyes) that the Christians were zealous not to offend against

---

\(^{33}\) Cf. also Segal 197: church tradition on the question of "blood" oscillated between a moralizing and a ritual understanding.

\(^{34}\) Haenchen 471, Achtemeier 65 f.

\(^{35}\) This is not to suggest that Luke included every relevant "historical reality" in his narrative; to take the most obvious case, he says nothing of the quarrel between Peter and Paul at Antioch (Haenchen 475 ff., Bruce "Paul of Acts" 290). It is, however, to suggest that truth, even if told in an "orderly" way which favors theological purpose over historical detail (cf. Achtemeier 73 f.), is an important criterion in his work.
Judaism, so that any and all estrangement is the fault of the Jewish side (cf. also Acts 7:51 ff.; 36 13:46, 18:6, 28:2637). That the decree is, from both internal and external evidence, still in effect for Luke's readers is indeed an anomaly in our literature, and a modification of Luke's more characteristic casualness toward Judaism; but that casualness (which Paul does not share38) remains the dominant note of Acts (I again stress the thoroughly un-Pauline Acts 15:1039), accords well with our literature, and comes altogether credibly from a movement such as our Hellenist mission which has ceased to pay much attention to Judaism.

Acts' portrayal of Paul as observant is similar to that of the decree not only in that it underlines Christian inoffensiveness to Judaism, but also in that there is no decisive reason why it could not be historically true. There is indeed no such extracanonical evidence for an observant Paul as for the decree, and some commentators argue that the real Paul could not have had Timothy circumcised (16:3) or gone through the redemption of Nazirites (21:23 ff.) for the stated purpose without gross hypocrisy.40 Against this, it may be argued that Paul should be taken at his word in 1 Cor 9:20, willing to live "as one under the law," and that the disputed events in Acts are

36 Hill 74 ff.
38 Goppelt 57.
39 Haenchen 112 f.
40 E.g. Vielhauer 39 ff.
an example of this. To rule out the historicity of these events is to presume without warrant that we can know what Paul would not have said or done in given circumstances; to treat the apostle as, in Munck's delightful phrase, "the austere champion of Paulinism, an arm chair theologian and not a human being." But historical or otherwise, Paul's observance (unlike the decree) has no normative status for Luke's readers, and so is not radically out of keeping with the rest of our literature or with the theory of a Hellenist origin for the mainline faith embodied in Acts.

The survival of the Hellenists in Antioch: I have argued that the "Hellenist mission" which founded the Antioch congregation was to the left of Paul with respect to its relationship to Judaism, and also that it is the source of the mainline faith found in our literature. I have also, however, accepted the widely-held view that the non-observant practice of the Antioch congregation was successfully ended by the forces of the right. But as a key exemplar of the mainline faith in our literature, and indeed the most dismissive of our authors toward Judaism, is Ignatius of Antioch, I need to explain how my

---

41 So Bruce "Paul of Acts" 294 ff., more cautiously Hill 182 f. and n. 96, and even Haenchen 611 f., cf. 482. Haenchen accepts only the Nazirite incident, not the circumcision of Timothy, but treats even the latter as Luke's honest belief.

42 Cf. Stowers 76 f.

43 Munck xxxiv.

44 Goppelt 79.
Hellenist trajectory survived its defeat in Ignatius' city to reappear 60 years or so later in his letters.

Here I think the solution is fairly simple. It is essentially the account offered, on this specific issue, by Meier. While the principled Paul left town following the incident, the pragmatic Hellenists stayed and bided their time. After 70 CE, the influence of Jerusalem and of Judaism in general diminished. If the community continued to obey the apostolic decree (as it may well have done, see discussion above), consciousness of that decree as an exercise in Jewish observance must have faded rapidly. The result, six decades after the incident, is the attitude of Ignatius; and while the pungency of his dismissal of Judaism may be peculiarly his own, its substance (or lack of substance, from a Jewish viewpoint) strongly suggests that disregard of Christianity's Jewish heritage was general in his congregation.

Clement and Ignatius on Judaism: My Hellenist hypothesis is intended to explain literature including both Ignatius and Clement, who write about Judaism in strikingly different tones. And while with Ignatius the question is how the Hellenist trajectory can have survived a setback to reach his day (see

---

45 Meier 43 f.

46 I do not follow Meier's larger reconstruction, which places the heavily Jewish Gospel of Matthew squarely on the trajectory from the Antioch incident to Ignatius (Meier 13 f. and passim). While I agree that Ignatius probably knew Matthew's gospel (Meier 24 f. and n. 57), it seems to me that Ignatius' attitude is much easier to explain if Matthew's milieu plays no part in his background.
discussion above), the question with Clement is how such a trajectory can be thought to have been headed in his direction at all. For I have defined the Hellenists largely in terms of their low regard for Judaism as a normative force; but Clement appears to show a high regard for Judaism as a normative force, which is one reason he is often thought to represent a Roman church which is to the right of Paul. Brown's reconstruction has Rome evangelized from Jerusalem and is also supported by the argument that NT Romans represents Paul's attempt to moderate his inflammatory rhetoric from Galatians for a more conservative Jewish-Christian audience.

Not everyone agrees that Christianity came to Rome from Jerusalem, or in a conservative form. Koester is convinced that the gospel drifted into the world capital from various directions as converts happened to move there. Goppelt suggests that Rome was probably evangelized from Antioch and represented the same brand of Christianity; K. Aland also considers the Roman congregation a Hellenist foundation; Meyer argues that the Roman community was Law-free before Paul, hence the discussion of "weak" and "strong" at NT Rom 14:1-15:13; and T. Robinson argues that the expulsion of possibly Christian Jews by Claudius in 49 CE for riots "impulsore Chresto" (Suetonius, Claudius 25:4)

47 E.g. J. Sanders 219; Brown "Rome" 159 ff.
48 Brown "Rome" 103 f.
49 Brown "Rome" 111 ff.
suggests a radical, not a conservative, Jewish Christianity. In the end, the origin and nature of Roman Christianity cannot be determined on the available evidence, and what we are left with is the evidence for the turn-of-the-century community as reflected in 1 Clement.

Clement is indeed kind and considerate in his references to all things Jewish, in contrast to the irascible Ignatius. But as argued above (Chapter 7), his Jewishness is only superficial; Judaism as Judaism is no more normative for Clement than for Ignatius, and though we remain largely ignorant of Christian history in Rome up to Clement's time, there is nothing in the substance of Clement's own Christianity that would not fit the Hellenist hypothesis.

---


51 So T. Robinson 81.
CHAPTER 14: EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

In Chapter 10 I answered the first two questions posed in Chapter 1: Is there a mainline faith uniting our literature over against Paul? What is its content? There is, I concluded, such a mainline orientation to be found in the literature, varied though it is, provided one does not use too demanding a standard of "uniting," and especially of "over against." For our literature is seldom if ever diametrically opposed to the theology of Paul's undisputed letters; I characterized it as clustered near the commonsensical, general and anthropocentric end of a continuum with respect to the topics at issue, with Paul at the paradoxical, specific and theocentric end. I also provided an account of its content, as it differs from Paul, under four headings: the role of Christ, the role of the Christian, the role of Judaism, and the role of Paul and the apostles.

In Chapters 11-13 I have been attempting to answer the remaining questions about the mainline faith -- Where did it come from? When did it arise? -- by examining several overall theories, including my own, of the relationship between our literature and Paul. It is time now to return to the specific tenets of the mainline faith, to see what has or has not been demonstrated about the origin of each, particularly with respect to my own theory of the Hellenist mission origin of the mainline faith.
THE ROLE OF CHRIST

Christ as savior: Our literature displays a conventional, settled use of "savior" as a present-tense title for Christ. Paul's single use of the noun, and his single use of the verb "save" in reference to Christ, are both future tense, clearly a reference to the parousia. As "early catholicism" is largely defined in terms of the loss of an active parousia expectation, nothing could be more natural than that "savior" should lose its future-tense meaning in such an atmosphere. "Natural" does not necessarily mean "true," of course; it is not logically impossible that some evangelists in the 30s CE (the Hellenists, say) already preached Christ as the present-tense savior. But here, the balance of probabilities appears to favor the early catholicism theory.

Christ's atoning death: As this concept is found in pre-Pauline passages in the undisputed letters, it seems clear that it dates from before Paul. Tracing it specifically to the Hellenists is another matter. As noted in Chapter 13, Meyer's assertion that the atonement language of NT Rom 3:25, in which Christ replaces the Temple cult, is the "signature of the hellēnistai" depends on his dichotomy between Jewish Christian "Hebrews" who saw Easter as restoration of Israel and Jewish Christian "Hellenists" who saw it as transcendence of the old order. The only demonstrable dichotomy between what may for convenience be called Hebrews and Hellenists involves Law

1 Meyer 88.
observance (at least with respect to table fellowship), as in Gal 2. That that dichotomy should reflect a broader dichotomy of attitudes toward Judaism seems plausible enough, and indeed my own theory generally affirms this, but there is no way of knowing the details; it is not impossible that (to take just one speculative example) the "Hebrews" too saw Christ's death as atoning, in a manner either superseding or fulfilling the Temple cult, while still believing themselves bound to the Law.

All we can know is that somebody in the Christian movement was preaching Christ's death as atoning before Paul; we cannot know whether it was a certain somebody, or everybody, and the latter is likely enough.\(^2\) But given that atonement language is pre-Pauline and survived to the time of our literature, and given the geographical limitations on Paul's influence,\(^3\) it seems quite certain that atonement theology was characteristic of an ongoing stream of Christian teaching quite apart from Paul. There is no evidence that this teaching originated with the Hellenists, but there is equally no evidence, and no likelihood, that it was not part of their teaching.

The lack of stress on Christ's death: The vagueness of references in our literature to Christ's death and its function was noted in Chapter 3 and subsequently.\(^4\) It is difficult to give anything but a vague explanation for it. The pre-Pauline passages

---

\(^2\) Cf. E. Sanders Palestinian 463.

\(^3\) Conzelmann History 68, 112.

\(^4\) E.g. Vielhauer 36, 45 for Acts, Corwin 172 f. for Ignatius, Ziesler 139 for the Pastorals.
noted in Chapter 10 are vague up to a point — the significance of Christ's death "for us" goes unexplained in them\(^5\) — but on the other hand Paul can sharpen such formulas for his own purposes, as in adding his own characteristic "to set us free from the present evil age" to the formula at Gal 1:4,\(^6\) so it is hard to get a reliable picture of the pre-Pauline situation. Bultmann considers a lack of clarity in the theology of Christ's death to have been characteristic of the "Hellenistic kerygma,"\(^7\) but his account includes reference to "Hellenistic syncretism," which plays no part in my own more restrained definition of the "Hellenist mission," so I cannot follow him with any confidence. It seems unlikely, however, that the theology of Christ's death would lose clarity over time, and Christianity\(^8\) took its first impetus from the resurrection rather than the crucifixion,\(^9\) so it seems entirely probable that our literature's vagueness about Christ's death was characteristic of a stream originating before Paul, surviving alongside him and appearing in our literature.

Repentance and forgiveness of sins: With the possible exception of NT Rom 3:25, forgiveness does not appear in the pre-Pauline passages, nor does repentance at all. Both are, however, tied to "sins" considered as transgressions, as is atonement. All

---

\(^5\) Ziesler 91.

\(^6\) E. Sanders Palestinian 465.

\(^7\) Bultmann 81.

\(^8\) Once again I acknowledge the danger of anachronism. See Chapter 1.

\(^9\) Koester 83 f.
are part of the same economy in earliest Christianity as in first-century Judaism\textsuperscript{10} and remain so in our literature, notwithstanding Paul's more profound and paradoxical ideas. Once again, a trajectory arising before Paul, continuing alongside him, and surviving into our literature is the most reasonable explanation. Once again, there is no positive evidence that the Jewish Christian Hellenists of Antioch participated in this trajectory; once again, there is no likelihood that they did not.

**THE ROLE OF THE CHRISTIAN**

The centrality of morals is one of the most striking characteristics of our literature. This is shown in many ways: the moralizing use of dikaiosuña, the various references to pleasing God or doing good deeds, the status of conscience. But its clearest manifestation is in the association of moral exhortation with expressions such as "the faith" or even "the gospel" (1 Tm 1:11), expressions which suggest that this, i.e. morals, is what Christian preaching is all about.

While a call to holy living is part of the pre-Pauline passages noted in Chapter 10 (1 Thess 4:1-8, Gal 5:19-21), it is difficult to see in these paranetical snippets the same centrality as in our literature. On the other hand, it is easy to see in our literature an outlook characteristic of a church that has lost its eschatological edge and focused disproportionately on the rectitude necessary to maintain itself in a world that may last indefinitely -- that is, the outlook of early catholicism.

\textsuperscript{10} E. Sanders *Paul* 78 f.
Against this it may be noted that our literature explicitly brackets its moral teaching with an eschatological expectation that is at least officially still alive. This link of parousia and holy living is the whole point of 2 Peter, and it is also found in Acts (24:15 f., 17:30 f. and elsewhere), Polycarp (2:1 ff.), 1 Clement (ch. 22 f., culminating in 23:5) and the Pastorals (1 Tm 6:14).\(^{11}\) Schwartz suggests that the whole message of Acts is that the general resurrection has begun (with Jesus), and so it is time to get morally prepared;\(^{12}\) if that message could be at all credible half a century or more after Easter, how much more so in the early days? Moral parenesis was part of the earliest gospel;\(^{13}\) how big a part is the question. The most plausible answer is that the moralism of our literature has roots in the earliest preaching but has been much accentuated by early catholic trends.

I argued briefly in Chapter 13 that the Hellenists, with their pragmatic attitude toward Judaism, are good candidates for having mediated a Law-based morality to the eventual Gentile church. That they made morality as central as our literature does is another matter. Again, we have no direct evidence of the Hellenists' position, and I would not even claim plausibility for any suggestion that the Hellenists were as moralistic as the

---

\(^{11}\) Ignatius (IgEph ch. 10-11:1) also links paranesis and parousia, but his exhortation is to heroic Christian virtue rather than to stock morality.

\(^{12}\) Schwartz 20 ff.

\(^{13}\) E. Sanders Paul 22.
Pastor or Clement, but neither is it plausible that they were as subtle and paradoxical in their moral teaching as Paul.

THE ROLE OF PAUL AND THE APOSTLES

Authority: We have no pre-Pauline evidence of the exercise of apostolic authority. It is obvious from Paul's letters, notably Galatians, that he considers his apostolic counterparts to be worth citing as authorities when it suits him, and he implies that they exercise authority. We have no evidence that the Hellenists made any point of apostolic authority; if anything, the account in Acts would suggest that the apostles were more concerned about the Hellenists than vice-versa.

Unanimity: Any suggestion of total apostolic unanimity in Paul's day is belied by Galatians. It is not logically impossible that there was such a concept before him, which he then disrupted, but it seems much more likely that it was a later ideal, fostered by early catholic trends. There is certainly no reason to attribute it to the Hellenists.

Continuity: Our literature's concern for continuity of apostolic teaching or authority reads most naturally as something that has arisen when enough time has passed for continuity to become an issue. At an earlier date, a lively enough expectation of the parousia would make continuity an irrelevancy. It is again not logically impossible that some form of continuity was on the apostles' mind, but there is no early evidence that it was, and certainly none that would attribute this concern to the Hellenists. This again appears to be a question of early catholicism.
Correct doctrine: The early catholicism explanation that correct doctrine became an issue when threatened by heresy seems plausible. It would be hard to put the matter any higher than that, since concern for correct preaching can also be found in Paul's undisputed letters, and it seems unlikely that even the earliest preachers would be totally unconcerned or unaware of the issue; it would appear to be a matter of degree, with our literature displaying a concern that has grown over time. There is no evidence as to the Hellenists' views in this area.

**THE ROLE OF JUDAISM**

The attitude of our literature toward Judaism is, as should be obvious by now, the centrepiece of the argument of this thesis, and the topic on which I differ most from standard interpretations. I have argued that our literature is, in Brown's terminology, to the left of Paul with respect to Christianity's relationship to Judaism, and also that it is likely that left-of-Paul Christianity is a pre-Pauline rather than a post-Pauline development.

The popular view of Paul as an arch-traitor to Judaism, though by no means without justification from a Jewish point of view, should not be allowed to obscure the fact that Judaism is still normative for Paul, even if not in a way non-Christian Jewish thinkers could approve. Judaism has no such normative status for any of our authors, although its scriptures, morals and even rituals are available for Christian use as deemed

---

14 Barrett Paul 1.
desirable. Ignatius' dismissal is brutal and embarrassing; the Pastor, Polycarp, 2 Peter, and especially Clement take the same position with greater courtesy. Acts is more complicated, but ultimately its concessions to Judaism's normative status -- the apostolic decree and Paul's public observance -- go only to show that Christians have done everything possible to conciliate Judaism and cannot be blamed for abandoning so many fruitless efforts (e.g. 28:25-28, the book's last statement on the subject).\textsuperscript{15}

Theories of "Petrine" Christianity notwithstanding, the attitude shown in our literature cannot have arisen out of any combination of Paul's thought and forces pulling to the right; what is needed is a pull to the left. The possibility cannot be excluded that that "pull" was merely a drift, brought about by the passage of time, when Paul was dead and most Christians were Gentiles and nobody remembered what Paul had been so passionate about or knew enough about Judaism to understand the arguments involved. But this is highly improbable, and not only because it seems unlikely that mere drift could so reverse Paul's position among his spiritual heirs. There is also the matter of the many Christians of Paul's own day who were not under his influence. What was their stance on this matter? Pauline? Hardly -- there was only one Paul, who had enough trouble getting people to agree with him in his own churches (a fact to which we owe most of his

\textsuperscript{15} Differently Segal 275, regarding Acts as a Jewish Christian document which gives the Law a higher status for Christians than Paul does.
letters\textsuperscript{16}). Right of Paul? Some of them, no doubt, but their heirs would be even less likely simply to drift to the position of our literature.

A left-of-Paul stream, on the other hand, would provide something stronger than a drift. Such a stream certainly seems to have existed: Jewish Christians who had abandoned the Law to a significant degree before Paul joined them, and who showed an inclination to carry the gospel beyond Judaism. Via Galatians, and also via Acts, we meet these people in Antioch.

THE HELLENISTS AND THE MAINLINE FAITH

The non-observant Hellenists of Antioch before Paul, the unrecorded communities of non-Pauline Christians of Paul's own day, and the dismissive, appropriationist authors of our literature: these are the stages on my proposed trajectory of the mainline faith. The Hellenists, I submit, were no mere bridge to Paul; they were a broad highway past Paul to our literature, to the Great Church, and eventually to modern Christianity.

Lacking Paul's subtlety and Paul's intensity, as I think their behavior in Gal 2 demonstrates, the Hellenists were well-suited to occupy a position near the "commonsensical, general and anthropocentric end" of the continuum of first-century Christian thought. I am not suggesting that their position was the same as that of our literature in general or of any one of our authors, but rather that their general orientation was such as could develop into that shown by our literature.

\textsuperscript{16} Cf. Barrett "Controversies" 229.
Their stance toward Judaism is their most original and characteristic feature. I do not suggest that their somewhat casual non-observance was accompanied by anything like the attitude of an Ignatius, or even of a Clement; but it was far more suited to develop in that direction than the theological contortions of Paul or the resolute observance of James.

Their moral teaching is not available to us, and it seems improbable that a group operating almost in the shadow of the resurrection would give morality as such the central role our literature does. But it is likely that the Hellenists' moral outlook was less tied to the Law than that of the Jerusalem church, less embarrassed about the Law than Paul, and less consciously concerned with the Law than either, thus anticipating the general character if not the centrality of our literature's moral outlook.

The uncertain emphasis on Christ's death found in our literature also seems likely, if only by default, to come from the Hellenists; it certainly didn't come from Paul. As for the focus on atonement, repentance and forgiveness of sins, it does not appear to be a Hellenist monopoly. Paul affirmed all of those things, though they were not central to his thought, and I would not doubt that the Jerusalem church preached them also. But the Hellenists, with a more mission-minded outlook than Jerusalem and a more accessible theology than Paul, would likely have had the best success propagating these ideas, and as such would be the forebears of our authors.
For what I am saying, ultimately, is that the Hellenists had enormous success propagating their ideas. What spread across the Roman Empire in the first century CE, in Paul's lifetime and afterward, alongside Paul's communities and at least rivalling them both in towns evangelized and in individual believers, was the preaching we encounter in Antioch.

AND BACK TO OUR LITERATURE

This thesis began from the assumption that our primary literature has enlisted Paul's name, in varying degrees, in support of material he would never have written himself. An inventory of that literature has found that this is true, up to a point. There are striking differences of emphasis, but there are no real binary oppositions. Even the widest gap (in my estimation), the difference between our literature's view of Judaism and Paul's, is not diametrical; Ignatius is not Marcion, the repudiator of the Jewish scriptures and the Jewish God, any more than Paul is James. Morality has a very different place in our literature from its role in Paul's theological scheme, but Paul and our authors both preach morality. Our authors are far vaguer than Paul about the importance of Christ's death, but they do not disregard it; Paul is less interested in atonement, repentance, and forgiveness of sins than our authors, but he affirms them all nevertheless. The fathering of the mainline faith onto Paul by our authors does him less than justice, but it also does him no real violence.

It is also worthy of note that most of the content of the mainline faith appears to be the product of longstanding
orientations, in fact older than Paul's own ministry, and not the invention of a new generation of "bishops" or of "epigoni." That Paul has been in considerable measure homogenized, co-opted or submerged in our literature appears to be true enough in itself; why he was chosen for such an honor would be a suitable topic for another thesis. But the suggestions such allegations often carry, that this process was somehow sinister in intention, or alternatively that it was bumbling in its lack of grasp of Christian essentials, are unwarranted. For our authors, as heirs of the Hellenists, propounding the mainline faith was simply business as usual.
AFTERWORD: HUMAN AND HOLY

The New Testament documents make up only a small fraction of the number of religious and secular texts surviving from the first and early second centuries CE. But in surviving manuscripts, in modern editions in print, in readership and in scholarly activity, these 27 writings dwarf all the rest. This is not a coincidence. The level of interest, whether among believers or among non-believers, is due almost entirely to the fact that the New Testament is the official "holy book" of the Christians.

This being so, anything written about the New Testament automatically raises questions about its implications for the reading of the New Testament as a holy book. Scripture scholarship which disregards such questions has always struck me as curiously cut off from its own context, as if heart surgery should be conceived of as simply an indoor sport, a feat of skill unconnected with saving human life.

---

1 Cf. Koester 16 f., Bruce Documents 14 ff.

2 Along with, of course, the Hebrew Scriptures, and in some churches the Apocrypha/Deuterocanonicals; but these are not my focus here.

3 Cf. Malina 65 f., making the same observation in support of a quite different point.

4 In view of my use of a simile involving "saving," I should perhaps make it clear here that I am not suggesting that only those committed to "holy book" status have a right to be Bible scholars; the Bible is the world's most public document. But I am suggesting that the implications of scholarship for that status, whether supportive, problematical or negative, should not be left out of account.
This thesis, too, raises such questions, both in its presuppositions and in its conclusions, by its attribution of certain features of the New Testament to human endeavors which are not obviously edifying. In this Afterword, I would like to acknowledge these questions and propose my own answers to them.

THE PROBLEM OF HOLY FORGERIES

I noted in Chapter 1 that I accept within this thesis what I take to be critical orthodoxy, the judgement that the Pastorals and 2 Peter were written, not by Paul of Tarsus or the disciple Simon Peter, but by later writers using their names. Now of course scripture scholars don't call this forgery; it is often represented as an entirely non-problematical custom of the ancient world, not intended to deceive and not in fact deceiving any but the unsophisticated. 5 While this may be true, there is no shortage of arguments and evidence to the contrary. It might be asked why a false name should be used if no one was expected to accept it as true; 6 and the Pastorals and 2 Peter are full of details which (assuming pseudonymity) seem best explained as lending verisimilitude to a deliberate deception. 7 The story of the unfrocking of a second-century presbyter for producing the pseudonymous Acts of Paul and Thecla, despite his pious motives,


6 Metzger "Literary" 16.

7 Kelly 33, Sidebottom 99.
suggests that pseudonymity was not accepted by the church at least at that point;\(^8\) the church seems to have based canonicity partly on what it took to be authenticity; it would not have been easy to win recognition as genuine for letters originally known to be good-faith pseudonymous works.\(^9\) And the popular view that a divinely inspired book cannot contain this sort of deception is not easy to shrug off.

As one who believes in the inspiration of scripture,\(^10\) I am impressed enough by these arguments to consider the pseudonymity of the Pastorals and 2 Peter an open question. Nevertheless, I must acknowledge that it is very hard to imagine the real Paul, with his paradoxical view of the function of the Law (e.g. Gal 3:19) writing or even closely supervising a passage like 1 Tm 1:8-11; and also that 2 Peter does not appear to fit a context within the real Peter's own lifetime. But pseudonymity is not fatal to a belief in inspiration. Taking inspiration seriously means believing that the Bible is God's book, and if that is so, it is God -- and neither fundamentalist preachers nor pious readers nor critical Bible scholars -- who gets to decide what

\(^8\) Metzger "Literary" 14, Guthrie New Testament 679.


\(^10\) Not its verbal dictation, which I think is a self-contradictory notion in view of such passages as Lk 1:3, which portrays the author as writing an "orderly account" after careful investigation, and especially 1 Cor 7:25, where Paul acknowledges he has "no command of the Lord." Verbal dictation would imply that the Lord had commanded him to write that the Lord had not commanded him to write.
belongs in it.\textsuperscript{11} A holy book's contents are what they are, and need no external justification.

The supposed tendentiousness or fictionalization of Acts is a similar problem to that of pseudonymity, and has a similar solution: If God chooses to inspire a theological work in a narrative guise, he is entitled to do so. But the problem is less pressing in any case. Even conservative scholars concede that Luke does not give a "Pauline" account of Paul's career,\textsuperscript{12} but that is not to rule out the possibility that Paul's just-like-Peter preaching and his Law-observant conduct in Acts were, within the conventions of ancient historiography, historically genuine samples of being "all things to all people, that I might by all means save some."\textsuperscript{13}

A further question, of course, is what becomes of this thesis if the Pastorals, especially, are not pseudonymous after all? In practice, it might never have been written if the Pastorals were generally accepted by scholars as genuine, since of all our literature it is probably the Pastorals which most attract the sort of comment to which this thesis is a response.

\textsuperscript{11} Cf. Wilfred Harrington, "We can hardly ever, in fact, decide a priori what is becoming or unbecoming to God, for divine condescension goes deeper than we know," Irish Theological Quarterly 29 (1962), 23f, quoted by Metzger "Literary" 22 n. 67. Cf. also Johnson's suggestion that fundamentalism is a conviction about the literal truth of the Bible which often fails to take seriously the literal content of the Bible (Johnson 63).

\textsuperscript{12} Bruce "Paul of Acts" 305.

\textsuperscript{13} See discussion above, Chapter 13; cf. Bruce "Paul of Acts" 294 ff., Hill 182 f. and n. 96, Goppelt 74.
In principle, however, not very much would have to change. The gap between Paul and the mainline faith is not diametrical even if the Pastorals are identified wholly with the mainline side. If Paul wrote them, that would narrow the gap a good deal, and complicate explanations somewhat. (We might need a secretary hypothesis to explain 1 Tm 1:8-11, for example;\textsuperscript{14} more generally, we might need to bear in mind Munck's observation that Paul was a human being and not an armchair Paulinist.\textsuperscript{15}) But our literature's overall attitude to Judaism, Paul's deepest convictions on the subject from NT Romans and Galatians, and my interpretation of the respective parties to the Antioch incident of Gal 2\textsuperscript{16} would remain; Paul might edge a bit closer to the middle of the continuum, but the gap would not go away, and my general explanation for it would remain the same.

SO WAS PAUL WRONG THEN?

Part of the point of this thesis is that Paul did not carry the day in early Christianity the way some scholars\textsuperscript{17} claim, or as anyone might think from reading the New Testament table of contents. The Hellenists, as I describe them, may well have had more to do with the early spread of Christianity than Paul did, at least numerically and geographically, and their version of the gospel was (and remains) more widely understood and accepted.

\textsuperscript{14} E.g. Kelly 25 ff.

\textsuperscript{15} Munck xxxiv (see Chapter 13). Cf. also Stowers' suggestion that if Paul had written an autobiography, it would probably appear "un-Pauline" to New Testament scholars.

\textsuperscript{16} See Chapter 12 above.

\textsuperscript{17} E.g. Goulder \textit{passim}. 
Does this mean that Paul lost? That he was wrong? That he
doesn't really count any more? No, it does not. A "holy book"
understanding of the New Testament implies that everything in it,
obviously including Paul's undisputed letters, counts as "Bible."
The New Testament canon demarcates what Dunn calls "the limits of
acceptable diversity."\(^{18}\) A consequence of that idea is that the
mainline faith as presented in Acts or the Pastorals or 2 Peter
cannot be described as inadequate, still less un-Christian,
merely because it is not as profound or exciting as Paul's
letters. But neither can Paul's teaching be dismissed merely
because it does not meet with the same widespread acceptance (or
comprehension) as the mainline faith. The two viewpoints, and
others also found in the New Testament, only count as "Bible"
together;\(^{19}\) and only thus does such human pluralism constitute
the singular Word of God.

\(^{18}\) Dunn 378.

\(^{19}\) Cf. Brown and Meier viii.
APPENDIX: COLOSSIANS AND NT EPHESIANS

The New Testament letters of Paul to the Colossians and to the Ephesians, often considered pseudonymous, were excluded from the literature studied in this thesis primarily because their orientation is significantly different from that of our literature, so that they attract fewer allegations of having homogenized or submerged Paul's theology. Nonetheless, these letters, if in fact pseudonymous, are part of the post-Pauline "reception of Paul," and a comparison of their contents to the mainline faith identified in the body of the thesis may be in order here.

A number of characteristic features of the mainline faith are indeed to be found in one or both letters. With respect to the role of Christ, these include atonement language ("peace through the blood of his cross," Col 1:20; "redemption through his blood," NT Eph 1:7) and forgiveness of sins or trespasses (e.g. Col 1:14, NT Eph 1:7), with hamartia never found in the singular; and, in NT Ephesians, a present-tense use of "savior" (5:23). Repentance, however, is mentioned in neither letter. Concerning the role of the Christian, both letters have vice

---


2 Especially Hanson 7, cf. also Beker 64 f., Koester 297 f.

3 Roetzel 132, Kee 283 for Colossians.

4 Barth 34.
lists (Col 3:5-10, NT Eph 5:3-5) and prescriptions of bourgeois morality (Col 3:18-4:1, NT Eph 5:22-6:9), though the latter are more even-handed as between husbands and wives or slaves and masters than those of our literature.\(^5\) Dikaiosunē is always used in a moralizing sense in NT Ephesians (4:24, 5:9, 6:1, 14);\(^6\) the word is not found in Colossians. NT Eph 5:10 refers to pleasing the Lord, and Col 1:21-23 makes staying clear of "evil deeds" constitutive of "the faith." "The faith" is also used in the mainline sense at Col 1:23 and NT Eph 4:5 ("one faith");\(^7\) "word of truth" (Col 1:5, NT Eph 1:13), however, appears to signify the gospel proclamation rather than a body of doctrine in the manner of our literature.

Striking differences from our literature and from the mainline faith are also to be found. Salvation is made a matter of God's breaking the power of darkness (Col 1:13) or of rulers and authorities (Col 2:15)\(^8\) or of the "power of the air" (NT Eph 2:2) in a manner more reminiscent of Paul's thought than of our literature. Good works are represented as a consequence or fruit of the gospel (Col 1:10-13 cf. 2:20-23; NT Eph 2:4-10), as in the undisputed letters, rather than as central to the gospel as in our literature (except perhaps at Col 1:21-23, see preceding paragraph).

---

\(^5\) Koester 266.

\(^6\) Barth 34.

\(^7\) Roetzel 132, Kee 306.

\(^8\) Ziesler 130 for Colossians.
Most striking of all, perhaps, is the emphasis placed in NT Ephesians on the incorporation of Gentiles into the promises made to Israel (especially 2:11-3:6), which the author goes so far as to call "the mystery of Christ" (3:4).\(^9\) While the specific point being made is quite different from that of NT Romans and Galatians,\(^10\) such a preoccupation with the relationship of the gospel to God's covenant with Israel is far closer to Paul than to anything found in our literature with the possible exception of Acts. Colossians contains expressions superficially compatible with our literature's appropriationist viewpoint, making Jewish practices "a shadow of what is to come" whose "substance" is Christ (2:17), and treating Jewish prohibitions as "simply human commands and teachings" (2:22); these expressions would appear, however, to be applied to a specific syncretistic, if not gnostic, Jewish-based Christian heresy\(^11\) rather than to Judaism as such.

I have characterized my literature as grouped near the commonsensical, general and anthropocentric end of a continuum, with Paul at the paradoxical, specific and theocentric end. This brief investigation suggests Colossians and NT Ephesians would fit somewhere in the middle.

---

\(^9\) Roetzel 143, Ziesler 132.

\(^10\) Koester 270, Roetzel 140, 143, cf. also Barrett "Controversies" 239 f.

\(^11\) Koester 264 f., Roetzel 136 f.
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