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ABSTRACT

The apparent departure of most of the original apostles from Jerusalem some time after the Apostolic Council brought about the decisive decline of the moderate group's influence in the Jerusalem Church and the eventual transference of leadership from Peter to James the Lord's brother who was the virtual head of the Jerusalem Judaizers. Consequently, the agreement at the Apostolic Council came to be unilaterally annulled by the Jerusalem Judaizers and the Judaizing campaigns toward the whole Gentile churches became drastically intensified. Moreover, the incident at Antioch aggravated irrevocably the already antagonistic relations between the Apostle Paul and the Jerusalem Judaizers. As a result, James the Lord's brother and other Jerusalem Church leaders came to reach the solemn conclusion that, with a view to the unity of all churches under the leadership of ONE MOTHER CHURCH at Jerusalem, Paul should be removed by all means.

On the other hand, in his firm belief that the Return of the Risen Lord was imminent, the Apostle Paul was determined to proclaim the Gospel even to those in Spain before His Advent took place. At the same time, however, he was deeply concerned about the future of the young and still weak Gentile churches in the face of the systematic campaigns of the Jerusalem Judaizers which would certainly be
escalated all the more immediately after his departure for Spain.
In these circumstances, the Apostle Paul made a grim resolution even at the risk of his own life (Cf. Rom. 15:30-32, Acts 21:11-14) to visit Jerusalem and appeal for the last time to a spark of conscience in the Jerusalem Judaizers led by James. Then, bearing in mind the possibility both of his death at Jerusalem and also that of a safe return from this city, the Apostle took two necessary measures. First, he took great pains (a) to bind the divided Roman congregation in his Gospel with the ultimate aim of making it the invincible protector of the true Gospel and (b) to check the danger of indiscreet enthusiasm among the Roman Christians in their expectation of the imminent Parousia. Such enthusiasm would directly threaten not only the very existence of the Roman Church itself but even that of all the churches in the Empire. Secondly, the Apostle obviously took his chance to effect his safe return from Jerusalem by removing the probable hostility against himself produced by the Jerusalem Judaizers among the Jewish Christians of the Roman Church and thus making the Roman Christians as a whole intervene positively between himself and the Jerusalem Judaizers for his safety.

Despite all these painstaking efforts, the Apostle Paul failed to escape the deadly trap set by James the Lord's brother when he arrived at Jerusalem.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM, THE AIM AND THE SCOPE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

In Romans 15:30-32, having grave premonitions of the impending danger and other probable disgraceful affairs at Jerusalem, the Apostle Paul pleads with the Roman Christians to strive together in their prayers to God for his personal safety and the achievement of the aim of his journey to Jerusalem.

So far as the Pauline epistles are concerned, we cannot find any other clear motives for this journey to Jerusalem apart from the delivery of the contributions collected for the Jerusalem Church. It is truly remarkable to see Luke recording in Acts 20:22: "καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ δεόμενος ἐγὼ τῷ πνεύματι πορεύματι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, ⋯⋯"; however, even this vital quotation from the Apostle himself does not directly help us to find a clue to the very reason for this perilous journey. Then could we conclude that it was the sole aim of the Apostle to bring the contributions to the Jerusalem Church? If it were so, he does not necessarily have to visit in person at the risk of his own life and can easily avoid the anticipated danger without

1 See also Acts 20:23, 21:10f.
anything to worry about by asking some other person to deliver it in his place. Why on earth does he have to go to Jerusalem despite all his ominous presentiments? Moreover, does 'ταύτα ἀπειθοῦνται ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαίῳ' incontrovertibly indicate the non-Christian Jews of Judaism? If it was true that the contemporary Jewish leaders were unceasingly making desperate efforts to remove the Apostle Paul, then what was their attitude toward the Jerusalem Church herself which existed right under their noses? Were the leaders of the Jerusalem Church not a bit aware of any kind of impending danger that would surely befall this Apostle for the Gentiles? If any possibility of fatal disaster that might be brought upon the Apostle had come to their notice, why did they not dissuade him from coming to Jerusalem? Unfortunately, we cannot find any clear evidence of their positive efforts trying to dissuade the Apostle in an attempt at saving him from the impending danger. Does this mean that, even if the Apostle's apprehensions were quite unfounded, the leaders of the Jerusalem Church could never suspect any probable plot on the part of the non-Christian Jews that might endanger his life itself? On the contrary, if they were fully aware of the unavoidable danger expected from the hostile Jews of Judaism, why did they not try to dissuade the Apostle from visiting Jerusalem in person? Did they keep silence because they knew too well that they had no way of shaking the Apostle Paul's determined resolution at all?¹

Nevertheless, not only the Apostle Paul’s own epistles but also Acts and various other writings depicting the contemporary historical situations present many exegetical problems to us as we attempt to grasp the stark nature of the impending danger that would befall the Apostle simply in the sphere of the antagonistic relationships between him and the Jews of Judaism. Moreover, the statement of Romans 15:31b itself discloses a very serious exegetical problem in the Apostle Paul’s relationship with the Jerusalem Church that can never be satisfied merely with the statements of Acts describing the Apostle’s last visit to Jerusalem. In what situation were contemporary Judaism and Christianity placed respectively at Jerusalem and in Palestine?

Admittedly, the poor Jewish Christians in Palestine at that time were in urgent need of the contributions that the Apostle Paul was bringing to Jerusalem. If so, how could the Apostle, in Romans 15:31b, consider the possibility that such contributions might be rejected? Do we have to interpret "... ἡ διακονία μου ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἐπρόσδεκτος τοῖς ἀγίοις γένηται" as the Apostle’s wishing the Jerusalem Church only to accept the contributions without wavering? What does the Apostle basically mean by ἐπρόσδεκτος? Should this strained relationship be understood, on the one hand, with a sympathetic heart toward the awkward situation of the Jerusalem Church striving for her own existence in the very midst of Judaism while endeavouring not to get too much on the nerves of the non-Christian Jews who were regarding the Apostle Paul with utmost hostility? Or,
on the other hand, should it be understood, irrespective of Judaism, solely in the sphere of the inner antagonistic relationship between Paul as the Apostle for the Gentiles and the leaders of the Jerusalem Church in their understanding the Gospel itself? To put it more concretely, was it the antagonism of the Apostle Paul to the original apostles or to the Judaizers in the Jerusalem Church? And if the Apostle Paul was antagonistic only to the Judaizers in the Jerusalem Church, what was the attitude of the original apostles toward the Judaizers and the Apostle Paul who were pitted against each other? How was the original apostles' position in the Jerusalem Church when the Apostle Paul was writing the epistle to the Roman Church? In this antagonistic situation, what would be the result if the Jerusalem Church refused the contributions of the Gentile churches that the Apostle was bringing together with other representatives of the Gentile churches?

How did the Apostle Paul analyse all this probable development of the situation? But, more than anything else, why of all places did the Apostle mention such a thing as casting a gloom over our gaze upon the primitive mother church and her relations to the Gentile churches in his epistle to the church which he had neither founded nor visited until then and why of all occasions did he choose that time, having his precarious journey to Jerusalem ahead? Did he mention his intolerable agony only to get the support of the Roman Christians' prayer? If the Apostle was expecting something more than mere prayer from them, was the Roman Church herself in a
position to give any effective support to him? How was the appearance of the Roman Church viewed from the Apostle's standpoint? Were the Roman Christians indeed building themselves up into such a solid Christian community as would deserve the praise of Romans 1:8? Then, how can we interpret the great internal dissension between the Gentile Christians and the Jewish Christians in the Roman Church that can be read throughout the epistle, the agony of the Roman Christians as a whole in the presence of hostile pagan neighbours which we see in ch.12, and the very delicate situation of the Roman Church in her relations with the Roman Empire which we can find in ch.13? How could the Apostle expect any positive intervention in the Jerusalem affairs from the very church that could not sustain even herself properly?

If the Apostle came to send such a letter to the Roman Church primarily in the interests of his future missionary plan in the west and was not much concerned about the local problems of the church in Rome, how is the Apostle's aim through Romans 15:30-32 interrelated with his admonitions throughout the epistle on the various problems of the Roman congregation? In other words, what is the relationship between his own Jerusalem problem and the local problems in Rome? If his Jerusalem problem, which can be inferred, in particular, from his own statement of Romans 15:31b, has anything to do with the local problems in Rome, how was his attitude toward the Jerusalem Church reflected in his Epistle to the Romans? What kind of motive did his attitude toward the Jerusalem Christians provide for his writing
to the Roman Christians? What exegetical significance could the result of our study of Romans 15:30-32 have in our understanding of the Apostle's aim through his Epistle to the Romans? The result of this study is, we believe, so crucial that our correct understanding of the Apostle's real aim through this epistle depends entirely on it.

It is regrettable to say that no previous study has shown us the true aspect of the Apostle Paul despite the enormous accumulation of the exegetical labours on this great epistle. It is, we dare say, due to all the exegetes' complete failure in understanding Romans 15:31b. Here lies an entirely new starting-point in the exegesis of the Epistle to the Romans and a new quest of the Apostle Paul comes to be demanded as an inescapable task of all serious New Testament students.

Nevertheless, we cannot but admit that the limit of this new quest is clearly indicated from the beginning by the very fact that since the close of the first half of this century there has been no dramatic appearance of new material relating to Pauline scholarship. There is indeed little to add to what has already, either fully or superficially, been made use of by many competent Pauline students of our days. Therefore, all our efforts throughout this study will be constantly concentrated on the critical examination of the legitimacy of the previous scholarship in handling the materials concerning this subject and on the subsequent reanalysis of them. Here, we can see both the limit of the present study and the possibility of a new quest of the greatest apostle, Paul, as a direct challenge to the previous scholarship.
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when new material becomes available real progress can be demonstrated easily and previous theories shown to have been false by the new facts. But if that is not the case and one has to work with the same material as before — and this is so with Luke-Acts, we see that he is pointing out exactly our own problem involved in the present study. Nevertheless, van Unnik himself is a bit cautious in estimating the value of the Qumran Scrolls as a new source material for the study of Luke-Acts in view of Fitzmyer's essay, "Jewish Christianity in Acts in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls". Though


2 See idem and J.A. Fitzmyer's essay in ibid., pp.233-257, and esp. p.253: "... The features of Essene tenets and practices ... have often shed important light on passages of Acts that describe the early Jewish Christian church. They at least provide concrete and tangible evidence for a Palestinian matrix of the early church as it is described in Acts. The evidence varies, since it is possible at times to think in terms of a direct contact or a direct imitation of (cont.)
the heated controversy on the yet 'Not Proven' Essene theory \(^1\) identifying the Qumran Covenanters with the Essenes observed by Josephus \(^2\) and others \(^3\) has eventually much enriched our understanding of the complicated climate of contemporary Judaism, no tangible evidence for Qumran influence on the early Jewish Christian church

\(^2\) (continued from the previous page) Essene usage (as in the case of "the Way"), while at other times the evidence is not so strong. Certainly, one cannot prove from such points of contact that the early Jewish Christian church developed out of an exclusively Essene framework. The most that one can say is that the early Jewish Christian church was not without some influence from the Essenes. It is not unlikely, as we have mentioned above, that among the "great number of priests" (Acts 6:7) who were converted some were Essene and provided the source of Essene influence ...."


\(^2\) See *Jewish Antiquities*, XVIII, i.5 and *The Jewish War*, II, viii.2-13.

\(^3\) See Philo, *Every Good Man is Free*, XII and *Hypothetica*, viii.11.1-18; Pliny, *Natural History*, V, xv.
can be adduced with confidence. Therefore, in the situation that one can only consider some common background derived from the Old Testament, we are not disposed to reckon the Qumran Scrolls as a reliable source for our study of the early Jewish Christian churches in Palestine and, in particular, the Jerusalem Church.

Hence, our primary sources for the present subject will be the Pauline epistles and the Acts of the Apostles. Other New Testament writings and those materials outside the New Testament will be regarded only as the secondary sources if they are relevant to the primary sources in the process of our research.

---

1 In his essay, Fitzmyer is applying wrong methodology in establishing his seemingly logical hypothesis. Cf. G. Mensching, Vergleichende Religionswissenschaft (Heidelberg, 1949), s.17: "... Das Homologe ist noch keineswegs immer das Analoge ..." Fitzmyer criticizes H.H. Rowley's rejection of any Qumran influence on the early Jerusalem Church and the New Testament as being 'radical' (See Qumran Scrolls, p.244), however, we think Rowley's attitude is far more convincing. See his The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament (London, 1957), pp.13f. and esp. p.32: "... there is no evidence to connect Jesus or the New Testament directly with the sect. Professor Millar Burrows, whose eminence in the world of scholarship is of long standing, confesses that the study of the Scrolls has not substantially affected his understanding of the New Testament. He says its Jewish background has become clearer and better understood, but its meaning has neither been changed nor significantly clarified [The Dead Sea Scrolls, p.343]. With this judgement I would fully associate myself." Cf. also W.S. LaSor, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament (Grand Rapids, 1972), pp.154-167, 247-256; H. Anderson's remark in his introduction to Jesus, edited by himself (Englewood Cliffs, 1967), p.32: "... There is no evidence of any direct contact between John or Jesus and Qumrân. The differences between these two and Qumrân are more noteworthy than the similarities ..."; the observations by Samuel Sandmel in his presidential address to the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in December, 1961 as quoted by R.K. Harrison, Archaeology of the New Testament (London, 1964), p.82: "... there is absolutely no evidence which would link early Christianity with the Dead Sea community, ... any alleged connections between Essene beliefs and Christian teachings are based on speculation and the discovery of parallel forms in the sectarian manuscripts and the New Testament ... their importance for the origin of Christianity has been greatly exaggerated over the years."
1. THE PRIMARY SOURCES

i. THE PAULINE EPISTLES

A. The Authenticity of the Epistles

Unlike F.C. Baur who concluded that only 'die Hauptbriefe', namely, the Epistle to the Galatians, the First and the Second Epistles to the Corinthians, and the Epistle to the Romans, could be ascribed to the Apostle Paul,¹ C.H. Dodd reckons the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, and those to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Philippians also as the authentic ones.² But, he is quite reluctant to admit the genuineness of the Second Thessalonians and, much more, of the Ephesians though he bases his exposition of the Apostle's thought on these two epistles as well.³ According to R. Bultmann, these two epistles belong to a Pauline school.⁴

In the case of the two epistles to the Thessalonians, "... the remarkably close and continuous similarities between the two epistles in style and content and arrangement ..."⁵ make it more convincing that the second epistle was written by the Apostle soon after the first one. Just as "... the vocabulary of 1 Thess. presents no

---

³ See *ibid.*, pp.9f.
⁴ See R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen, 1968⁶), s.495.
features which can fairly be described as necessarily unPauline ....",\(^1\) so it is in the second epistle. Furthermore, the seemingly different eschatological stratum\(^2\) and the significant change of tone\(^3\) were plainly due to the different situation which arose in the Thessalonian Church after receiving the first letter. Hence, the hypothesis of inauthenticity for the Second Thessalonians is not persuasive at all."\(^4\)

As to the Epistle to the Ephesians, despite the argument of those contesting the authenticity of this epistle in the light of the seemingly unPauline features of language and style, the substantive theological difference between this epistle and the other Pauline

---

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 71

\(^2\) Cf. ibid., pp. 78f. and esp. p. 79: "... 2 Thess. would be an attempt to conserve the substance of the earlier epistle, bring it up to date with warnings against contemporary fanaticism and pietistic enthusiasm, and restating the Pauline eschatology, for the benefit of a later generation, in terms of a wider historical prospect ...."


epistles, especially, the Epistle to the Colossians,¹ and the silence on any definite historical situation which the epistle was intended to meet,² we cannot but identify this unknown 'great Christ-mystic'³ and, at the same time, 'the greatest Paulinist of all time'⁴ who "has carried the apostle's thinking to its logical conclusion, beyond the point where the apostle stopped, and has placed the coping-stone on the massive structure of Paul's teaching"⁵ with the Apostle Paul himself.⁶


³ See A. Deissmann, Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History, trans. by W.E. Wilson (Gloucester, 1972), p.24: "... A great part of the critical difficulties, found in the contents of this epistle, disappears when Paul becomes known to us also from the undoubtedly 'genuine' letters as the great Christ-mystic.²" [n.2: "The old these, so greatly used in discussions about genuineness, that the teaching of the Apostle was contained in the four chief epistles (the very phrase is itself a petitio principii) was an act of violence. Unconsciously the way of settling many a question about social and political matters has been derived from this: and now what is it good for?" (Ibid., pp.24f.)].

⁴ See F.F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Ephesians (London, 1973⁷), p.11.

⁵ Ibid., pp.11f.

⁶ Cf. E.K. Simpson, The Epistle to the Ephesians, pp.15-19 in Simpson, E.K. and F.F. Bruce, Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians (Grand Rapids, 1975⁸) of The New International Commentary on the New Testament; F.F. Bruce, Ephesians, pp.11f; G.B. Caird, Paul's Letters from Prison (Oxford, 1976), p.29: ";... There are difficulties in attributing it to Paul. But these are insignificant in comparison with the difficulties of attributing it to an imitator. We shall therefore provisionally accept the traditional ascription." Also cf. A. Jülicher, Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Tübingen, 1906⁷), s.128: "... So müssen wir hier die Debatte mit einem non liquet schliessen."
Finally, it is the authenticity of the so-called Pastoral Epistles as a whole that we have to discuss. Even those critics who object to the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles admit the facts that these three epistles are so closely connected with one another that they should be examined in common,\(^1\) and that in all likelihood they originated with the same author.\(^2\) W.G. Kümmel sums up the ground of the objections against the Pauline composition of these epistles as „1. Sprache und Stil, 2. die vorausgesetzte geschichtliche Lage, 3. die Bekämpfung der Irrlehrer, 4. die Gemeindeverhältnisse, 5. die Theologie der Past.\(^3\) But, when we examine the texts themselves more critically, not only the linguistic evidence presented by the disputants of the Pauline authorship\(^4\) but also their historical and theological analyses\(^5\) are far from convincing. The style of the Pastorals strengthens the argument for the Pauline authorship,\(^6\) and the linguistic argument against the Pauline composition also should be carefully reexamined in the light of 'the dissimilarity of subject matter, the advancing age of the Apostle, the change of environment, and the difference in the recipients'.\(^7\) We find W. Lock being quite

---

\(^1\) Cf. Jülicher, Einleitung, s.152.
\(^2\) Cf. Moffatt, Introduction, p.414: "... The internal evidence does not justify any hypothesis of a plurality of authors. The pastorals in all likelihood came originally from one pen, but it is not possible to ascertain who the author was ...."
\(^3\) Kümmel, Einleitung, s.327. For the detailed discussions, see ibid., ss.327-339.
\(^6\) See W. Lock, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles (Edinburgh, 1966, 1924\(^1\)), xxix.
persuasive when he argues that the proof that the vocabulary shows a much greater approximation to that of Christian and pagan writers of the second century than to that of the earlier Pauline letters does not strengthen the linguistic argument against the Pauline authorship because the Pastoral Epistles may have influenced the Christian writers and there is no evidence that the words concerned are not earlier than the second century.\(^1\) When we analyse the false teachings against which the Apostle is warning, we can conclude that those false teachers belonged most probably either to 'a Judaism of the dispersion influenced by Essenesm'\(^2\) or to 'an incipient Gnosticism with its dualistic view of matter'.\(^3\) Nevertheless, Lock is not sure whether 'τῆς προελευσεως γνώσεως' (1 Tim. 6:20) should be applied to 'the early stages of Gnosticism'\(^4\) or to 'the Rabbinical pride in knowledge'.\(^5\) One can possibly connect the prohibition of marriage\(^6\) with the non-Christian or Christian Jews influenced by Essenesm,\(^7\) however, we also

---

1 See Lock, Pastoral, xxix. Also cf. idem: "... There is no word impossible to St. Paul, no word not natural to him ...."

2 See ibid., p.47.

3 See Guthrie, Pastoral, p.92.

4 See Lock, Pastoral, p.76. Unlike Lock, 1 Cor. 8:2f. cannot be used as reference to the early stages of Gnosticism. 'ἡ γνῶσις' in 1 Cor. 8:1 indicates simply 'the knowledge that there were no such entities as idols' [F.F. Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians (London, 1971), p.78]. Also cf. F.W. Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids, 1974), p.189: "... Knowledge in Paul's vocabulary is not something purely intellectual, it is a knowledge which has results and leads to action, especially religious action ...."

5 See Lock, Pastoral, p.76.

6 See 1 Tim. 4:3a.

7 See Lock, Pastoral, p.47.
should consider the undeniable fact that there were not a few Jewish Christians who greatly boasted their rabbinic knowledge of the Mosaic law\(^1\) including the food-law\(^2\) as well as the Jewish legends and genealogies as their national inheritance.\(^3\) On the other hand, we also cannot exclude the probable influence of 'Oriental tendencies which developed into Gnosticism'\(^4\) in the next century. Even so, all these probabilities do not justify most critics' common mistake identifying the Gnosticism of the second century with the false teachings in the Pastoral.\(^5\) Besides, Kümmel's confident objection to the historical reliability of the Pastoral, in particular, in view of the difficulties occasioned by the reference to Trophimus in 2 Timothy 4:20b\(^6\) is by no means incontestable. D. Guthrie tries to solve this problem by suggesting the possibility of the Apostle Paul's having made another visit to Miletus after his release from his first Roman imprisonment.\(^7\) But, Kümmel believes this assumption along with the report of the second Roman imprisonment of the Apostle first mentioned by Eusebius\(^8\) is 'unbegriindete Konstruktion',\(^9\) whereas he admits the probability of the Apostle's journey to Spain in the light of 1 Clement.\(^10\)

\(^1\) Cf. Lk. 11:52; Rom. 2:20.
\(^2\) Cf. 1 Tim. 4:3f.; Tit. 1:15.
\(^7\) See Guthrie, *Pastoral*, pp.178f.
\(^8\) Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, II, xxii.
\(^9\) See Kümmel, *Einleitung*, s.333.
\(^10\) See *idem.*
Nevertheless, G. Bornkamm argues that the Apostle's missionary journey to Spain is quite unlikely and cannot be proved. Furthermore, according to him, in fact, Clement himself may have deduced from Romans 15:24f., 28 that the Apostle's hope was actually realized. Anyhow, despite their disagreement upon the Apostle's journey to Spain, both Kümmel and Bornkamm deny the Apostle's journey to the east after his first Roman imprisonment. But, even if we do not admit the possibility of this other journey to the east, the statement of 2 Timothy 4:20 does not refute the argument that this second epistle was written during the Roman imprisonment. Though it is impossible to fix the chronology of the Apostle's life with certainty, still we can conjecture to some extent the dates of a few important events in his life on the basis of the Gallio Inscription at Delphi. Bornkamm and Conzelmann calculate the date of the Apostle's martyrdom as being probably A.D. 60, however, such an earlier date is not very convincing. In spite of the great difficulties in providing a precise chronological table, the majority of the scholars support the theory of the Apostle's martyrdom under Nero in A.D. 64. If we

1 See G. Bornkamm, Paulus (Stuttgart, 19702), s.120.
2 See idem. Cf. also Marxsen, Introduction, p.22.
4 See Bornkamm, Paulus, s.10; Conzelmann, History, p.32.
5 Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (London, 1932), xxvi: "... the end of Paul's two-year imprisonment in Rome (Acts xxviii.30) brings us to A.D. 64. In that year, or early in the next, the Neronian persecution broke out, and according to tradition, Paul perished under Nero ...."
accept this theory and calculate other dates backward from the date of the Apostle's martyrdom, the following dates can be suggested:

- The Apostle's arrest in Jerusalem: A.D. 59
- The Apostle's imprisonment in Caesarea: A.D. 59-61
- The Apostle's departure for Rome as a prisoner: A.D. 61
- The Apostle's arrival in Rome: A.D. 62
- The Apostle's imprisonment in Rome: A.D. 62-64
- The Apostle's martyrdom under Nero: A.D. 64

According to this calculation, Trophimus, who had already joined the Apostle's last visit to Jerusalem, could by no means make another journey with the Apostle apart from that very one which he made for the last time with the Apostle in chains being taken to Rome for trial. Even in the case of Timothy, we know that he went with the Apostle to Jerusalem,² however, according to Acts, it is not clear at all whether the Apostle in chains was still accompanied by him on his voyage to Rome. If we assume that Second Timothy was written at a later stage in the Apostle's Roman imprisonment, we can conclude that Timothy was unable to accompany the Apostle in chains and probably only a part of the original company including Luke and Trophimus³ could sail for Rome.

---

¹ Cf. in particular idem: "... we may say that the earliest date which is at all likely for Paul's departure from Corinth for Jerusalem is shortly before Easter, A.D. 57, and the latest, A.D. 59. The later of these seems to me the more probable ...."


³ We cannot dismiss the possibility that Trophimus may have wished to witness to the Apostle's innocence at the imperial court.
We think Timothy was, most probably, sternly ordered by the Apostle Paul himself not to follow him. And such a decision made by the Apostle in chains is not strange at all. When both the Apostle Paul and Luke tried constantly to make his contemporaries, in particular the Roman authorities, believe that the Christians were loyal to the Roman Empire and were never causing danger to the Roman society in his epistles and Acts respectively, it testifies that they were clearly aware of the ever-abiding danger of being misunderstood by the Roman authorities and of the probable subsequent hostility toward the Christians as a whole. Therefore, on the one hand, the Apostle could not yet abandon his last hope of being acquitted on the charges of the Jews at the imperial court and released, but on the other hand, he also must have seriously considered the grave possibility of facing the charge of being a pestilent danger to the empire after his witnessing to the Kingship of Jesus Christ and His coming Kingdom. He was ready to witness boldly to what he believed even in the presence of the Roman emperor, however, at the same time, he was also fully prepared to give up his life willingly for the glory of God. It did not matter at all to the Apostle whether he would be released or be executed after the trial in Rome. What mattered most to him was the young Gentile churches without the shepherd who would safely preserve them until the Day of the Lord. Even before his arrest in Jerusalem, the Apostle was well aware of the grim possibility of his being separated for good from the Ephesians by death.¹ In the eyes of the Apostle Paul, it was

no one else but Timothy that would have to carry out this immense task in the case of his death in Rome. Concerning μνημονεύω δεν γίνεται ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ in 2 Timothy 1:4, Lock pointed out correctly the fact that this verse could scarcely be an allusion to the scene of Acts 20:37. He also rightly paraphrases the same verse as follows: "... I remember the tears you shed at our parting ...." Then, when and where did this parting which is not mentioned at all in the Acts take place? Without doubt, the only possible answer to this question is Timothy's heartbreaking parting from the Apostle Paul at the wharf of Caesarea. Luke could not describe this heartrending scene in the Acts though he himself also had to bid farewell in tears to Timothy, because he believed the Apostle's voyage to Rome should be described by all means not as one of great despair and sorrow but as a triumphant and glorious one not only putting the absolute trust in the emperor's justice but also witnessing to the truth of God revealed in the Risen Lord in the very presence of the emperor of this great empire. It should be admitted that this apologetic aim of Luke through the Acts has caused a lot of difficulties to New Testament students. Anyway, during the voyage to Rome, Trophimus, too, had to give it up because of his serious illness either at Myra (Acts 27:5) or at

---


2 See Lock, *Pastoral*, p.82.

3 It is very likely that the Asian Jews' false accusation brought against the Apostle Paul due to his company with the Apostle in Jerusalem and the subsequent tragic result had brought on unbearable agony to Trophimus finally leading him to the physical breakdown. Also cf. Kelly, *Pastoral*, p.222: "... If the letter is genuine, it is natural to suppose that Trophimus accompanied Paul after his arrest, but fell sick on the way and dropped out of the party at Miletus ...."
Cnidus (Acts 27:7).1 According to 2 Timothy 4:20, however, he did not go back to Ephesus but stayed at Miletus. We think the Apostle must have already been informed by Trophimus that he was going to Miletus. Therefore, it is not strange at all that Timothy came to be informed of this incident belatedly by the Apostle through his subsequent correspondence with him after receiving the first letter from Rome. One may ask why the Apostle made no mention of Trophimus' illness in his first letter, but, so long as there is no way to find out exactly in what situation both the Apostle Paul and Timothy as well as Trophimus were placed when the Apostle was writing his first letter to Timothy,2 such a question alone can hardly be used to disprove the historical reliability as well as the authenticity of the Second Epistle to Timothy. Consequently, it becomes quite clear that the Epistles to the Philippians, to the Colossians and to Philemon could not have been written during the Apostle's Roman imprisonment. When the Apostle was writing the Pastoral Epistles, the Gentile churches outside Palestine already had a well organized ecclesiastical system for the effective government of the congregation.3 Each church was led by 'ἐπίσκοποι' or 'πρεσβύτεροι'4 with the help of 'δικαίοι'. The office of ἐπίσκοπος is not yet monarchical as we can find in the

---

1 Considering the fact that Trophimus was an Ephesian, the Roman centurion, Julius (Acts 27:1), must have arranged the landing of this sick patient, most probably, at Cnidus.

2 We may have to consider that it must have taken some time even for the Apostle to confirm Trophimus' safe arrival at Miletus through their correspondence since his arrival in Rome.

3 Cf. esp. Phil. 1:1; Acts 20:17.

4 In the Pastoral, ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος indicate the same office, namely, the overseer of the congregation. Cf. Acts 20:17, 20:28.
second century, and even the position held by both Timothy and Titus\(^1\) was not 'the Ignatian bishopric\(^2\) but that of the apostolic delegate discharging the Apostle's instruction in the churches whither they were dispatched by the Apostle himself. The attitude of the critics reading the monarchical episcopacy of the second century into the Pastoral Epistles does not convince us at all.\(^3\) Contrary to Kümmel's argument,\(^4\) such an ecclesiastical system as we see in the Pastorals does not contradict the Apostle Paul's expectation of the imminent Parousia.\(^5\) Besides, the theology of the Pastorals is essentially Pauline.\(^6\) Though Kümmel is ascribing the Pastorals to 'ein Christ des späten Urchristentums'\(^7\) by enumerating some new theological terminologies and expressions appearing in these epistles,\(^8\) we cannot limit the Apostle's vocabulary only to that which he had used in his ten letters. In addition, we cannot assume the theology of the Pastorals to be unPauline merely because the Apostle introduced some new words and expressions which, he believed, were most appropriate in that particular situation where Timothy and Titus were standing. Furthermore, on the foundation of this faulty hypothesis, Kümmel argues that "... keine lebendige Enderwartung mehr besteht, ..."\(^9\) in

---

1 Cf. 1 Tim. 3:1-7; Tit. 1:5-9.
5 See Phil. 1:1 along with 4:1.
7 See Kümmel, *Einleitung*, s.338.
8 See *ibid.*, ss.337f.
9 See *ibid.*, s.338.
the Pastorals. Nevertheless, both 1 Timothy 6:14 and Titus 2:13a are clearly indicating the old Apostle's unchanged conviction of the imminent Parousia which is consistent throughout the Apostle's genuine epistles.\(^1\) It was more than enough for the Apostle in chains to remind them once again of the very fact which they also firmly believed. It is not the voice of an unknown Christian of the second century but the Apostle Paul's own voice that we hear so clearly through, especially, 2 Timothy 1:4, 1:8, 1:16-18, 2:8f., 3:10f., 4:6-8, 4:9-16, and 4:19-21.\(^2\)

B. The Integrity of the last two Chapters of the Romans

In his commentary on the Romans, C.K. Barrett affirmed that the problem caused by the various textual traditions due to the different positions of the Doxology "... in no way affects the substance of the Epistle to the Romans ...."\(^3\) But, it depends how we understand this Epistle. Throughout this Epistle, the Apostle Paul is carefully dealing with the specific problems of the Roman congregation. Unless he had some fairly sufficient information on the exact situation in which this congregation was placed, how could he attempt to solve the problems of the church which he had never visited before? From whom did he get all this information after all?

---

\(^1\) Cf. Kümmel, *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen, 1972\(^2\)), ss.127f.

\(^2\) Also cf. Metzger, *Background*, p.239.

\(^3\) *The Epistle to the Romans* (London, 1973\(^5\)), p.13.
Here lies the great importance of Romans 16:3-15. Barrett takes the integrity of ch.16 for granted; however, the supporters of the Ephesian theory have a different story. According to this theory, we cannot produce any positive evidence in support of the Apostle's precise knowledge of the circumstances of the contemporary Roman Christians. The discovery of \( p^{46} \), T.W. Manson believed, had decisively strengthened his position as a champion of the Ephesian theory of Romans 16. Arriving at this stage, we have to admit that Barrett's conclusion is a bit hasty and an oversimplifying of the significance of the complicated textual traditions. Just as the last two chapters of the Romans play so important a role in understanding the whole Epistle, so the textual problem involving the Doxology is inseparably connected with the integrity of the last two chapters, especially ch.16. To clear off all the doubts about the integrity of the last two chapters which, in fact, crucially affects the very substance of this great Epistle, it is essential to analyse some

---


controversial key-arguments over the authenticity of the Doxology and its various positions in the textual traditions.¹

Though we can no longer argue, as C.H. Dodd did in 1932, that "... There is no textual evidence whatever for any separation between xv. and xvi. ...",² does this oldest extant Greek manuscript of the Pauline epistles really provide the sure external ground for the much debated hypothesis originally put forward by David Schulz³ and subsequently accepted by many exegetes⁴ even on internal grounds alone?⁵

Along with this revitalized Ephesian hypothesis, to further our discussion, we must also briefly touch on the much more radical one suggested by F.C. Baur. On the supposition that Marcion himself may not have

---


² Dodd, Romans, xvii.


⁴ Cf. W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Edinburgh, 1971, 1895)³, xciii; Kümmel, Einleitung, s.278, n.47.

⁵ Cf. esp. Dodd, Romans, xviii-xix; Kümmel, Einleitung, ss.278f. Also cf. Leenhardt, Romans, pp.16f. and Marxsen, Introduction, p.108.
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mutilated the last two chapters but only found a copy with this part already missing, Baur accepted Romans 1:1-14:23 as the original body of this Epistle. Without any critical examination of the facts he proceeds to deny the integrity of ch.16 by enumerating basically the same arguments as the upholders of the Ephesian theory do. He also contests the integrity of ch.15, on the purely hypothetical ground that the Apostle Paul himself could never make such a concession to the Jewish Christians in the Roman Church, as this would have been in complete contradiction with his Gospel. He concludes that these last two chapters of a later origin

1 Cf. Origenes, Commentaria in Epistolam B. Pauli ad Romanos, trans. by Rufinus in J.-P. Migne (ed.), PG, Tomus XIV (Paris, 1957), col.1290: "... Caput hoc Marcion, a quo Scripturae evangelicae atque apostolicae interpolatae sunt, de hac Epistola penitus abstulit; et non solum hoc, sed et ab eo loco ubi scriptum est, omne autem quod non est ex fide, peccatum est, usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit. In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est in his quae non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput diverse positum invenimus...."


3 See ibid., pp.369-381.

4 See ibid., pp.379ff.

5 See esp. p.370: "... How can we imagine that the Apostle, in an Epistle of such a nature, and after all that had passed on the subject, would make such a concession to the Jewish Christians as to call Jesus Christ a minister of the circumcision to confirm the promises of God made unto the Fathers ...." But, M. Goguel rejects Baur's attitude flatly as an unfounded one: "... Cette opinion était inspirée par une conception beaucoup trop étroite du paulinisme. Pour en montrer la fausseté, il suffit de rappeler que, pour Paul, c'est la mort du Christ qui abroge la Loi. Celle-ci était donc encore valable pendant la vie du Christ qui, étant né au sein du peuple juif, a dû s'y soumettre. S'il fallait penser que l'apôtre n'a pas pu écrire que le Christ avait été le serviteur de la circoncision, il faudrait aussi déclarer inauthentique la phrase de l'épître aux Galates sur Dieu qui a envoyé son Fils, né sous la Loi, pour racheter ceux qui sont sous la Loi (Gal., 4,4-5) ...." [Les Épîtres Pauliniennes (Introduction au Nouveau Testament, Tome IV), Deuxième Partie (Paris, 1926), p.247]. See Baur, Paul, Vol.I, pp.370ff.
must be attributed to a disciple of Paul, who, in the spirit of the author of the Acts of the Apostles, in the interest of peace and harmony, wished to replace the keen anti-Judaism of the Apostle by a milder and more accommodating influence in favour of the Judaizers.¹

But, neither the hypothesis of Manson and other upholders of the Ephesian theory nor the somewhat hasty supposition of Baur has any convincing textual support. In spite of Manson's confident conclusion,² the appearance of P⁴⁶ by itself does not prove that the original text of the Epistle to the Romans ended with 15:33.³ Besides, Baur, who gives us the impression that he starts his argument for the rejection of the last two chapters not from any textual evidence but from his already well-known hypotheses,⁴ should have disproved

¹ Ibid., p.381.
² See Manson, Romans, pp.237ff.
³ Despite our disagreement with his conclusion, we admit that P⁴⁶ clearly bears witness to the existence of a manuscript ending with 15:33 which was prepared in the orthodox circle, most probably, for reading at public worship. In this sense, when Kümmel tries to refute Manson's hypothesis by arguing: "... das Vorhandensein der Doxologie hinter 15,33 in P⁴⁶ beweist keineswegs, dass es je eine Handschrift gegeben hat, die mit 15,33 endete, geschweige denn dass diese Textform von Paulus nach Rom geschickt wurde, zumal P⁴⁶ selber ja Kap.16 enthält ...." (Einleitung, ss.277ff.), it is obvious that he has completely failed to grasp the textual tradition in which P⁴⁶ is standing. Consequently, his argument cannot give us any help in disproving Manson's hypothesis.
⁴ He argues that there existed a direct confrontation between the Apostle Paul and the original apostles at Jerusalem [See his The Church History of the First Three Centuries, trans. by A. Menzies, Vol. I (London, 1878), pp.52f.] He also believes the majority of the Roman congregation were Jewish Christians (See ibid., p.66). Also cf. B. Weiss, A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament, trans. by A.J.K. Davidson (London, 1887), p.320: "... it being necessary for Baur to do this because they were directly at variance with his conception of the Apostle's anti-Judaism (XV.4,8), of the anti-Pauline Judaism of the Roman Church (XV.14ff.) and of the Gentile apostolic undertakings of Paul (XV.19) ...."
Origen's testimony more convincingly.\(^1\) The accusation of mutilation
brought against Marcion by Origen had been doubted not only by Baur
but also by F.J.A. Hort\(^2\) and A. von Harnack\(^3\) later. Nevertheless,
it is most unlikely that either the Apostle Paul or any unknown editor
other than Marcion had prepared such a ridiculous text ending at

---

\(^1\) Apart from his pre-conceived hypotheses, Baur could not suggest any
foundation for his downright distrust of Origen's statements. In
fact, he avoids deliberately mentioning the clear testimony of
Origen: "... In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est in quae non
sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput diverse positum invenimus
..." that immediately follows his quotation [He is quoting only:
"... Caput hoc Marcion ... usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit ..."]\(^{[Paul,}
Vol.1, p.369)]. Ironically, in spite of his hypothesis supposing
Romans 16:1-20 to belong to a letter to the Ephesians [See E. Renan,
Saint Paul (Paris, 1869), LXXIII], E. Renan was absolutely correct
in arguing that: "... Faut-il, avec Marcion et avec Baur, déclarer
apocryphes les deux derniers chapitres de l'épître aux Romains?
On est surpris qu'un critique aussi habile que Baur se soit contenté
d'une solution aussi grossière. Pourquoi un faussaire aurait-il
inventé de si insignifiants détails? Pourquoi aurait-il ajouté à
l'ouvrage sacré une liste de noms propres? ..." \(^{[Ibid., LXXIf.]}\).

\(^2\) See his "On the End of the Epistle to the Romans" reprinted from
JP, Vol.3 (1871), p.51sq. in J.B. Lightfoot, Biblical Essays (London,
1893), pp.349f: "... It is now equally certain that Marcion some-
times mutilated the text of his favourite apostle, and that some
variations or omissions imputed to his pen were in fact simply the
readings which he found already in his MS ... Though copies of his
Apostolicon were seemingly current here and there in the Church, no
extant document can be shewn to have been affected by any of his
wilful alterations. Indeed 'copies corrupted by Marcion' need mean
to us no more than 'copies agreeing in a certain reading with Marcion's
copy ...' But, he adds: "... On the whole it is reasonably certain
that the omission is his only as having been transmitted by him ..."
\(^{[Ibid., p.350]}\).

\(^3\) See A. von Harnack, Marcion: das Evangelium vom fremden Gott
(Leipzig, 1921), ss.145*ff., esp. s.145*: "... sie [Röm. 15,16] sind
also gar nicht vor M.s Augen gekommen; mithin hat nicht er sie
gestrichen oder etwa durch Zufall ein verstümmeltes Exemplar in die
Hand bekommen ..."
14:23.¹ Even when the Doxology follows it, it is still a very nonsensical ending for any letter, not to mention this Epistle.² The ideal place for an ending, apart from ch.16, would be either 15:13 or 15:33. Now, we can easily conclude that there must have been some special reason for having made such a bad cut at 14:23. Manson believes it was Marcion's hand that was responsible.³ This conclusion becomes quite convincing when we look at 15:3-12, in particular, v.8:

---

¹ Cf. B. Weiss, *Introduction*, p.321: "... But there is no doubt that Marcion left out the chapters solely because they did not suit his anti-Judaism, conduct which harmonizes with his treatment of the Pauline epistles ...." At the same time, we have to realize that 14:23 does indeed provide a very ideal conclusion for Marcion's, as Harnack defines, 'dogmatischtendenziösen Motiv' (See his *Marcion*, s.145*). Cf. Manson, *Romans*, p.235: "... It may be considered that from the Marcionite point of view the statement of xiv.23 that 'whatever is not of faith is sin' makes a more decisive conclusion to the argument than anything the Pauline continuation can offer ...."

² Against Lightfoot's hypothesis, according to which, 'at some later period of his life, the Apostle cut off the last two chapters containing personal matters for a wider circulation and added a doxology as a termination to the whole' [See his "M. Renan's Theory of the Epistle to the Romans" reprinted from *JP*, Vol.2 (1869), p.264sq. in *Biblical Essays*, p.319], even Hort himself maintains: "... the last words of xiv. make a very bad end, even when the Doxology is allowed to follow ...." (The *End of the Romans*, p.349). Also cf. Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, xciv: "... it does not explain how or why St. Paul made the division at the end of chap.xiv. There is nothing in the next thirteen verses which unfits them for general circulation. They are in fact more suitable for an encyclical letter than is chap.xiv. It is to us inconceivable that St. Paul should have himself mutilated his own argument by cutting off the conclusion of it. This consideration therefore seems to us decisive against Dr. Lightfoot's theory ...." Besides, unlike Lightfoot's conjecture, it is highly improbable that the Apostle had added the Doxology to 14:23. Cf. P. Corssen, "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Römerbriefes" in *ZNW* (1909), s.32: "... Allein der Schluss des 14. Kapitels bietet keine Anschlussfläche für die Doxologie ... Es scheint mir aus stilistischen Gründen unmöglich, dass Paulus daran unmittelbar die Doxologie in ihrem feierlich gehobenen Tone, mit den dunklen verschränkten Sätzen angeschlossen haben sollte ...." Therefore, the location of the Doxology at the end of ch.14 witnessed by some manuscripts can be explained only through Marcion's mutilation of the last two chapters. Also cf. F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London, 1969, 1963¹).

³ See Manson, *Romans*, pp.232ff.
"λέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενημένα μην προστίθηνα διὰ ψυχής διὰ θεὸν, εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαργυλίας τῶν πατέρων,".  
16:26: "μετεφθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τὰ γραμμὰ γραφής κατ’ ἐπιταφίαν τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος," also itself explains so clearly the very reason why Marcion had to excise this last chapter as well.  

Before going any further, we need to examine the position of P. Corssen on this matter. Although he does not completely dismiss the possibility of Marcion's wilful mutilation of the last two chapters, he still argues:

So frei Marcion ohne Zweifel mit dem Text der paulinischen Briefe verfahren ist, so schwer ist es doch zu erklären, warum er c.15 und 16 in Bausch und Bogen verworfen haben sollte, wenn er sie vorfand. Warum schloss er denn gerade 14, 23 und nahm nicht wenigstens die beiden folgenden harmlosen Sätze noch mit auf? Selbst das lässt sich nicht mit Sicherheit behaupten, dass eine Stelle wie 15, 4 ἔσα γὰρ προσγράμμα εἰς τὴν ἑκτέραν διακαταλικώς ἔγραψη ihm hätte Anstoss bieten müssen, da er doch z. B. auch 1 Kor 9, 10 ὃ ἢμα ἐγράψαν und 10, 16 τὰ ἔριδα τῶν ἱμῶν ἐγενόθειαν hatte stehen lassen. Ebensowenig lässt sich nach meinem Dafürhalten vom

1 It would be interesting to think a moment how Marcion's interpretation of v.8 might have been different from that of F.C. Baur. Would not Marcion have believed that some unknown Judaizer had cunningly interpolated not merely this verse but also chs.15 and 16 in the lump?

2 Unlike the case of ch.15, Manson argues, Marcion could not touch ch.16 because "... it formed no part of the text known at Rome in the second century ..." (Romans, p.234). Nevertheless, cf. Lightfoot, Renan's Theory, p.319: "... (unless Rufinus in his translation has misrepresented Origen's meaning) he [Marcion] removed the Doxology ..."

3 See Corssen, Überlieferung, s.32: "... Marcion hat sie nicht in seinem Text gehabt, aber Marcion könnte sie, wie Origenes meint, willkürlich entfernt haben ...."
paulinischen Standpunkt aus etwas Triftiges
gegen die Echtheit von c.15 einwenden. Nach
unserer Kenntnis der Dinge deucht es mir daher
das Wahrscheinlichste, dass das von Marcion
benutzte Exemplar des Römerbriefes am Schluss
verstümmelt war.¹

But, strangely enough, as we see here, Corssen is mentioning 15:4
instead of 15:8 which is the most crucial verse in this chapter.
Though he considers that Marcion seems to have dealt with the Pauline
letters thus freely,² this is, in fact, not the case. It depends
whether we should believe Marcion's stupidity was such as not to
realize the inevitable consequence of his removing, as he exactly
wished, all the explicit and implicit Old Testament references to
Jesus Christ quoted by the New Testament writers or not.
Unfortunately, Corssen seems to have mistaken this great genius of
the second century for an incurable blockhead.³ Corssen should have
remembered, first of all, those passages, including 1 Corinthians
9:10, had been spared by Marcion not because they were considered
harmless but because he had no alternative so long as he was determined
to hold Jesus Christ Himself, secondly, not all the Old Testament
references in the New Testament writings were of equal dogmatic

¹ Ibid., s.45.
² See idem.
³ Previously Hort made the same mistake in the development of his
argument. See his The End of the Romans, p.349. Also cf. Moffatt,
Introduction, p.140: "... The only question is, Does Origen's
charge imply that Marcion actually mutilated the epistle, or that he
found an examplar in use which did end with 14+16²³-²⁷? The former
theory depends on the probability that the contents of Ro 15-16
would prove obnoxious to Marcion; but this hardly appears likely,
for the OT quotations would not discredit the passage to Marcion,
any more than they did the gospel of Luke ...."
significance in the eyes of Marcion. Even with regard to ch.16, Corssen makes a passing comment by saying:

Die Schwierigkeiten, von denen die Voraussetzung gedrückt ist, dass dies Kapitel ein ursprünglicher Teil des Römerbriefes sei, sind seit Semler oft genug erörtert worden und, wie mir scheint, bis heute unwiderlegt geblieben. Aber über diese Frage wird man besser schweigen, wenn man nichts Neues dazu zu sagen hat.1

In order to understand Corssen's position more clearly, we should look into his interpretation of the Doxology briefly. According to him, it was originated in the Marcionite church by those who wished to give a conclusion to their copy of the Romans in accordance with their view.2 Independently from De Bruyne who concluded that the short prologues to the Pauline letters which are found in numerous Vulgate manuscripts are of Marcionite origin,3 Corssen also reached the same conclusion.4

1 Corssen, Überlieferung., s.45.
2 See ibid., s.34. But, cf. Moffatt, Introduction, p.135: "... Corssen probably goes beyond the mark in assigning its origin to Marcionitism, but at any rate it [1625-27] does not betray Paul's mind ...."
4 See Corssen, Überlieferung., ss.36ff.
Furthermore, according to him, the author of the prologue to the Romans did not know the last two chapters because "... in dem Prolog zu Rom keine einzige Handschrift Zeugnis für den oder vielmehr die Botin ablegt ...." From this argument he thinks he can bring forward a decisive proof of the fact that "... alle Spuren der kürzeren Ausgabe des Römerbriefes schliesslich auf Marcion zurückzuführen sind ... niemand darf sich mehr auf die kirchliche Überlieferung gegen die beiden Schluss-kapitel berufen ...." Nevertheless, while admitting that one can hardly find the answer to the question how Marcion came to omit the last two chapters, he affirms that it is most likely that the copy of the Romans utilized by Marcion was one which was already mutilated at the end. The key-point in his argument is, as we have already seen, Marcion's text, which was already lacking the last two chapters through mutilation by someone before Marcion, provided the very starting point for all the future shortened recensions of the Romans in the textual tradition and at sometime later his followers, the Marcionites, composed the Doxology for this short text of Marcion.

But, the real problem of Corssen's hypothesis has not yet been fully revealed. With De Bruyne, Corssen believes the short prologue to the Romans is no doubt of Marcionite origin. Then, which phrase in the prologue in question is so Marcionite? One can easily indicate

---

1 Ibid., s.45.
2 Idem. Also cf. s.34.
3 See ibid., s.45.
that it is no other than "... Hi [Romani] praeventi sunt a falsis apostolis et sub nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi in legem et prophetas erant inducti ....",¹ in particular, we think, the expression 'in prophetas erant inducti'. Corssen explains:

Sehr merkwürdig ist nun gleich, dass auch die Römer von falschen Propheten bearbeitet sein sollen, von denen doch in dem Briefe selbst keine Rede ist, noch merkwürdiger, dass sie zu dem Gesetz und den Propheten verleitet worden seien. Das klingt doch wesentlich anders, als wenn von den Galatern gesagt wird, sie seien zu dem Gesetz und der Beschneidung bekehrt worden. Wie hätte ein gut katholischer Christ je so etwas schreiben können? Deutlicher konnte sich der Marcionit wohl nicht entdecken.²

Nevertheless, as far as this passage is concerned, there is nothing exclusively Marcionite. Considering the unique position of the Old Testament prophets as the indispensable mediators between God as the Law-Giver and the Jews as the recipients of the Law, it was very natural for the Judaizers to appeal constantly to the inviolable authority of these prophets as the servants of God in their obstinate attempts to impose the Mosaic Law as a whole, and especially circumcision, upon the Gentile Christians. The Apostle Paul was already very familiar with this kind of stereotyped tactic of the contemporary Judaizers directed towards his young Gentile congregations.³ Therefore, with this passage alone, unless it is accompanied with some more convincing

¹ See ibid., s.37 and also De Bruyne, Prologues, p.9. For the references to these sources, cf. De Bruyne, Prologues, pp.12f. and Corssen, Überlieferung., s.37.
² Corssen, Überlieferung., s.43.
³ Cf. Gal. 3:10-29, esp. vv.17f.
proofs, the hypothesis of Marcionite origin cannot be established in regard to this prologue. It is not, however, our ultimate aim to refute this hypothesis of Corssen. If we accept the Marcionite origin of these prologues, as he wishes, Corssen can by no means escape the disastrous consequence of his irresponsible play with these patchy hypotheses. If this prologue to the Romans, in particular, the phrase "... in prophetas erant inducti ...." is certainly of Marcionite origin, how can the Doxology including "... ἐπιταγμένη τοῖς ἐλληνικοῖς ἱερῶι ...." (v.26) be counted as a Marcionite product? Here, we come to encounter one of the most preposterous obduracies in New Testament exegesis. Corssen maintains:

Wenn es nun weiter heisst, das Geheimnis sei jetzt offenbar und durch prophetische Schriften bekannt geworden, so ist klar, dass damit nicht die alttestamentlichen Propheten gemeint sein können. Denn wenn das Geheimnis in der Zeitlichkeit verschwiegien blieb, so kann es nicht in ihren Schriften gelegen haben und jetzt durch sie bekannt geworden sein. Aber auch das Fehlen des Artikels macht es unmöglich, an die alttestamentlichen Schriften zu denken, denn sie bildeten einen abgeschlossenen und anerkannten Komplex, auf den als solchen hinzuweisen war. Es müssen also andere Schriften gemeint sein, durch die das offenbarte Geheimnis unter allen Völkern bekannt geworden ist.¹

¹ Corssen, Überlieferung., ss.33f. Later, Goguel also reaches basically the same conclusion as Corssen. See his Épîtres, Prem. Pt., pp.251f.: "... notre texte ne dit pas que l'Evangile a pour lui le témoignage des prophètes, il dit qu'il a été révélé dans les temps récents (v6v) par des écrits prophétiques. Ce n'est pas là une idée paulinienne ... Les seuls écrits par lesquels l'Evangile puisse être révélé sont des écrits chrétiens, mais cela nous transporte à une époque bien postérieure à Paul, au plus tôt à celle de Marcion. Il ne nous semble pas que la doxologie puisse être plus ancienne ...." But, cf. Barrett, Romans, p.11: "... The reference to the 'scriptures of the prophets' is indeed not Marcionite ...."
This is truly a ridiculous logic which one can hardly expect to hear from any sound-minded exegete, however, this is the only course that he can, or rather, must take to assist his already doomed hypothesis. In addition, arguing that, along with Ephesians 3:5 which, according to him, is closely in harmony with our passage, both Colossians 2:2 and Ephesians 3:18f. after all fall into the same context, Corssen asserts that "... So sind es denn gewiss in erster Linie eben die paulinischen Briefe selbst, die dem Verfasser der Doxologie als "prophetische Schriften" gelten ...."¹ Does the context of Ephesians 3:5 really require the readers to receive Paul's own letter(s) as the same prophetic writings with the one mentioned at Romans 16:26?² Such an idea is not merely un-Pauline but utterly anti-Pauline.³

In many aspects, Harnack's approach to this matter is more sensible, though he is after all in the same wreck with Corssen.⁴ Despite his

---

¹ Corssen, Überlieferung., s.34.
² Cf. G.B. Caird, Paul's Letters from Prison (Oxford, 1976), p.64: "... The Christian revelation was 'according to the scriptures' (1 Cor. 15:3-4). Paul himself would hardly have been convinced by it, had it not been 'attested by the law and prophets' (Rom.3:2). and he is able elsewhere to quote Old Testament passages which point to the salvation of the Gentiles (Rom.9:25-10:21). But it was precisely this way of reading the Old Testament that had burst upon Paul with all the amazement of a new revelation. The veil of incomprehension which had lain over the scriptures as long as he read them as a law book had been removed, and the glory of the old covenant had faded into insignificance before the superior splendour of the new (2 Cor.3:18,14) ...." ³ See Gal.3:8; 1 Cor.15:3f.; Rom.1:2, 3:21, 9:33, 10:11, 15, etc. Also cf. Harnack, Marcion, s.146*: ... Die "prophetischen Schriften" können schlechterdings nur das A.T. bezeichnen (gegen die Ausleger, die hier in verstündlicher Verlegenheit an christliche Prophetenschriften denken) ...."
⁴ See Harnack, Marcion, ss.144*ff.
wrong inference from 16:25, seemingly owing to his grammatical mistake, his motive for establishing the hypothesis combining the shorter recension of the Doxology by the Marcionites with some alleged supplements by the orthodox church is quite interesting.\(^1\) Making comments upon 16:25-27, he exclaimed: "... Ferner ist καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰ. Χρ. nach κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίου μου nahezu unerträglich ..."\(^2\) Why is 'καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ' following 'κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίου μου' almost intolerable for Harnack?\(^3\) Did the Apostle Paul never use the expression 'τὸ εὐαγγελίου μου' in his epistles before? His bitter remark had nothing to do with this expression. Was it then because the author of this verse dared make 'his gospel' precede 'τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ' or, more probably, because he could never imagine the Apostle Paul having tried to accord his gospel, at least, the same authority that the contemporary Christians had given to 'the preaching of Jesus Christ'\(^4\) itself? By saying 'τὸ εὐαγγελίου μου' here the Apostle meant neither any qualitative difference between his gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ nor any exercise of authority comparable with that of Jesus Christ over the contemporary Christians including the Romans, and

---

\(^1\) See ibid., s.146*.

\(^2\) Idem.


\(^4\) Or 'the message of Jesus Christ'.
this kind of Pauline usage of the 'subjective genitive'\(^1\) in describing
the Gospel he had to preach\(^2\) had been frequently employed in his
letters\(^3\) with the strong intention of emphasizing his apostolic
authority directly conferred by Christ Jesus as well as the unique
color of the Gospel entrusted to him personally by the same Risen
Lord. 'Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ' in 'τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ' is, however,
grammatically not the 'subjective genitive' but the 'objective
genitive'.\(^4\) Therefore, 'τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ' should be trans-
lated as 'the preaching (or rather 'the proclamation') about Jesus Christ.'\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Cf. Arn.-Gingr., p.318: "... The man who is commissioned to do the
preaching can be mentioned in the subj. gen. ....."

\(^2\) Cf. Lietzmann, Römer, s.130: "... τὸ εὐαγγέλιον του .... ist aber
an sich ganz unaanstössig = 'das von mir verkündete Evangelium' ...."

\(^3\) See Rom. 2:16; 2 Cor. 4:3; 1 Thess. 1:5; 2 Thess. 2:14; 2 Tim. 2:8.

\(^4\) Cf. Bl.-Debr., § 163.

\(^5\) Thus, The Bible: an American Translation [The New Testament, trans. by E.J. Goodspeed] (Chicago, 1931): "To him who can make you strong
by the good news I bring and the preaching about Jesus Christ, ...."
and The Jerusalem Bible (London, 1966): "Glory to him who is able
to give you the strength to live according to the Good News I preach,
and in which I proclaim Jesus Christ, ...." Cf. Martin Luther, Der
Brief an die Römer [D. Martin Luthers Werke (Kritische Gesamtausgabe),
56. Bd.] (Weimar, 1938), s.153, n.2: "'Predicatio hic [et
praedicationem Ihesu Christi] passiue accepitur, Scil. Qua Christus
est predicatus.'; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p.433: "... The
genitive is clearly objective, the preaching 'about Christ' ....";
Bruce, Romans, pp.282f.: "... This phrase ['and the preaching of
Jesus Christ' (KJV)] is synonymous with 'my gospel'; 'preaching'
represents Gk. κήρυγμα, the message proclaimed (as in 1 Cor.i.21);
Jesus Christ is its subject-matter ...." Barrett tries to understand
'Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ' as 'a genitive of content' (See his Romans, p.287),
however, despite its grammatical possibility, yet, theologically, this
is unacceptable, because 'Jesus Christ' is not a mere content of the
preaching but the ultimate object of this apostolic activity (Cf. Arn.
-Gingr., p.432). A really fine example of 'a genitive of content'
cannot be found in this phrase but in Jn 21:8: "... τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῶν Ἰησοῦν."
instead of 'the preaching of Jesus Christ'.\textsuperscript{1} It is true, as O. Michel says, that "... das Evangelium des PIs besteht in der legitimen Art, die Botschaft von Jesus Christus weiterzugeben ....",\textsuperscript{2} however, 'τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ' cannot be interpreted simply as 'supplement and explanation' of 'τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου',\textsuperscript{3} in such a sense. It was only in the Gospel preached by the Apostle Paul that Jesus Christ was most correctly preached, and the Apostle Paul's Gospel is in fact nothing but the proclamation about Christ Jesus.\textsuperscript{4} Therefore, "... κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ...." should be translated as "... through my Gospel, namely the proclamation about Jesus Christ\textsuperscript{5} ...." Despite Harnack's somewhat hasty astonishment, this phrase is thoroughly Pauline.\textsuperscript{6} Thus Harnack is not justified at all in reading a Marcionite element into 'κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου' and subsequently attributing 'καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ or καὶ κερίου

\textsuperscript{1} Thus, KJV and RSV.

\textsuperscript{2} O. Michel, Der Brief an die Römer (Göttingen, 1963\textsuperscript{3}), s.389.

\textsuperscript{3} See \textit{idem}: "... Das zweite Glied ist Ergänzung und Erklärung des ersten ...."

\textsuperscript{4} We conclude: τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου (my Gospel) = τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (the proclamation about Jesus Christ).

\textsuperscript{5} Matthew Black suggests that: "... one may interpret the two expressions 'my gospel' and 'the preaching of Jesus Christ' as a kind of hendiadys, and take the preposition with the verb as instrumental: '... who is able to strengthen you through my proclamation of the gospel of Jesus Christ' ...." \textit{[Romans} (London, 1973), p.185]. Nevertheless, we believe 'καί' here is not uniting the two expressions in the form of a 'hendiadys' but it is an 'epexegetical καί' (Cf. Bl.-Debr., § 442. E.g., Rom. 1:5, Mt. 8:33 and Jn 1:16).

\textsuperscript{6} Also cf. E. Käsemann, An die Römer (Tübingen, 1974\textsuperscript{3}), s.408: "... Die Präpositionalwendung in 25c charakterisiert gerade diesen Inhalt näher und tut es in solcher Plerophorie, dass schon dadurch das eigentliche Thema der Doxologie markiert wird. Die Ausdrucksweise erscheint zunächst durchaus paulinisch ...."
'I. Xp.' to the corrective addition of the great Church.  

Concerning v.26, he finds a Marcionite element again in "... die Vorstellung, dass erst jetzt das bisher unbekannte Heil offenbart worden ist ..." and concludes 'γινωσκόμενος' as well as 'διὰ τὰ γραφῆν προφητικῶν' are also the later supplements of the same Church on the basis of a rather peculiar reasoning that:

die alttestamentlichen Propheten neben νῦν unmöglich stehen können; denn dieses νῦν zeigt unwidersprechlich die christliche Epoche an. Dazu kommt, dass γινωσκόμενος neben γινωσκόμενος eine Überladung ist.

This time, Harnack's argument can be confuted much more easily. Careful examination of this verse enables us to perceive the plain fact that 'γινωσκόμενος ἐν νῦν' contrasts 'Χρέει οὖν διαφυλάσσεται' of the previous verse, and 'διὰ τὰ γραφῆν προφητικῶν καὶ θεοῦ αὐτήν τὸν θεὸν ἐπιτέλεσαν πίστεν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ έννοι γινωσκόμενον' is supplementing 'γινωσκόμενος ἐν νῦν' more clearly in the light of the Saving Act of the ever-same God since the Creation. The old eternal

---

1 Harnack, Marcion, s.146+.
2 Idem.
3 Idem.
4 Here, 'τε' means 'and', thus, indicating the 'close connection and relationship' between 'γινωσκόμενος ἐν νῦν' and 'διὰ γραφῶν προφητικῶν ... γινωσκόμενον'. Cf. Bl.-Debr., § 443, (3) and also Arn.-Gingr., p.815.
5 Thus, "... through the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret for long ages but is now exposed and made known through the prophetic writings to all nations according to the command of the eternal God for the obedience of faith ...."
mystery to which the Old Testament prophets had borne witness so con-
stantly but which had to remain secret because of the wicked blindness
of human mind,¹ is now (νῦν) at last clearly revealed through the
Christ-Event in whose light alone we can only understand the true
significance of the Old Testament prophecies as a whole.² So, Harnack's
further 'ganz gekünstelt'³ attempt to prove that the originally
Marcionite, shorter form of the Doxology⁴ came to be catholicized
later through some supplements by the Church, falls to the ground.

The common dilemma unexceptionally faced by the upholders of the
Marcionite origin of the Doxology is the irreconcilable contradiction

¹ Cf. 2 Cor. 3:14-16: "啜兮 καταρακτός ἐστιν τοῖς ὁμοίως τοῖς κάλλιστα ἐστιν ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς ἡμέρας ἐστιν τοῖς κάλλιστα ἐστιν τῇ παλαιᾷ αἰωνίᾳ μένειν, καὶ ἀνακαλυπτώμενον ἢν ἐν Χριστῷ καταρακτωτά ἃ ἔστε σήμερον οὐκ ἔστι σημαίνωσιν. Μιᾶ ἡμέρᾳ κάλλιστᾳ ἢνίκα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς καταρακτοτάτου ἡμέρας τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς καταρακτοτάτου ἡμέρας."²

² Cf. J. Calvin, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians, trans. by R. Mackenzie (Edinburgh, 1972²), pp.326ff. When Goguel said: "... Le fait que la doxologie insiste sur l'idée que l'Evangile a été inconnu de toute éternité et révélé seulement dans les derniers temps et qu'elle n' invoque pas, comme le christianisme apostolique aimait à le faire, l'idée que l'Ancien Testament lui rend témoignage permet même d' aller plus loin et de dire que la doxologie doit être marcionite ..." (Épîtres, Deux. Pt., p.252), he was also completely missing this truth like others apart from his failure to appreciate the grammatical structure of this sentence. Cf. Käsemann, Römer, s.411: "... spricht der Inhalt der Doxologie selbst in der Wendung vom göttlichen Schweigen nicht notwendig für marcionitischen Ursprung ..." and also Leenhardt, Romains, p.18, n.2: "... Il n'y a pas lieu de soupçonner pour ces versets une origine marcionite, comme le pense M. Goguel ...."³

³ See Schumacher, Beiden Letzten Kapitel, s.121.

⁴ Cf. Bruce, Romans, p.282: "... We have, indeed, no MS or other objective evidence for such a shorter original text of the doxology ...."
between their hypothesis and Origen's clear testimony informing us for the first time of the position of the Doxology\(^1\) as well as Marcion's wilful mutilation of the last two chapters.\(^2\) Though the present Doxology is, as James Moffatt indicates, an 'unexampled one in Paul's correspondence',\(^3\) in fact, "... Der ganze Römerbrief stellt ja etwas

\(\footnotesize{1}\) Cf. Schumacher, \textit{Beiden Letzten Kapitel}, s.125.  
\(\footnotesize{2}\) Cf. G. Zuntz, \textit{The Text of the Epistles} [The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy delivered in 1946] (London, 1953), p.227: "... who, like the present writer, accept Harnack's view that this passage [the Doxology] is of Marcionite origin ... [n.4] Whether the 'Marcionite' form [ending with ch.14] was created by Marcion or whether he inherited it I do not presume to decide ...."

\(\footnotesize{3}\) See Moffatt, \textit{Introduction}, p.135: "... The addition of such a doxology is as unexampled in Paul's correspondence as the definition of God as the only wise or eternal and of the scripture as prophetic; ..." Nevertheless, H.W. Schmidt is correctly pointing out: "... Warum soll der Ausdruck μετα σοις Θεός auffällig sein? Man denke nur an die δοξή του Θεος im 1.Kor., auch daran, dass Paulus wenige Zeilen vor dem beanstandeten Ausdruck in V. 19 das Wort δοξάς gebraucht. Die anderen uns bekannten Paulus-Briefe haben zwar keinen so feierlichen Briefschluss. Aber kommt die Doxologie wirklich so überraschend, wenn man is unserem Brief an Stellen wie 8,32ff. und 11,33 denkt (E. Kuhl)? Und ist nicht auch der Eingangsruss im Römerbrief viel ausführlicher und feierlicher ausgefallen und ohne Parallele in den anderen Briefen? ... Man wird dem Apostel nicht gerecht und vergisst das schöpfersische, sich nie wiederholende, immer eigenartige Wesen seines Denkens, wenn man hier Echtheit und Unechtheit nach einem engen Schema beurteilt."

\textit{Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer} (Berlin, 1972\(^3\)), s.266. Also cf. Lietzmann, \textit{An die Römer} [in \textit{Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus} (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 3. Bd.). Tübingen, 1919], s.77 (as quoted by Schumacher in his \textit{Beiden Letzten Kapitel}, s.117): "... Es ist richtig, dass Paulus sonst keinen Brief mit einer Doxologie schliesst, denkbar aber, dass er gerade bei diesem am meisten predigtmaßigen Schreiben das Bedürfnis nach einem feierlichen Schlussaccord empfunden hat ...."

It is quite doubtful, however, whether the Apostle had really prepared this Doxology only, as Lietzmann assumed once, with the aim of giving an ideal closing piece matching the body of the Epistle. In this sense, we can say, Schumacher is also misunderstanding the Doxology despite his effort to uphold its authenticity. We would rather believe that the whole piece of this Doxology is nothing but an example of the insuppressibly overflowing deep emotion of the Apostle in that moment that eventually came to provide the most wonderful ending for this great epistle. This is well proved by the seemingly very bad sentence structure jammed, in particular, with the ill-composed and meaningless repetitions with overloaded prepositions.
As we have observed hitherto, the text of the Doxology itself does not allow any challenge to its authenticity.\(^2\)

Above all, the following remark of R. Schumacher forces the critics to reappraise whether they are unconsciously applying their own moral standards to an imaginary hypothetical author of the Doxology or whether such a boldly guileful Christian author had actually existed as they argue with one voice:

Paulus redet die Leser an, er spricht von sich in der ersten Person. Etwas Deartiges würde man später kaum gewagt haben, besonders wenn man nur aus liturgischen Gründen, wie häufig angenommen wird, dem Brief einen Abschluss geben wollte.\(^3\)

Now, we need to examine the external evidence of this hypothesis.

Do the three kindred manuscripts, D (Codex Claromontanus),\(^4\) F (Codex Augiensis),\(^5\) G (Codex Boernerianus),\(^6\) really attest indirectly, as

---

1. Schmidt, Römer, s.266.
2. Apart from Hort, The End of the Romans, pp.321-329, cf. also Schmidt, Römer, s.266. Though Michel suggests that it is not the Apostle himself but a later compiler of Pauline text that is speaking in the Doxology (See Römer, s.392), his theory is nothing but an opportunistic word-play taking advantage of the two exegetical extremes. See also Käsemann, Römer, s.411: "...Man wird sich damit begnügen müssen, an eine paulinisch beeinflusste Gemeinde zu Anfang des 2. Jahrhunderts zu denken und sogar ein späteres Datum nicht auszuschliessen. Gekennzeichnet wird damit eine Phase im Prozess der Sammlung paulinischer Briefe." But, his argument is equally unfounded.
4. Cf. also CODEX CLAROMONTANUS SIVE EPISTULAE PAULI OMNES GRAECE ET LATINE EX CODECE PARISIENSI CELEBRARIMO NOMINE CLAROMONTANI PLERUMQUE DICTO SEXTI UT VIDetur POST CHRISTUM SAECULI NUNC PRIMUM EDIDIT CONSTANTINUS TISCHENDORF. Lipsiae, 1852.
6. Cf. also XIII. EPISTOLARVM PAULI CODEX GRAECVS CVM VERSIONE LATINA VETERI VULGO ANTEHERONYMIANA OLM BOERERIANVS NVNC BIBLIOTHECAE ELECTORALIS DRESSENSIS SYMMA FIDE ET DILIGENTIA TRANSCRIPTVS ET EDITVS A CHRISTIANO FRIDERICO MATTHAEI. Misenae (Meissen), 1791.
Corssen argues so affirmatively, the so-called Marcionite text of the Romans in 14 chapters with the Doxology? Corssen launches this hypothesis by maintaining that the Doxology was missing in the model of D on the basis of the two significant facts: first of all, the colometrical transcription suddenly comes to an end just before the Doxology and this much debated closing is transcribed stichometrically; secondly, the signature simply put in the title as 'ΤΠΟΔΙΘΑΙΟΤῸ' and 'AD ROMANOS' is not at all in accordance with the usual form accompanying other letters. Nevertheless, the sudden transition from the 'colometry' to the 'stichometry' itself does not necessarily prove that "... der Schreiber von D eine stichisch geschriebene Handschrift zu Hilfe genommen habe, aus der er die fehlende Doxologie ergänzte ...." Furthermore, though Corssen believes that this hypothesis was confirmed by the signature of the Romans, in fact it is not so. Despite his vigorous attempts to disprove the solution suggested by both E. Riggenbach and Th. Zahn, we still believe the metrical transition along with the exceptionally simplified signature purely on the grounds of the economy of space ('auf Gründe der Raumsparnis') is much more convincing.

1 See Corssen, Überlieferung., ss.2-12, 15-17. Also cf. ibid., ss.34, 45.
2 See ibid., s.5.
3 See ibid., s.6.
4 Idem.
5 Idem.
7 Cf. Corssen, Überlieferung., s.7.
especially, when we come upon Ephesians 6:23-24 and its signature. The colometrical transcription ends again right before καὶ ἀμῖην (v.23) and, henceforth down to ἐπὶ (v.24), the copyist transcribes 'ohne Rücksicht auf Sinnabteilung'. Besides, unlike the case of other letters, the signature of the Ephesians is put only in two lines: ΠΡΟΕ ΕΒΕΩΤ[αι], ΠΡΟΕ ΚΟΛΟΣΣΑΕΙΣ. Arguing that the copyist could easily have managed to transcribe colometrically through an approximate arrangement if the economy of space had been the true reason, Corssen retorts confidently:

warum denn derselbe Schreiber, der in diesen beiden Fällen mit dem Raum so knausert, in andern Fällen so verschwenderisch damit umgeht, dass er von der Unterschrift abgesehen, auf die letzte Seite des 1. und 2. Timotheusbriefes nur drei, auf die des Philippierbriefes nur zwei Zeilen und die des Titusbriefes gar nur eine Zeile Text setzt?2

Considering the fact that the text of the last page of the Romans demands 18 lines and that of the Ephesians 19 lines respectively, in the case of these two epistles it would not have been very difficult for the copyist, as Corssen points out, to transcribe up to the end without either metrical transition or unusual shortening of the signatures. But, this argument of Corssen was rejected by J. Dupont: "... la prodigalité dans les dernières épîtres ne contredit pas la parcimonie des premières ...."3 Another arbitrary aspect of Corssen's reasoning is found in his inconsistent attitude in handling the closings of the two epistles. He maintains that the model of D underwent

---

1 See Zahn, Einleitung, s.285.
2 Corssen, Überlieferung., s.7.
3 Dupont, Histoire, p.20.
mutilation of the closing of the Ephesians, whereas it did not experience mutilation of the close of Romans simply because 'die Analogie der verwandten Handschriften F G und der übrigen' makes it inconceivable.¹ This hypothesis, however, presupposes that the common model of F G had the Doxology after 14:23 and not at the end.² Nevertheless, the validity of this presupposition itself should be examined. In the light of such a marginal note in the Latin version of G as 'deest in graeco' (1 Cor. 3:8-16), it is clear that the model of G was defective.³ At the same time, another marginal note at 1 Corinthians 11:7: 'a principio t per initium non est in latino interpretatum' clearly shows, together with that for 1 Corinthians 3:8-16, that the copyist of G must have had a Latin text with critical commentary under his very eyes.⁴ Moreover, unlike G, F does not leave any blank space between 14:23 and 15:1. If the copyists of F G were really transcribing a common model, what was the cause of this difference? Furthermore, though F does not have the Doxology in its Greek text, remarkably enough, it contains it at the end of the Epistle in the Latin text. We can infer from this fact that the copyist of F had another annotated Latin text very different from the one used by the copyist of G. Both copyists knew the existence of the Doxology

¹ See Corssen, Überlieferung, s.8.
² See ibid., ss.8f.
³ See ibid., s.9.
⁴ Cf. Dupont, Histoire, p.21. Here, Dupont is referring to A. Reichardt, Der Codex Boernerianus (Leipzig, 1909), s.16.
and, in contrast to the uncertain reluctance of the copyist of \textit{G},\footnote{It was in fact due to the copyist's confusion either between his model lacking only the Doxology and, at least, two other manuscripts, one having the Doxology after 14:23, but the other at the end, or, more probably, between his model having the Doxology after 14:23 (more precisely, after 14:23 + 16:24) and another manuscript having it at the end [in fact, this one was the text of the original form: 1:1-16:23 + Doxology] [Against Hort who assumes that the copyists of both \textit{F} and \textit{G} copied from 'a single archetype wanting only the Doxology'. See his \textit{The End of the Romans}, p.340]. If the latter was the exact situation faced by the copyist, we may assume that the copyist of \textit{G}, who came to judge, from the comparison between the two manuscripts, that it was far better to place the Doxology at the end, could not put it after 14:23 despite the evidence of his model. At the same time, his adherence to his model prevented him from placing it at the end. Having been placed in such a dilemma, his only choice was to leave a blank space after 14:23 without the Doxology. It is not strange at all that the Doxology was also missing in his interlinear Latin translation of the Greek text, whereas the copyist of \textit{F} did not necessarily have to omit the Latin text parallel to its missing Greek text when he was transcribing them in the separate double columns. Cf. In \textit{F}, the Epistle to the Hebrews is transcribed only in the Latin column without its Greek parallel.} the copyist of \textit{F} firmly believed that the right position of the Doxology was at the end of the Epistle notwithstanding its complete absence in his Greek text.\footnote{Also cf. Dupont, \textit{Histoire}, p.21.} Then, why is the Doxology missing in the Greek text of \textit{F}? It is not difficult to explain. Taking the confident attitude of the copyist of \textit{F} into account, we can be quite sure that he would hardly have finished transcribing his Greek text without adding the Doxology at the end of the Epistle in harmony with its Latin text if he had found the Doxology at all in any available Greek text. Hence, we cannot but conclude that the copyist of \textit{F} had never come across any Greek text of the Epistle containing the Doxology\footnote{Also cf. \textit{ibid.}, p.22: "... Il est donc vraisemblable que la doxologie ne se trouvait dans le modèle grec de \textit{F} et \textit{G}, ni après XIV, ni après XVI ...."}
but only the Latin text(s) containing it, however, instead of attempting his own risky translation from the Latin text in his possession,\(^1\) he was humble enough to be satisfied with the Greek text without the Doxology in the situation that there was no way to find the text of the Doxology in its original Greek.\(^2\) Despite Corssen's emphasis on the significance of the blank space in \(G\) after 14:23, there is no proof that the Doxology stood after 14:23 in the common model of \(FG\). In fact, the two copyists were possessing texts of common origin but at different stages of recension in the textual history.\(^3\) Consequently, Corssen's first hypothesis that the Doxology was missing in the model of \(D\) cannot be supported by his second hypothesis that the common model of \(FG\) had the Doxology after 14:23 but not at the end. Even if we admit his third hypothesis that \(Z\), the alleged archetype of \(DFG\), had the Doxology after 14:23,\(^4\) it

\(^1\) It would be, no doubt, very difficult for the upholders of the Marcionite origin of the Doxology to understand such a decent attitude of the copyist.

\(^2\) But, he transferred 16:24 placed after 14:23 to the end of the epistle to give a closing to his Greek text. In his Latin version, he made the same change to harmonize it with its Greek counterpart. Cf. Present Thesis, p.61f.

\(^3\) Cf. Present Thesis, pp.61ff.

\(^4\) See Corssen, *Überlieferung*, s.11. To justify this hypothesis, Corssen argues, against the earliest and best witnesses (Cf. Metzger et al., *Textual Commentary*, pp.539f. Also cf. Schumacher, *Beiden Letzten Kapitel*, s.134: "... Der echte Segenswunsch steht nicht an Schlusse des Briefes, sondern 16,20...."), that the original position of the benediction is at 16:24 on the basis that the Doxology precedes both the greeting and the benediction in the Philippians, Second Timothy and Hebrews (See his *Überlieferung*, s.12). According to him, thus 16:24 is the original ending of the Epistle, and the Doxology cannot follow this benediction because "... sie die Doxologie ersetzt ihn der Segenswunsch in rhetorisch pomphafter Form ...." (Idem). Though we are fully aware of Corssen's desperate effort to lay a steppingstone to his ultimate hypothesis of the Marcionitext of the Romans, he should not have so arbitrarily forced together the benediction (16:20b) as the Apostle's prayer for the Roman Christians and the Doxology as the Apostle's praise to God into a concept of the so-called 'Wunsch'.
cannot give any aid to his already badly battered previous hypotheses. According to his genealogy of D F G, first, so far as the Doxology is concerned, D has managed after all to preserve this reading of its archetype despite the slight change of position, whereas its immediate predecessor (the model of D) had completely lost this reading;\(^1\) secondly, both F and G rejected the Doxology against the reading of their common model.\(^2\) We can hardly understand what kind of genealogical coherence these kindred(?) manuscripts have. Furthermore, is it logically sound to jump from these facts to the conclusion that:

Demnach kann sehr wohl die Urhandschrift von D F G die Doxologie hinter 14,23 gehabt haben, die dann in dem einen Zweige der Überlieferung, der auf G führt, länger erhalten blieb, während sie in dem andern, der mit D endet, früher verloren ging.\(^3\) ?

Examining those given facts, we cannot find any convincing link either among D F G or between Z and D F G. Nevertheless, it is remarkable to see how skilfully Corssen gets on J.B. Lightfoot's back\(^4\) from this faulty tower of hypotheses to reach a conclusion totally unacceptable to the latter. Though at the conclusion of his article he depends heavily on Lightfoot's well-known hypothesis, he still fails to present any convincing textual evidences through his previous hypotheses that would lead to this ultimate hypothesis:

---

\(^1\) See Corssen, Überlieferung, ss.5ff.

\(^2\) See ibid., s.9: "... Es ist denkbar, dass die Doxologie in der gemeinsam Vorlage von F und G hinter 14,23 stand, aber athetiert war ...."

\(^3\) Idem.

\(^4\) See ibid., s.17 and Lightfoot, Renan's Theory, pp.315-319. But, Lightfoot regarded 16:20 as 'the true close of the epistle' when it was written originally by the Apostle (See ibid., p.320).
As we have already seen, this hypothesis is the main foundation of his much publicized scholarship. Therefore, so far as Corssen's hypotheses are concerned, no external evidence can be presented against the authenticity of the Doxology placed at the end of the Epistle.

We need to study carefully one more external evidence presented by De Bruyne as a decisive proof against the authenticity of the Doxology. The witness is Priscillian (+ 385), the Spanish heretic, who had made a concordance of the Pauline letters in the fourth century. De Bruyne indicates the fact that out of the 125 sections of the Romans no section begins with 16:25. Furthermore, he points out that even in the two canons, namely Canon XV and Canon XXIV, where the Doxology must have had its place if it was in his Bible at all, no section of the Romans is quoted. Nevertheless, when we examine these two canons very closely, it is easily discovered how rash De Bruyne's conclusion was. Every careful reader would immediately recognize that the Doxology is not simply standing in the background of Canon XV but forming the very core of it. It is true that 1 Corinthians 2:7-8 is

---

1 Corssen, Überlieferung., s.17.
2 Also cf. Dupont, Histoire, p.22: "... Il faut renoncer à voir, de ce chef, dans les trois manuscrits D F G les témoins indirects de la recension courte avec doxologie, que l'on dit remonter à Marcion."
4 See ibid., p.430.
5 κατὰ λαλεῖσαι θέεο δειγμαν ἐν μοστρῆν, τὴν ἀπεκκρυμένην, ἴν πραύλης δὲ θέεο πρὸς ἅπαν ἅπαν ἐν ἄρα ἑαυτοῦ ἄλλῳ ἄλλῳ τούτου ἐγγεμεν' εἰ γὰρ ἐγγεμεν'.
also standing behind Canon XV, however, in Canon XV it is the Doxology of the Romans that is constituting the main frame. If we analyse the two contexts of the Doxology and Canon XV, the keywords of both sides can be juxtaposed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Doxology (Romans 16:25-27)</th>
<th>Canon XV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. μυστηρίων (v.25)</td>
<td>1. sacramentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ἀποκρυμένου (v.25)</td>
<td>2. absconditum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χρίστου (v.25)</td>
<td>3. per apostolum ... (et quod) Christus (sapientia nuncupetur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. φανερωθέντος ἐν νόν (v.26)</td>
<td>4. nunc ... manifestatum sit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, 'μου' in 'κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου' is singular and indicates the Apostle Paul as an individual, likewise 'apostolum' in 'per apostolum' is also singular and indicates indisputably an individual Apostle, namely no doubt the Apostle Paul, whereas 'we' (οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡγείητο θεός) in 1 Corinthians 2:7 may not exclusively indicate the Apostle Paul but his fellow workers as well. The central idea of the Doxology, 'Christ as Wisdom of God' as we can infer from '... μόνος ὃς ἡγεῖτο θεός, ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χρίστω, ὡς ὁ δῷς ἐκ τῶν αἰώνων τῶν αἰώνων ὁμῆρον.' (v.27) is also clearly reflected in "... Christus sapientia nuncupetur ...." This conclusion becomes more convincing when we compare the condensed description of the 'Christ-Event' as 'Mystery and Wisdom of God' in the

---

1 "... et quod Christus sapientia nuncupetur quam nemo principum huius mundi cognouit" as quoted in De Bruyne, Deux Derniere Chapitres, p.430.
2 See "... sacramentum olim filii hominum absconditum, nunc per apostolum santis manifestum sit et quod Christus sapientia nuncupetur quam nemo principum huius mundi cognouit." as quoted in idem.
context both of the Doxology and also in 1 Corinthians 2:4-16. We are not sure whether this part of Canon XV is the original work of Priscillian or of the corrected recension by Peregrinus, however, it is quite certain that the author of Canon XV is concisely summarizing the Apostle Paul's idea found in the Doxology in reference to 1 Corinthians 2:7-8, in particular, v.8. Therefore, the actual result of our examination of Canon XV is the exact reverse of De Bruyne's conclusion: "... Nous pouvons donc conclure que la doxologie n'était pas dans la Bible de Priscillien ...." Here, again we come to reach the same conclusion that there is yet no external evidence that can refute the authenticity of the Doxology.

With regard to Origen's testimony, De Bruyne, who attributes the Doxology not to the Marcionites but to Marcion himself, argues:
"... Comment Origène a-t-il pu avoir un manuscrit marcionite sans doxologie et savoir que c'était là le véritable texte de Marcion? ...." Referring further to Jerome's commentary on Ephesians 3:5 in which the

1 Cf. ibid., p.450: "... Nous n'avons, il est vrai, les canons du célèbre hérésiarque que dans la recension corrigée de Peregrinus. Celui-ci a retouché le texte pour les idées comme pour le style ...."
2 Idem.
3 See his "La Finale Marcionite de la Lettre aux Romains retrouvée" in RevBén, Tome 28 (1911), pp.140ff.
4 Ibid., p.140.
5 See idem, n.1: "S'il est vrai que S. Jérôme dans son Commentaire d'Eph. 3,5 (éd. Vallarsi VII. 592) ne fait que traduire Origène, il faudra supputer que celui-ci fut plus tard mieux informé. Quand il écrivit son commentaire sur la lettre aux Ephésiens, dans les dernières années de sa vie, il avait rencontré quelques manuscrits — catholiques, évidemment — qui n'avaient pas la doxologie."
author is no doubt faithfully conveying the testimony of his great predecessor, he confidently retorts:

Si mal informé sur les textes de sa propre Église qu’il ne connaissait plus de manuscrits sans doxologie, comment est-il si bien informé sur les origines plus lointaines du texte marcionite?

, and concludes that Origen neither knew Marcion's text nor could open any Marcionite Bible. On this foundation, he tries to explain the alleged error of Origen as follows:

Il avait entendu on plutôt lu quelque part que Marcion avait supprimé tout ce qui suivait 14,23; et ce renseignement parfaitement exact, il l’a mal interprété; convaincu lui-même de l'authenticité de la doxologie qu'il trouvait dans tous ses manuscrits, il a dû croire que Marcion l'avait supprimée.

But, first of all, as R. Schumacher rightly points out, how can De Bruyne prove that there were catholic texts lacking the Doxology at the time of Origen? Secondly, does Jerome's commentary on Ephesians 3:5 really contradict Origen's early testimony in his

2 De Bruyne, Finale Marcionite, p.140.
3 See idem.
4 Idem.
5 See Schumacher, Beiden Letzten Kapitel, s.123.
commentary on the Romans? The first question should be answered through the second question because De Bruyne's whole argument is based on the very hypothesis that Origen's testimony found in Jerome's commentary on Ephesians 3:5 indisputably disproves his early affirmation in the Romans.

It is quite obvious that Origen had Montanism in mind when he mentions:

Qui volunt prophetas non intellexisse quod dixerint, et [Al. sed] quasi in ecstasi locutos, cum praesenti testimonio, illud quoque quod ad Romanos in plerisque codicibus inventur, ad conformationem sui dogmatis trahunt, legentes: Ei autem qui potest vos roborare juxta Evangelium meum, et predicationem Jesu Christi secundum revelationem mysterii temporibus aeternis taciti, manifestati autem nunc per Scripturas propheticas et adventum Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et reliqua.

, however, it is certainly the Marcionites that he is indicating through "... Sciant igitur qui prophetas non intelligunt, nec scire desiderant

6 (continued from the previous page) Evangelium meum, et predicationem Jesu Christi secundum revelationem mysterii temporibus aeternis taciti, manifestati autem nunc per Scripturas propheticas et adventum Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et reliqua. Quibus breviter respondendum est, temporibus praeteritis tacitum Christi fuisse mysterium, non apud eos qui illud futurum pollicebantur, sed apud universas gentes quibus postea manifestatum est. Et pariter adnotandum, quod sacramentum fidei nostrae, nisi per Scripturas propheticas, et adventum Christi non valeat revelari. Sciant igitur qui prophetas non intelligunt, nec scire desiderant, asserentes se tantum Evangelio esse contentos, ...

1 See Present Thesis, p.25, n.1.


3 Hieronymus, Ephesios, cols.512D-513A.
asserentes se tantum Evangelio esse contentos, ...."¹ Nevertheless, one can easily perceive that Origen's ultimate concern in this passage is the defence of the prophetic writings in the Old Testament. Therefore, we have to admit the relevance of this passage, in particular, "... quod ad Romanos in plerisque codicibus invenitur ... legentes: Ei autem qui potest vos roborare juvta Evangelium meum, et predicationem Jesu Christi ...." to our present discussion. Though De Bruyne remarks on this passage "... il faudra supposer que celui-ci [Origen] fut plus tard mieux informé ....",² why does this critic think Origen is mentioning "... in plerisque codicibus invenitur ... legentes: Ei autem qui ...." in this context? Does he mention this fact to acknowledge that the authenticity of the Doxology is not unanimously attested by the catholic codices? But, the immediately following "... Et pariter adnotandum, quod sacramentum fidei nostrae, nisi per Scripturas propheticas, et adventum Christi non valeat revelari. Sciant igitur qui prophetas non intelligunt, nec scire desiderant, asserentes se tantum Evangelio esse contentos, ...." indicates not simply the Marcionites but the strongly polemic character of this whole passage directed towards these heretics.³ In fact, what Origen is affirming in this passage is 'the majority of the extant manuscripts, with the exception of those Marcionite ones, clearly attest the authenticity of the Doxology'.⁴ Thus, far from being a belated

¹ Ibid., col.513A.
² De Bruyne, Finale Marcionite, p.140.
³ Also cf. Dupont, Histoire, pp.16f.
⁴ Cf. Hort, The End of the Romans, p.334: "... What he calls 'most MSS.' here are identical with 'those copies which have not been corrupted by Marcion' ...."; Dupont, Histoire, p.18: "... Tous les manuscrits attestent la doxologie, à l'exception des seuls exemplaires marcionites ...."
acknowledgement of his error as De Bruyne conjectures, Origen's second testimony is in perfect harmony with his first one.\footnote{Also cf. Dupont, Histoire, p.18.} De Bruyne also maintains that Marcion had certainly added the greeting 'Gratia cum omnibus sanctis' after closing the letter at 14:23.\footnote{See De Bruyne, Finale Marcionite, p.140.} However, this second unproved hypothesis\footnote{Cf. Corssen, Überlieferung., s.102: "... Der Segenswunsch aber stammt ohne alle Frage aus der längeren Ausgabe ...." and Schumacher, Beiden Letzten Kapitel, s.124: "... Dass es sich nicht um etwas Ursprüngliches handelt, lassen die griechischen Handschriften erkennen. Offenbar ist der gennante Segenswunsch nachträglich in die lateinischen Handschriften eingeschoben. Nicht anders verhält es sich mit der abweichenden Form, die De Bruyne später in einigen Handschriften an derselben Stelle des Textes fand: Gratia cum omnibus sanctis (statt vobis). Dass die Worte auf Marcion zurückgehen, wie De Bruyne glaubt, ist nicht bewiesen ...."} can by no means support the alleged Marcionite authorship of the Doxology. In affirming

Origène n'a pas mis la doxologie à la fin du chapitre 16, il l'y a laissée; il n'avait pas non plus à chercher quelle pouvait être la place primitive de la doxologie qui se trouvait dans les manuscrits marcionites, puisqu'il était convaincu qu'elle ne s'y trouvait pas.\footnote{De Bruyne, Finale Marcionite, p.142.}

De Bruyne is blaming Origen for having mistaken not only Marcion's authorship for the Apostle Paul's but also the catholic codices for the Marcionite ones. Nevertheless, it is nothing but an arbitrary conclusion forced by his unfounded hypothesis of Marcion's authorship. Accordingly, we cannot but conclude that Origen must have been
acquainted with some specific information about Marcion's mutilation handed down by the church.¹

Are we still unjustified in declaring that the authenticity of the Doxology cannot be disproved either through any subjective analysis of the text itself or on any external evidence?

Then, how can we finally analyse the various textual traditions in regard to the ending of the Romans?

(a) 1:1 - 16:23 + Doxology

The original text of the Romans was in this form.²

The fact that the fathers of the Church, namely Irenaeus (+ c.200), Tertullian (+ c.222-225) and Cyprian (+ c.258) do not quote from chs.15, 16 does not disprove the integrity of these two chapters

1 Despite De Bruyne's objection to H. von Soden, we cannot totally dismiss the latter's argument that Origen had at his disposition some manuscripts sufficiently close to the Apostolic Age. See Soden, Die Schriften des Neuen Testamentes in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt, I. Tl., 3. Abt. (Berlin, 1910), s.1510 as quoted by De Bruyne in his Finale Marcionite, p.141.
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along with the Doxology. Even when Tertullian refers to Romans 14:10 as 'in clausula' at Adversus Marcionem, V, 14:14, it does not necessarily mean that his copy ended with ch.14. Here, he is making this remark only in clear antithesis to 1:16 and 2:2.3

(b) 1:1 - 14:23

Marcion mutilated the last two chapters including the Doxology and prepared his short recension.

(c) 1:1 - 14:23 + Doxology + 15:1 - 16:23 + Doxology

This form was given rise to through two different stages by the scribes in the orthodox

---

1 Cf. Westcott and Hort, New Testament, Appendix, p.112: "... as these chapters contain no passages which any of these writers had specially strong reasons for quoting, and many of their verses are quoted nowhere in patristic literature except in continuous commentaries, this is not a case in which much weight can be attached to silence ...."; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, xc: "... The chapters were not quoted because there was little or nothing in them to quote ...."; De Bryune, Deux Derniers Chapitres, p.429: "... Parce que tel ancien Père ne cite pas la doxologie dans ses écrits, il ne s'ensuit pas qu'il ne la lisait pas dans sa Bible ...."

2 In Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, I), pars 1: Opera Catholica. Tvrnholti, 1954.

churches who expanded a Marcionite text in their possession\(^1\) through consulting a text of the original form which they came to find later.

At first stage, the form 1:1 - 14:23 + Doxology was produced for the purpose of reading at public worship by simply adopting the ideal closing which their short text lacked.\(^2\) Later in the same circle, either by the same scribe or another, 15:1 - 16:23 - Doxology was appended to the first

---

\(^1\) Cf. Manson, *Romans*, p.235: "... It has also to be remembered that at the time when Marcion was active the number of MSS. of the Pauline corpus was small, and probably very small. Consequently his Apostolikon may easily have been the source from which many copies were taken simply because there was no other text available ...." Also cf. Bruce, *Romans*, p.29: "... But such was the influence of Marcion's edition that his text ... was reproduced in greater or lesser degree in many orthodox lines of transmission, especially in western and, more particularly, Latin copies ...."

\(^2\) Codex Amiatinus bears witness to a text standing in this tradition. One may ask why the scribe had to satisfy himself by simply adding only the Doxology to his short text when the text of the whole epistle was lying under his very eyes. Moreover, even if we admit the fact that nearly two thirds of ch.15 is covered with the Apostle Paul's personal plan which was not so important for the later generation, he still could have made a very good cut after v.13 which, in fact, provides a far better ending than 14:23. But, this question can be easily answered. As Lightfoot mistook it nearly two millennia later, the scribe, in his complete ignorance of Marcion's short text, must have believed that the short text in his hand had been originally prepared by the Apostle himself and so had the previous Church tradition been in line with it. We assume that, despite the availability of the text of the original form, the same result was repeatedly produced in most cases wherever the copy of Marcion's short text had reached first.

Away from our position, Schumacher tries to admit the possibility that "... marcionitische Exemplare aus den katholischen die Doxologie herübergemommen und an den Schluss von c.14 gesetzt haben ...." (*Beiden Letzten Kapitel*, s.135). But, he should first answer the question how Marcion's disciples could accept the very thing which their master had abhorred so much. Unless Origen's testimony is disproved, this possibility cannot be seriously considered.
revision for the same purpose. It is highly improbable that the scribe had to put the Doxology after both 14:23 and 16:23 because he was not sure about its correct position. The scribe must have thought the double presence of the Doxology at these two places would be more ideal for the public reading, in particular, when the congregation was encouraged to join the reader as they do in singing the refrain of a hymn:

1st Stage

\[(1:1 - 14:23) + \{1:1 - 16:23 + \text{Doxology}\} \]

\[\downarrow\]

\[1:1 - 14:23 + \text{Doxology}\]

2nd Stage

\[(1:1 - 14:23 + \text{Doxology}) + \{1:1 - 15:1 - 16:23 + \text{Doxology}\} \]

\[\downarrow\]

\[1:1 - 14:23 + \text{Doxology} + 15:1 - 16:23 + \text{Doxology}\]
This text was produced in the orthodox church by passing through two different stages. First, an ending similar to other Pauline letters¹ was prepared by a scribe for their short text of Marcionite origin. Later, the Doxology was further added from another text of the original form,² most probably, again for the reading at public service:³

1st Stage

\[(1:1-14:23) \rightarrow \rightarrow (16:24)\]

\[1:1-14:23+16:24 \ldots \text{ The Model of F}\]

¹ Cf. 1 Thess. 5:28, 2 Thess. 3:18. Also cf. Phil. 4:23, Philem. v.25, and Gal. 6:18.

² Cf. The Vulgate MSS. 1648, 1972 and 2089, etc.

³ When Zuntz presumes composedly that "... Its occurrence in almost all witnesses can be accounted for by the observation, likewise due to Harnack, that the Marcionite doxology is throughout transmitted with a number of orthodox interpolations, and by its varying position at the end of the fourteenth, fifteenth, or sixteenth chapter of the Epistle. The inference is that behind our texts there lies an older form without the doxology. The only known witnesses for this primitive form are F G (or rather the archetype of this pair) and Marcion himself ...." (Text, p.227), he is properly understanding neither the difference existing between the two models of F and G nor the widespread consequences of Marcion's mutilation in the textual history of the Romans. He is not only oversimplifying the recension processes of the different texts without any convincing analysis but also unreasonably underestimating the influence of Marcion's short text in the orthodox circle.
2nd Stage


1:1 - 14:23 + 16:24 + Doxology ... The Model of G

(e) 1:1 - 16:24

The texts of this type were produced through two different formation processes. As we have already indicated,¹ F and G underwent different processes. The copyist of F who was already in the possession of a text consisting of 1:1 - 14:23 + 16:24 came across another copy in the form of 1:1 - 16:23 lacking the Doxology. This lack arose either, as Hort suggests, through the accidental loss of 'the outer leaf of a parchment book' or through damage done to 'the last or outer column of a papyrus roll',² or rather more probably, through mutilation by a rash scribe who, like many exegetes of our times, happened to regard it as a Marcionite addition. He added 15:1 - 16:23 to his short text and, at the same time, transferred the good-wish to the end to provide

¹ See Present Thesis, pp.45ff.
a suitable closing to his text. We assume that he made the same change in his Latin version. Nevertheless, it is remarkable that he refrained after all from furnishing the Greek translation of the Doxology to his Greek version after his Latin version. On the other hand, the copyist of G who was keeping a text 1:1 - 14:23 + 16:24 + Doxology\(^1\) came to discover later a copy of the original form having the Doxology after 16:23, and was convinced that the end of the epistle is the ideal place for the Doxology. Nevertheless, his adherence to his former text did not allow him to put it at that right place. Finally, he left a blank space after 14:23 without the Doxology but transferred the good-wish from its original place to after 16:23 to give a reasonable closing to this epistle. He also moved the good-wish in the same way in his Latin version:

\[
\begin{align*}
F \\
(1:1 - 14:23 + 16:24) & \rightarrow \left[ (1:1 - 14:23 + 15:1 - 16:23) \right] \\
1:1 - 16:23 + 16:24
\end{align*}
\]

\(^1\) This means the copyist of G was possessing a more recent recension than the copyist of F.

1:1 - 14:23 + an empty space + 15:1 - 16:23 + 16:24
( enough for the Doxology)

(f) 1:1 - 14:23 + Doxology + 15:1 - 16:24

This form was produced in the orthodox circle by supplementing the text 1:1 - 14:23 + Doxology with the other one in the form of 1:1 - 16:24. In this case, the scribe must have also considered 16:24 a proper ending for his expanded text.¹

(g) 1:1 - 15:33 + Doxology + 16:1 - 23

In all respects, this text, namely P⁴⁶, is the most unique case throughout the entangled textual traditions of the Romans. In contrast to those cases of the forms: (c), (d), (e), (f) which came

¹ We are not quite sure whether Origen was acquainted as well with a text exactly in this form ending with 16:24 when he said "... In aliis vero ... invenimus ...." Nevertheless, Zuntz is completely distorting all these painful processes of recension carried out in the orthodox circle since Marcion's mutilation, when he argues that "... Origen, in fact, knew non-Marcionite manuscripts which had the doxology after xiv. 23; the later tradition derived from manuscripts of this type. This, then, is quite a special case: a Marcionite addition, not by Marcion, applauded, received, and adapted by the catholic tradition because of its liturgical value ...." (Text, p.228).
into being originally through Marcion's short recension, the form (b), this form (P₄⁶) originates exclusively in the orthodox circle without any influence of Marcion's short text. It had been brought into being through two phases of recension. First, out of the text of the original form, a shorter one excluding only 16:1-23 had been prepared originally by an orthodox scribe. If this recension had been made by the Roman Church herself,¹ one can imagine she may have done it for wider circulation among the orthodox churches having similar problems. But, considering the clear fact that this Epistle is dealing with the particularly delicate internal problems of the Roman congregation, it is quite doubtful that the leaders of the Roman congregation would have officially launched this mission without taking the various regional situation of each individual church into account.² Rather, we assume it had been done by a scribe from another church

¹ Cf. Bruce, Romans, pp.28f.: "... There is no difficulty in understanding why an edition should have circulated without chapter xvi. If copies of the Epistle were sent to a number of churches, because of the general interest and relevance of its contents, all but one of these copies would very naturally have lacked chapter xvi, which with its many personal messages could have been applicable to one church only ...."

² Though C.E.B. Cranfield points out the possibility that the Apostle Paul himself may have produced this recension for another church after omitting the last chapter as not being of general interest [See his A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Vol.1 (Edinburgh, 1975), p.10], this is a much more improbable conjecture in every respect.
outside Rome who happened to have access to this Epistle during his visit to the Roman Church and strongly felt the necessity of reproducing the great Apostle's teaching for the reading at public worship\(^1\) not only in his own church but also in other churches. Later, this recension was expanded by another scribe in another orthodox circle who discovered a copy lacking only the Doxology most probably through the wilful mutilation by a rash orthodox scribe who judged it to be a Marcion's addition. Thus, this malformed text was produced by the combination of the positive recension and the stupid mistake equally made in the orthodox circle.

Through our brief survey of the various textual traditions of the Romans, we can suggest the following conclusions: first of all, under the circumstances that the reproduced copies of the Pauline letters were extremely scarce and, consequently, were unavailable by most orthodox churches, the copies of Marcion's short text, which had been actively reproduced for the expansion of his cause with the effective backing of his wealth since his break with the Roman Church in A.D. 144,\(^2\)

\(^1\) The appearance of P\(^46\) answers belatedly Schumacher's following question: "... Wenn man aber annimmt, dass nur c.16 bei der Vorlesung ausfiel, warum setzte man die Doxologie nicht hinter 15, 33? Die hier stehende Schlussformel bot kein grösseres Hindernis, als der unechte v.16, 24 es für manche Handschriften war, die die Doxologie an ihn anschlossen ...." (Beiden Letzten Kapitel, s.133).

\(^2\) Cf. Walker, History, pp.56f.
made their ways into the orthodox circle very readily from the very start, thereby, sowing the seeds of the inestimable chaos in the subsequent textual history of this Epistle. Secondly, apart from Marcion's notorious offence, the two exceptional decisions made in the orthodox circle as we can detect in P\textsuperscript{46}, namely the omission of ch.16 for the reading at public worship and the wilful mutilation of the Doxology from ignorance, in particular the latter, added more confusion to the already chaotic situation of the textual traditions. Thirdly, when Origen testified that "... In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est in his quae non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput diverse positum invenimus ....", he was unaware that those codices having the Doxology at other than after 16:23 (except those in the form of P\textsuperscript{46}) were all basically derived from Marcion's short text. But, his ignorance of this truth cannot be seriously blamed when we consider the unbelievably universal infiltration of Marcion's short text into the orthodox churches which had taken place before his time. Fourthly, the omission of the references to Rome at both Romans 1:7 (ἐν Ῥώμη) and 1:15 (τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμη) in some manuscripts was made not by Marcion, as T.W. Manson argues,\textsuperscript{1} but by the individual scribes who, in the course of their work of recension, wished to adapt the Apostle's message more agreeably to their local churches.

\footnote{See his Romans, p.236: "... It is our view that Marcion produced his text from the Romans by the removal of chapter xv and of the references to Rome in i, 7 and 15 ...." But, 'the great and humiliating rebuff which he received at Rome' (See \textit{ibid.}, p.229) cannot be regarded as the motive for having struck out these two references so long as there is no evidence that he had removed the title of this Epistle itself in his \textit{ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΟΝ}. Cf. Bruce, \textit{Romans}, pp.30f. and Cranfield, \textit{Romans}, p.8, n.5.}
After all these discussions, may we conclude, to the best of our knowledge, there is no single textual evidence which can disprove the integrity of the Romans chs.15 and 16 including vv.25-27 despite the various positions of the Doxology. After all, to the great disappointment of T.W. Manson, the presence of the Doxology after 15:33 in P₄₆ does not strengthen at all the position of those supporters of the Ephesian theory.

In the situation that the Ephesian theory can in fact no longer present any external evidence, its internal grounds are deplorably vulnerable to counter-criticism. The two major points specified by Manson as the conclusive foundation of his hypothesis that ch.16 is 'a letter, or part of a letter, to Ephesus'¹ are as follows:

chapter xvi contains a large number of greetings to Paul's friends. It is unlikely that he had so many personal friends — some of them intimate friends — in the Roman church which he had never visited. Further, those in the list, who are otherwise known, are connected with Asia and Ephesus. Again the exhortations in xvi.17-20 read very oddly if they are taken to be addressed to a church to which Paul was a stranger.²

Nevertheless, any objective-minded exegete would fully commit himself to H. Lietzmann's 'acid'³ but thoroughly sound comment on this unfounded theory:

Ein fast aus lauter Grüssen bestehender Brief, wie es Cap. 16:1-23 als selbständiges Schreiben sein

¹ Manson, Romans, p.236.
² Idem.
³ Cf. ibid., pp.236f.
würde, ist ein U Ding, und der Hinweis auf v.17-20
als 'Inhalt' zeigt das Missverhältnis nur noch krasser.¹

Even Manson's desperate addition that "... Any further information
that was asked for at Ephesus could doubtless be supplied verbally by
the bearer of the letter ...."² does not convince us at all. Though
he is quoting Colossians 4:7ff. and Ephesians 6:21f. as relevant
references to such a verbal supplement to the Apostle's letter,³ still,
it is not persuasive at all for two reasons: first, apart from the
fact that we cannot find any Pauline epistle which does not contain a
substantial Apostolic message for the very congregation of his concern,
how can we imagine the Apostle Paul, who had enough time to send such
lengthy greetings which have no parallel in the entire Pauline letters,
could also prepare such an unprecedentedly brief Apostolic prescription
for the grave danger to which he alludes? Secondly, Manson does not
seem to be fully aware of the contextual difference between the Romans
written by the Apostle as a free man and the two epistles written by
the Apostle in chains,⁴ not to mention the fact that these two letters
contain more than substantial Apostolic messages. The names in the
greetings are definitely in favour of Rome. Considering that Prisca
and Aquila seemed to be originally wealthy residents in Rome with a
considerable business foundation,⁵ their return after the death of the

¹ Lietzmann, Römer (1928³), s.129.
² Manson, Romans, pp.237f.
³ See ibid., p.238, n.1.
⁴ Cf. esp. Eph. 3:1, 4:1; Col. 1:24, 4:3, and 4:18.
⁵ Cf. Rom. 16:5: "... τὴν κατ' εἶδον τευχήν, ἐκκλησίαν ...." Also
cf. Dodd, Romans, xxi.
Emperor Claudius (+ Oct., A.D.54) to this city, where they could once again do good business as tentmakers with the richest customers in the Empire, is very natural. Even 2 Timothy 4:19, which makes us assume that this couple were again staying in Ephesus in around A.D.64, does not weaken this argument. It is not strange at all that they were keeping another establishment in that city for their business apart from the main one in Rome. It is very likely that they were visiting Ephesus on business. Epaenetus' presence in Rome also does not contradict our opinion. We do not necessarily have to reckon this 'ἀπορχῆ τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς Χριστόν' to be a resident in Rome. Could we not grant the possibility that this eminent Christian, most probably, as an authoritative leader of the Ephesian congregation, was visiting the Roman Church on a mission to discuss some common problems that faced these two important churches? Even if he came to settle in the capital city of the Roman Empire, there is nothing strange about that. The supporters of the Ephesian theory may still object that the Apostle could not know about the laborious service of a lady in the church which


2 Cf. Lietzmann, Römer, s.128: "... vermutlich haben sie ihr römisches Haus (und Geschäft) bei der Ausweisung nicht veräussert, sondern es wie üblich durch einen Sklaven als procurator verwalten lassen ...." Also cf. Dodd, Romans, xxi: "... there is no reason to suppose that the Roman establishment was closed down. All that Aquila and Prisca would need to do when they left would be to instal a procurator who was not a Jew, and he could carry on business as usual ...."

3 See Dodd, Romans, xxi.

4 Cf. Renan, Paul, LXVIII: "... Au v.5, Paul salue Épénète, ((le premier-né de l'Asie en Christ)). Quoi! toute l'Église d'Éphèse s'était donc donné rendez-vous à Rome? ...."

5 Also cf. Dodd, Romans, p.237: "... it would not be surprising to find that a distinguished member of the church of Ephesus had been sent to Rome on Church business ...."
he had never seen. Nevertheless, they have to deal with Romans 1:8 first. Even if we do not completely agree with the way of approach to this matter of J.B. Lightfoot and others the remaining names in vv.7-15 cannot be used in support of the Ephesian hypothesis. Though the Romans had no doubt very poor means of communication by our modern standards, when we imagine for ourselves the scenes on the Roman highways, the very arteries of this mighty Empire, all leading to Rome, the capital, the mobility of the contemporary world cannot be too much underestimated. Therefore, the Ephesian theory should be rejected even on the internal grounds.

Now, unless any counter-evidence makes a dramatic appearance in the field of textual history, it is fair enough to conclude once for all that Romans 16:3-16 is the very unmistakable explanation how the Apostle Paul who had never been to Rome could manage to receive so detailed information on all the delicate internal as well as external problems faced by the mixed congregation of the Roman Church. In addition, the couple, Prisca and Aquila, throw new light on our further understanding of the Apostle Paul's handling the extremely subtle

---


discords between the Gentile and Jewish Christians in the Roman Church. Apart from the fact that this couple were the most reliable friends and, at the same time, the chief correspondents of the Apostle Paul from whom the Apostle could hear the most up-to-date news of Rome \(^1\) (in all likelihood, through their widespread business network), they were wife and husband of a mixed marriage between a Gentile woman and a Jewish man. It does not matter at all to us whether Prisca was of a noble Roman family \(^2\) or not. \(^3\) Accordingly, the Apostle Paul could analyse the serious problems existing between the two groups on the basis of the most unbiased reports of this couple and do even-handed justice to this troubled congregation through his greatest Epistle, *the Romans*.

\(^1\) Cf. esp. Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, xlf.

\(^2\) Cf. W.M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (London, n.d. \(^1\), 1920 \(^1\)), p.268: "... The unusual order, the wife before the husband (so XVIII 18), must be accepted as original; for there is always a tendency among scribes to change the unusual into usual. Paul twice (II Tim. IV 19, Rom. XVI 3) mentions Prisca before Aquila; that order was, therefore, a conversational custom, familiar in the company among whom they moved; though it must have seemed odd to strangers in later generations. Probably Prisca was of higher rank than her husband, for her name is that of a good old Roman family ...." Also cf. Bruce, *Romans*, pp.270f.

\(^3\) Both Sanday and Headlam (See *Romans*, p.420) and Dodd (See *Romans*, xxi-xxii) argue that Aquila and Prisca may have been freed slaves of the Acilii, however, the fact that the Apostle put Prisca before his husband in his official letter (as well as in his private letter) dismisses this possibility. If Prisca had been a freed female slave, the Apostle would no doubt have named Aquila, husband and a born Jew, before his wife in this Epistle.
ii. THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

A. The Value of the Acts of the Apostles as a historical Source in reconstructing the Apostle Paul's Life

In the conclusion of his quite exhaustive introduction to the Acts of the Apostles,¹ M. Goguel once declared that the Acts deserves neither the honour of being considered 'une source historique de tout premier ordre' nor the indignity of being treated as 'une oeuvre d'imagination'.² Irrespective of the pros and cons with regard to Goguel's analysis, we cannot but doubt whether the main-stream of the study of the Acts between 1923³ and 1975⁴ could ever make basically, in the strict sense, even a single forward step from this position.

² See ibid., pp.364f. According to him, we cannot see in the Acts any accurate description of the history of the churches or even that of a part of the churches of the Apostolic Age because "... le cadre dans lequel le récit est présenté est la création d'un homme qui est déjà assez loin des événements qu'il raconte et qu'il ne les aperçoit qu'à travers le christianisme de son temps, c'est-à-dire leur fait subir, instinctivement sans doute mais non moins réellement pour cela, une adaptation à ses propres idées ...." (Ibid., p.365), however, the historical value of the documents and traditions utilized by the author is incontestable (See idem) despite the intentional and tendentious distortions of the facts (See idem. He points out, in particular, the account of the Apostolic Council). Therefore, he concludes by adding that "... Sans doute ils [the materials of the Acts] n'ont pas la valeur des épîtres pauliniennes, mais ils fournissent des indications qui permettent d'apprécier, de coordonner et d'encadrer les données que l'on tire des épîtres. Le livre des Actes se trouve être ainsi, malgré toutes les lacunes et les insuffisances qu'il peut présenter, l'une des bases les plus essentielles sur lesquelles repose l'histoire du christianisme ancien." (Ibid., pp.366f.).
³ This year, the adventurous article of M. Dibelius, "Stilkritisches zur Apostelgeschichte" applying form criticism for the first time to the Acts made its appearance in Eucharisterion für H. Gunkel (Göttingen), II, ss.27-49.
⁴ On April 30, 1975, Ernst Haenchen passed away leaving behind a copy supplied with numerous marginal notes and some manuscript pages with particular passages recently prepared. The posthumous edition of his (cont.)
In 1950, after making an excellent survey of both contemporary and previous studies of the Acts, J. Dupont concluded first that the literary problem of the Acts controls its historical questions.\(^1\) Indicating the Council of Jerusalem as the very example justifying his conclusion, Dupont argues that, in the presence of the two different testimonies, the Galatians and the Acts, no satisfactory explanation will be given unless we begin with 'un examen littéraire des données fournies par les Actes'\(^2\) and that the existing difficulty with respect to the Apostolic Council "ne fait que souligner la nécessité de se rendre compte avant tout de la manière dont, au point de vue littéraire, le Livre des Actes est composé."\(^3\) Here, Dupont presupposes, like many others, that Acts 15 contradicts Galatians 2 irreconcilably. Is Luke's account really at odds with that of the Apostle Paul over the most important event in the Apostle's relations with the Jerusalem Church? Above all, how does Dupont understand the Galatian context? We would continue our discussion about this issue later in the section "The alleged Discrepancies between Acts 15 and Galatians 2". Dupont's conclusion is more specific:

(continued from the previous page) commentary on the Acts was published in 1977 with the help of Frau Margit Haenchen who undertook the trouble to edit all notes, marginal notes and manuscript leaves according to this copy and these manuscript pages left by her husband. Cf. "Vorwort zur 7. Auflage" von Erich Grässer in E. Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1977), s.6.


\(^2\) See *idem*.

\(^3\) Ibid., pp.117f.
Nevertheless, the examples presented in support of this conclusion are hardly convincing. To begin with, in regard to the trial of Jesus Christ before the Sanhedrin, Dupont argues Luke (22:67-71) seems to give simply an interpretation of the early tradition represented by Mark (14:61-64a) and Matthew (26:63-65) because both Mark and Matthew report that the Sanhedrites condemned Jesus Christ for blasphemy when He, identifying Himself manifestly with the Son of man, declared that they shall see Him seated at the right hand of God, not when He admitted Himself to be the Son of God, whereas, according to Luke, the Sanhedrites condemned Him for blasphemy when He affirmed that He is the Son of God.² Now, let us look at these three accounts:

Mark 14:61-64a

Matthew 26:63-65


---

1 Ibid., p.118
2 See ibid., pp.118f.
3 It is not quite certain whether this expression which clearly reflects the typical 'Jewish tendency to avoid direct references to God' [Cf. (cont.)
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When we closely examine, first of all, the passages in Mark and Matthew, it becomes quite clear that Dupont's hypothesis is not well-founded at all. He argues confidently:

Où est le blasphème? Il n'est pas dans la première assertion de Jésus, simple réponse à la question qui lui a été posée; se dire le Messie, et en ce sens le Fils de Dieu, ne constituait pas un crime passible de la peine capitale. Le blasphème, attentatoire à la majesté divine, se trouve dans la seconde déclaration où, s'identifiant manifestement au Fils de l'homme, Jésus annonce qu'on le verra assis à la droite de Dieu.  

But, how can he, against the testimony of John, prove that Jesus' declaration of being the Son of God had not served as the motive for 

3 (continued from the previous page) V. Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark (London, 1974, 1952\(^1\)), p.567] is more original than \(\delta \upsilon \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \beta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \). Because we cannot completely dismiss the possibility that the high priest and other Sanhedrites were simply quoting what the people had said about Jesus, namely \(\delta \upsilon \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \beta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \), apparently the most blasphemous remarks that they had already heard before this trial. For the same reason, Professor Hugh Anderson's suggestion that "... it is quite improbable that a high priest of the Sadducean party would have used this language [\(\delta \upsilon \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \epsilon \lambda \rho \nu \pi \nu \iota \iota \iota \iota \) in collocation with the term 'Christ' or 'Messiah'. The semblance of verisimilitude barely disguises the fact, therefore, that here the Church has put its own language on the lips of the high priest ...." [The Gospel of Mark (London, 1976), p.331] is not very persuasive. Also cf. Taylor, Mark, p.567: "... It may well be that the high priest has in mind echoes of the teaching of Jesus (cf. Mt. xi. 21 - Lk. x. 22) or the implications of the claim to be the Builder of the New Temple."

1 Probleme, p.118 with reference to G. Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, I. Bd. (Leipzig, 1898), ss.252-259.

2 See Jn 19:7: "... ἰδεῖς ἔνοχον ἔχεις, καὶ κατὰ τὴν νομίμα ἐγείρει \(\alpha \nu \beta ο \alpha \beta ο \gamma ί \) \(\epsilon τ \iota \upsilon \delta \eta \varsigma \beta ο \alpha \nu \tau \omega \epsilon \upsilon \)ς.," and also 5:18. Cf. C.K. Barrett, The Gospel according to St. John (London, 1975\(^\text{(10)}\)), p.451: "... \(\pi \alpha \iota \varepsilon \iota \eta \nu \) here means 'make out to be'; ... It is far from clear in Mark on what the charge of blasphemy is founded; in John there is no difficulty; Jesus blasphemes in claiming for himself essential equality with God ...." Also cf. B.F. Westcott, The Gospel according to St. John [Grand Rapids, 1975, (Cambridge, 1880\(^1\))], p.270: "... The form of expression made himself the Son of God emphasizes the heinousness of the charge. The claim was attested in action and not only in word ...."
his condemnation by the Sanhedrin?\(^1\) According to Luke, the Sanhedrites were clearly aware that only the Son of God can be seated at the right hand of the power of God. Besides, in Mark as well as in Matthew, Jesus' declaration identifying Himself as the Son of man (\(\varphi ιων\),\(^2\) the cosmic Judge, follows immediately His affirmation of being the Christ the Son of God without pause, thus, in fact, forming one continuous solemn proclamation as the Christ of God, the eternal Saviour and Judge. The punctuation mark (either \(\cdot\) or \(,\)) after Jesus' affirmation of being the Christ the Son of God, which we can find in the modern Greek text, should never be regarded as a pause of action in a speech but as a pause of meaning, namely a mere grammatical sign for the clarification of meaning. For the proof of his hypothesis Dupont would require to establish two facts: (a) that after declaring Himself to be the Son of God Jesus kept a period of silence which would have allowed a charge of blasphemy to be brought, (b) the Sanhedrites did not at this point condemn Him for blasphemy. In the absence of this proof, his hypothesis is not to be considered seriously. Above all, Luke's account (22:70f.) is in complete agreement with John (19:7), the only eye-witness of the trial of Jesus Christ before the Sanhedrin among the four Evangelists.\(^3\) Furthermore, Dupont should have paid closer attention to the definite article in both 'ὁ θεός τοῦ θεοῦ' (Mt. and Lk.) and 'ἐν θεῷ ἐν θεῷ' (Mk). Certainly, we can find in Jewish writings such expressions as 'son of God' (Wisd. 2:18) or

---

\(^1\) Cf. Mt. 27:39-44, esp. vv.41-43. Also cf. Mt. 27:54 and Mk 15:39.

\(^2\) Cf. Dan. 7:13.

\(^3\) Cf. Jn 18:15f.
'son of the Most High' (Sir. 4:10) applied to the righteous individuals, however, none of them has the definite article 'ο' before 'οίκος'.

Though we admit that the suffering righteous man described in Wisdom 2:12-20 reminds us of the Suffering Servant in Isaiah 53, the very context of Wisdom 2:1-3:19, especially 2:21-3:10, clearly shows that 'ο θεοτόκος' in vv.12-20 is by no means the Messianic One but one of many righteous men confronted with the wicked ones (ο άσιφείς) in the world. The presence of 'ο' before 'οίκος' is grammatically unique to the Messianic title2 that should be traced back to Psalm 2:6-9.3

Unless the Sanhedrites had been completely ignorant of those most controversial Messianic passages in the Old testament,4 the widespread publicity of Jesus Christ, in particular, through His Royal Entry into Jerusalem5 surely must have induced them to examine His activities more

---

1 See Wisd. 2:18: "καὶ γάρ εστίν ο θεοτόκος ο θεοῦ, ...."; Sir. 4:10: "καὶ εστὶν ὁ θεοτόκος θεοῦ, ...."

2 It is quite surprising to find the anarthrous form of 'the Son of God' in the Johanne Gospel (19:7: "... ο θεοτόκος εστί αυτήν ἐπηγιναν."). however, this exceptional example by no means refutes our argument. On the contrary, this anarthrous form proves irrefutably the genuineness of the Johanne account of this scene. Was it not so natural that the Jewish leaders had omitted the article when they were speaking to the pagan ruler who could never conceive even the slightest idea of 'the Only Son of God'? Also cf. Mt. 27:54 and Mk 15:39. Cf. further Westcott, John, p.270: "... A Roman would have no distinct idea of One to whom alone the title "Son of God" truly belongs ...." But, cf. Jn 20:31.

3 Cf. esp. vv.6f.: "Τίνι τὴν τούτων προσκαμίσας, καὶ τῆς ουδὲν ἔκδοτο, τῇ θεοτόκῳ εἰς ἱππον." Also cf. Acts 13:33; Heb."1:5.

4 Also cf. Ps. 110:1-7 along with Mt. 22:41-46, Mk 12:35-37, Lk. 20:41-44, Acts 2:34f., and Heb. 1:13; Dan. 7:13f. Considering the escalated mood among the contemporary Jews in their expectation of the Messianic Kingdom, such ignorance among the religious leaders can hardly be conceived. In fact, they had admittedly very detailed knowledge concerning the Coming Messiah. Cf. Jn 7:41ff. together with Mic. 5:2.

closely in the light of those passages in question. Consequently, when the high priest and other Sanhedrites asked Jesus whether He was the Son of man, they were, in fact, asking 'Are you the Divine King?'.

Though there is no way to ascertain how the Sanhedrites were exactly interpreting the cosmic appearance of the Son of man, another(?) Divine King from Heaven, in Daniel 7:13, it is more likely that they were anyhow identifying this cosmic Judge with the mysteriously veiled Son of God, who would stand on Zion as the King of the Most High and break the nations with a rod of iron, rather than separating the One from the other. Thus, so far as the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin is concerned, unlike Dupont's argument, there is no single evidence to prove that Luke is simply interpreting the earlier traditions represented by Mark and Matthew. On the contrary, it can be equally, or rather more convincingly, argued that Luke's account\(^1\) could be in a sense not merely more informative but more original unless there is a crucial evidence that can successfully deny any possibility of acquiring first-hand information, on the side of Luke, through the Apostle Paul who must have been told about this trial by John, the only eye-witness, during his visit to Jerusalem. Luke's agreement with John upon Jesus' assertion of being 'Son of God', that unequivocally constituted, in the eyes of the Sanhedrites, the hideous crime liable to the capital penalty, may confirm this.

---

\(^1\) Cf. esp. Lk. 22:67f.: "... εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς: ἐὰν ἔμιν εἶπες, καὶ μὴ πιστεύσωτε ἐὰν δὲ ἔρισθησαυ, καὶ μὴ ἀπεκρίθητε." and 22:70b: "... ὁ δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔη ὡς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμί."
In the same context, Dupont argues further that the Lucan version of the Roman centurion's remark made after the Death of Jesus shows that "... la rédaction actuelle ne semble pas avoir conservé la signification de la tradition qu'elle emploie ...." Here, the futility of Dupont's hypothesis becomes much clearer than ever before. Comparing the Lucan text with those of both Matthew and Mark, he maintains:

Si l'on tient compte du parallélisme des récits, on songera naturellement, pour comprendre la version de Luc, au titre messianique bien connu; ((le Juste)). Il est probable, en effet, que le mot δίκαιος avait ce sens dans la tradition utilisée par Luc; mais rien n'oblige à penser que Luc lui-même y ait encore vu un titre messianique.

Nevertheless, why do we have to read the Messianic title into this Lucan version? Just as it is quite unthinkable that this pagan centurion could conceive the idea of the Only Son of God, thus the Son of God not a son of God, so equally we feel doubtful about any possibility of the centurion's appreciation of the Messianic One on the Cross. Under the very circumstances that even His own disciples could not understand His Messianic Death on the Cross, 'δίκαιος' here, unlike δίκαιος in Acts 3:14 ("... Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνι ὄψεσθε καὶ δίκαιον ἰδοὺ ἐστιν ...")

---

1 See Lk. 23:47b: "... εἶτας καὶ ἄνθρωπος ὑμεῖς δίκαιος ἐστε."  
2 Dupont, Problèmes, p.119.  
3 See Mt. 27:54: "... ἄληθῶς ὑμεῖς ἰδεῖς ὃν ὑμεῖς."  
4 See Mk 15:39: "... ἄληθῶς ὑμεῖς ὑμεῖς ὑμεῖς ὑμεῖς ὑμεῖς ὑμεῖς ὑμεῖς."  
5 Dupont, Problèmes, p.119.  
6 Cf. Mt. 27:54; Mk 15:39.  
indisputably indicating the Messianic title,\(^1\) can have no other meaning than 'innocent'. Therefore, we can say Dupont is not only wrong in his surmise that 'it is probable that the word \textit{dikaios} had the meaning of 'the Just', the well-known Messianic title, in the tradition utilized by Luke' but totally irrational when he condemns Luke on this unfounded conjecture for having failed to preserve the signification of the tradition which he used. It is difficult to understand why Dupont ignores the very fact that both Matthew and Mark support that the Roman centurion's remark itself is clearly reflecting, together with the accusation of the Jewish leaders before Pilate (Jn 19:7) and their mockery beneath the Cross (Mt. 27:43), the tumultuous publicity caused by Jesus' claim to be the Son of God. Consequently, the confident conclusion reached by Dupont:

\[\text{Quand il s'agit de la théologie des Actes, il faut donc savoir de quoi l'on parle. La source du passage que nous venons de voir employait sans doute les mots (( Saint )) et (( Juste )) comme des attributs messianiques; mais il ne semble pas que les termes aient gardé le même sens dans la rédaction actuelle. Le rédacteur est un helléniste; le vocabulaire qu'il reprend n'a plus toute la signification qu'il avait dans la théologie de son contexte judaïque. L'observation rejoint ce que nous avons constaté dans la réflexion du centurion. Inversement, si l'expression \textit{dikaios} tend à se vider ainsi de son sens théologique, nous avons vu que l'expression (( Fils de Dieu )) acquiert, dans le récit que Luc nous donne du procès de Jésus, une valeur nouvelle qu'elle n'avait pas à l'origine.}^2\]

\(^1\) Again Dupont insists in vain that here 'un rédacteur hellénisant' wrote it simply in the sense of 'the innocent one' without the value of a Messianic title (See \textit{Problèmes}, p.119). But, do we need to trouble ourselves to remind him that the disciples of the Risen Lord (above all, Peter) were no longer ignorant of their Master's Messianic Death on the Cross once for all?

\(^2\) \textit{Ibid.}, pp.119f.
proves to be entirely unfounded and unworthy of serious consideration. It is regrettable to point out that, despite his full conviction that all the problems of the Acts, not to mention that of its historical reliability, can and should be solved only through the literary criticism, neither his shrewd hope of the fruitful result of M. Dibelius' works\(^1\) nor his confident emphasis on the crucial necessity 'to identify, beyond the work of the redactor, the different literary units which he had welded together and to assign their places in the life of primitive Christendom in order to make contact with the Apostolic Church across the traditions emanating from her\(^2\) could reach any crystalline conclusion, especially in regard to its historical reliability, even ten years later.\(^3\) Though Dupont, after H.J. Cadbury,\(^4\) no longer admits the validity of Dibelius' theory of itinerary as a 'einheitliche schriftliche Quelle',\(^5\) it is obvious that he is faithfully introducing none other than Dibelius' hypothesis\(^6\) when he concludes,

---

\(^1\) See *ibid.*, p.120: "... Les travaux du professeur de Heidelberg ont incontestablement fait faire à l'étude des Actes un progrès dont on n'a pas encore recueilli tous les fruits ...."

\(^2\) See *idem*.

\(^3\) See his *Les Sources du Livre des Actes* (Bruges, 1960), pp.159-162.


\(^5\) See M. Dibelius, "Die Apostelgeschichte als Geschichtsquelle" in *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte*, hg. von H. Greeven (Göttingen, 1957\(^3\)), s.95.

\(^6\) See *ibid.*, ss.92ff. and esp. s.93: "... das vielberechtete "wir", in dem man früher unter dem Einfluss modernhistoristischer Gedanken das ursprünglichste Element des ganzen Reiseberichts sah, ist doch vielleicht erst bei der Verarbeitung von Lukas eingefügt worden, um seinen eigenen Anteil an den Reisen des Paulus zu kennzeichnen ...."
in regard to the so-called 'we-passages' (Wir-Stücke) with which our understanding of the historical reliability of the Acts is inseparably connected, that

Nous considérons comme un progrès important, accompli par les travaux récents, la prise de conscience du fait que le (nous) doit trouver son explication au niveau de la rédaction, non à celui de la documentation qui a servi à composer l'ouvrage. Quant à savoir si l'auteur a conservé le (nous) d'un document antérieur ou s'il l'a introduit dans des récits qui ne le contenaient pas, la question importe assez peu; l'essentiel est de se rendre compte qu'il emploie délibérément la première personne du pluriel. La confrontation avec des textes anciens qui présentent la même particularité dégage la portée du procédé: l'auteur veut faire entendre qu'il a pris personnellement part aux événements qu'il rapporte.¹

Under the circumstances that, on the whole, the materials, including those passages attributed to the itinerary,² utilized in the Acts are said to reveal the very personality and interests of Luke,³ what is the real and most decisive factor, in Dupont's view, that makes modern critics seriously question the historical reliability of the Acts? It is, according to him, the discrepancies between Acts 15 and Galatians 2.⁴

¹ Dupont, Sources, p.160.
³ See Dupont, Sources, pp.157f. and 160.
⁴ See Dupont, Problèmes, pp.52-70 and esp. p.51: "... Il semble que toutes les difficultés que rencontre l'étude du Livre des Actes se trouvent réunies dans le chapitre XV. En lui-même d'abord, le récit du Concile de Jérusalem ne peut manquer de poser la question des sources: saint Luc s'appuie-t-il sur des documents en rapportant les discours de Pierre et de Jacques? d'où tient-il le décret dont il nous donne le texte? Mais le ch.XV pose surtout un problème historique très ardu: dans une page de l'Épître aux Galates, saint Paul mentionne les diverses circonstances dans lesquelles il a été en (cont.)
(continued from the previous page) rapport avec les autorités de l'Église de Jérusalem, et il est bien difficile, on le sait, de faire cadrer les renseignements de saint Paul avec les données des Actes. Faut-il donc avouer que, sur ce point où on peut le contrôler, l'auteur des Actes s'est bel et bien trompé? S'il en est ainsi, voilà son crédit d'historien fort diminué et on ne manquera pas, dès lors, de remettre en question son identité: comment concevoir de telles erreurs chez saint Luc, un compagnon de saint Paul, si bien placé pour être parfaitement renseigné? ..." Also cf. ibid., p.117.

B. The alleged Discrepancies between Acts 15 and Galatians 2

Dupont is correctly aware of the great significance of the alleged discrepancies between the Acts and the Galatians with respect to the account of the Apostolic Council that would not simply affect Luke's credit as a historian but inescapably force us to call his identity as a companion of the Apostle Paul in question.1 As the indisputable evidence for the discrepancies between the two accounts, he argues confidently that the Apostle Paul had paid, according to the Galatians, only two visits to Jerusalem, whereas Luke is recording four visits of the Apostle to this Holy City. Apart from Acts 9:26, 11:27-30 and 15:1ff., Dupont maintains, Acts 12:25 also speaks about a voyage which is not identical with that of 11:27-30.2 He argues further that, unlike Luke's misinformed accounts, both Acts 11:27-30 and 15:1ff. are in fact relating the same visit mentioned in Galatians 2:1-10.3 Hence, are we to reach the eventual

---

1 See Dupont, Problèmes, p.51.
2 See ibid., p.52.
3 See ibid., pp.61ff. and also 117.
conclusion that Luke could not have been a companion of the Apostle and, therefore, the Acts itself should not be used for any responsible reconstruction of the Apostle's life? By no means! Though Dupont tries to read one more voyage into Acts 12:25 on the basis that the text: "... ὑπέστρεψαν ἐῖς Ἰερουσαλήμ ..." is evidently secondary in comparison with the other one: "... ἐπέστρεψαν ἐῖς Ἰερουσαλήμ ...",¹ this textual evidence does not offer him such a support as he expects. 'ἐῖς' here is not to be taken as 'to' but as 'the Hellenistic equivalent of ἐν',² and a comma should be put after ὑπέστρεψαν³ because 'ἐῖς Ἰερουσαλήμ' is placed at the beginning of the participial phrase in which it belongs⁴ for the grammatical effect of accentuation.⁵ Thus,

¹ See ibid., p.52. Although A. Loisy argues "... la leçon des ms. B S. ἐῖς Ἰερ., paraît fautive ...." [Les Actes des Apôtres (Paris, 1920), p.498. Cf. also ibid., p.499] [Tischendorf, Nestle and Conzelmann (See his Apg., s.80) also reject the reading 'ἐῖς Ἰερουσαλήμ'], this more difficult (therefore, seemingly more original) reading, 'ἐῖς' (X B), is securing far better textual evidence than both 'ἐῖς' (P74 A33) and 'ἀνέ' (D V 181). Here, Dupont is fully associating himself with the very argument made by the authors of The Beginnings of Christianity [See Pt.I, Vol.III: The Text of Acts by J.H. Ropes (London, 1926), pp.114f. and Vol.IV, p.141].


³ See Metzger et al., Textual Commentary, p.399.

⁴ See Haenchen, Apg., s.372. Here, Haenchen is following H.H. Wendt, his predecessor in the Meyer commentary. See H.H. Wendt, Die Apostelgeschichte (Göttingen, 1913⁵), ss.199f.: "... "Barnabas und Saul. kehrten zurück (nach Antiochia), nachdem sie nach Jer. hin ihre Dienstleistung vollzogen hatten." ἐῖς steht so prächtig wie 25 u. ö., die Vorstellung ihres Hinkommens nach Jer., wo sie dann den Dienst verrichteten, einschliessend ...." Also cf. Conzelmann, Apg., s.80: "... ἐῖς ist nur möglich, wenn man es zum folgenden Patizipialsatz zieht ...."

⁵ See Haenchen, Apg., § 5, s.91: "... ἐῖς Ἰερουσαλήμ πληρώματε τῆς ἐνεκείμενης gehörts zusammen und zeigt die betonten Begriffe am Anfang und Ende ...."
far from attesting to another new voyage to Jerusalem, what Luke exactly says in 12:25 is "Barnabas and Saul returned, after they had fulfilled the commission at Jerusalem, bringing with them John whose surname was Mark". It is true that Luke is still recording one more visit to Jerusalem in the Acts, however, this difference should not be used to diminish the historical reliability of Luke's account unless we are perfectly correct in assuming that the Apostle Paul's narration in the first two chapters of Galatians is a kind of annalistic autobiography in which he was supposed to record all the previous events. Moreover, does the Galatian context itself demand the inclusion of this famine-relief visit to Jerusalem?

The heart of the matter at issue needs to be examined a little further in the light of E. Haenchen's important article which appeared in 1960. We have to pay particular attention to this article because in it Haenchen's position on the present issue was most thoroughly elucidated and this position has not been changed a bit even in the last edition of his over-acclaimed commentary on the Acts.

---

2 "Quellenanalyse und Kompositionsanalyse in Act 15" in *Judentum Urchristentum Kirche* (Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias), hg. von W. Eltester as Beiheft zur ZNW, 26 (1960), ss.153-164.
3 See Present Thesis, p.72, n.4.
article, Haenchen's foremost concern as a celebrated herald of the so-called 'Kompositionsanalyse'¹ was to refute the 'Quellenanalyse' revitalized by R. Bultmann in the study of the Acts as a whole and especially ch.15.² Nevertheless, Bultmann's lucid criticisms of Haenchen's analyses of the Lucan materials in the inaugural edition of the latter's commentary on the Acts³ show just how vulnerable his very controversial 'Kompositionsanalyse' is⁴ and also how inconsistent his attitude in applying this analysis to the Acts in place of the 'Quellenanalyse' is by his relying on the 'Itinerary' in regard to 21:27-36.⁵ To make matters worse, despite his vigorous attempts to confute Bultmann's application of the 'Quellenanalyse' to the Acts outright, Haenchen could not yet define the exact nature of the so-called 'tradition', which is in fact the only, but entirely hypothetical, foundation of his 'Kompositionsanalyse', even in his article of 1960 in which he ought to have had an answer to Bultmann's

¹ See Kompositionsanalyse, ss.154f.
⁴ See Bultmann, Frage, pp.71-75.
⁵ See ibid., pp.75f. In contrast to his giving up of the itinerary theory afterwards in regard to 21:27-36, this inconsistent attitude of Haenchen is still manifested towards 21:15-26 in his last edition. See his Apg. (1977), ss.585f.
criticism made in 1959.1 Unlike Bultmann trying to find out some common ground by arguing that Haenchen's interpretation of Acts 15 would not be modified at all even if the latter admits that the author of the Acts had utilized a written source,2 Haenchen dismisses any possibility of such a compromise,3 thus, diminishing the historical reliability of the Lucan account more drastically than this famous source critic.

But, how convincing after all is his 'Kompositionsanalyse' when applied to the Acts? When Haenchen concludes that the speeches of Peter (15:7-11) and James (15:13-21) originated not from a source taken over by Luke, as Bultmann believes,4 but from Luke himself,5 it

---

1 Cf. Bultmann, Frage, p.74: "... Haenchen ist gewiss mit Recht der Meinung, dass er vor den Acta keine „Apostelgeschichten” gegeben hat; an solchen konnte die apostolische Zeit kein Interesse haben. „Eine Apostelgeschichte” wie die lukanische konnte erst in einer neuen Generation geschrieben werden" (S.87). Aber es gab freilich Uebelieferung aus der apostolischen Zeit, auf die Lukas für sein Werk angewiesen war. Doch in welcher Form gelangten sie an „Lukas”? Als mündliche oder schon als schriftliche Tradition? Man vermisst bei Haenchen eine zusammenhängende Untersuchung dieser Frage. Der auffallend kurze Abschnitt „Die in der Apg. benutzte Tradition" (S.95f.) geht auf die Frage nicht ausdrücklich ein, sondern spricht nur unbemitt von Traditionen ...."

2 See ibid., p.73. For his argument over other parts of the Acts, cf. ibid., p.74.

3 See Kompositionsanalyse, ss.157-160.

4 See Bultmann, Frage, pp.71-73.

5 See Haenchen, Apg., s.157. Concerning Peter's address: "... τι περιήλθε τον θανον, έπιδειξαν ζωνην έπι τον πράξειν την μακριναν. Εν ουτε οι πατερεσ ήμαν ουτε ήμεν ιερεσ της ιερας της κυριους" (15:10), Conzelmann also argues: "... Die Auffassung vom Gesetz als einer untragbaren Last ist weder allgemeinjüdisch (der jüdische Ausdruck „das Joch” hat nicht den Sinn der Unerträglichkeit und Unerfüllbarkeit) [in reference to St.-Bil., I, ss.608ff.] noch paulinisch; es ist die Auffassung eines Christen in der Zeit, da die Trennung vom Judentum bereits zurückliegt ...." (His Apg., s.91). But, here Peter is obviously not mentioning (cont.)
is needless to mention that he is fully committing himself to the very hypothesis of Dibelius presented in the latter's two well-known studies, „Das Apostelkonzil“ (1947)\(^1\) and „Die Bekehrung des Cornelius“ (1947).\(^2\)

As the sure basis of this conclusion, Haenchen argues with great confidence:

\[
\]

Nevertheless, what is the real cause of this peculiar deviation of the LXX from the Massoretic Hebrew text? Can we say, in particular, the LXX text: \(\text{"διὸς ἐκβολήσων οἱ καπὶλειποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων..." (Amos 9:12)}\) came to be produced by the LXX translators' misreading of the original Hebrew text: \(\text{"…וֹנָּהֵי מַעְלָה חַפְּשָׁנָה..."}\)? This can hardly be considered. Then, did the LXX translators prefer a positive revision of the original passage seemingly smeared with the narrow-minded Jewish nationalism to a verbal rendering of the original

\(^5\) (continued from the previous page) a '\(θαυμάζω\)' in the same complacent attitude toward the fulfillment of the Law as can be seen among most Pharisees of his day. Cf. Gen. 6:5, 8:2; Job 14:4, 15:14; Ps. 51:5; Jer. 17:9, etc.

\(^1\) First appeared in the Festheft of TL, 72 (1947) [dedicated to W. Bauer on his seventieth birthday], cols.193-198.

\(^2\) First appeared in CN, 11 (1947) [presented to A. Fridrichsen on his sixtieth birthday], pp.50-65.

\(^3\) Haenchen, Apg., s.157.
words, thus, introducing the expectation of a universal Messianic kingdom, still Jewry-centred, but more broadly embracing the gentile world? Instead of admitting the possibility of such a positive recension which is in fact quite doubtful, we would rather assume that the LXX translators must have had before them another Hebrew text reading: "... הנשא הָנִים סְדָךְ מַעֲמֵ֥ר בִּשְׁבִּיר֥ה יַעֲבֹרֻ֖תנּוּ...". But, unlike H.A.W. Meyer who regards the present Massoretic text as the original one, we cannot entirely dismiss the probability that the other reading standing behind the LXX text is more original and our present text is the product of the later revision after the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. Therefore, under the present circumstances that no one

1 The idea of a universal Messianic kingdom can hardly be considered in the present context of Amos singling out Edom as a nation for special emphasis. Here, the restoration of the Davidic kingdom whose former territory had included Edom can be more easily perceived. Cf. J.L. Mays, Amos (London, 1969), p.165: "... What the oracle expects in the future is not a universal world-wide kingdom, but a revival whose contours conform to what had already occurred in Israel's history under Yahweh ...."

2 Cf. H.A.W. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Acts of the Apostles, trans. by W.P. Dickson, Vol.II (Edinburgh, 1884), p.57: "... The LXX., who certainly had before them another reading (נַשּׁא הָנִים סְדָךְ מַעֲמֵ֥ר בִּשְׁבִּיר֥ה יַעֲבֹרֻ֖תנּוּ...), deviate considerably from the original text, which runs: "... and C.C. Torrey, The Composition and Date of Acts (Harvard Univ., 1916), pp.38f.: "... Rabbi Akiba and his followers had not yet set up a "standard" text of the Prophets; ... and the LXX rendering of Am. 9, 11f. certainly represented a varying Hebrew text ...."


4 Cf. Mays, Amos, p.164: "... The specific reference to Edom and the text's presupposition that Edom is only a remnant fit best into a time after the fall of Jerusalem in 586, when Judean resentment against Edom rose to a shrieking crescendo, and Edom was subject to severe pressure from the south and east (cf. Obad. 10;14; Lam. 4.21f.; Ps. 137.7). It is difficult otherwise to explain the singling out of Edom for particular emphasis; and in the mid-eighth century that nation was independent and intact ...."
can declare for a certainty that the alternative Hebrew text to our existing Massoretic one was absolutely unavailable to the participants in the Apostolic Council, James' thorough reliance upon the LXX must by no means be taken for granted. Furthermore, the significant differences existing between James' quotations from the Old Testament at Acts 15:16-18 and the LXX rendering of Amos 9:11-12 not only indicate the comprehensive character of the Old Testament quotations made by James but also strongly imply the unlikelihood of his dependence on the LXX. Hence, Haenchen can hardly be justified in bringing an accusation of having tried to justify the Gentile-mission with 'einem sinnwidrigen LXX-Zitat' against Luke. As we have seen hitherto, the fact that "certainly the LXX version of the second part [of James' quotations from the Old Testament] lends itself to James's application more than MT would" does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that James quoted these Old Testament passages from the LXX.

1 See Μετὰ τῶν ἀναστρέψαν (Acts 15:16a) instead of 'ἐν τῇ ἑκάτερῃ ἑκείνῃ' (Amos 9:11a), and 'λέγει κύριος ποιεῖν τὴν γνώσιν ἀπ' ἰδίως' (Acts 15:17b-18a) instead of 'λέγει κύριος ἐν θεές ἐν ποιεῖν τῳδε' (Amos 9:12b). Here, it is quite clear that Jer. 12:15a is standing behind 'Μετά τῶν ἀναστρέψαν' and Isa. 45:21b behind 'λέγει κύριος ποιεῖν τὴν γνώσιν ἀπ' ἰδίως' respectively. Nevertheless, the Lucan rendering of 'I will return' at Acts 15:16a is 'ἀναστρέψαν' instead of 'ἐπιστρέψαν' (See the LXX rendering of Jer. 12:15a: "καὶ ἐστίν μετὰ τοῦ εἴδωλος καὶ ἐλέησαι τούτο ἡμῖν ... ". Even in the case of James' quotation at Acts 15:17b-18a, freely made out of Isa. 45:21: "πάντες τοῖς ἐκείνης ἡμῖν ἐρχόμεθα ἐρχόμεθα ... . . . .", the Lucan renderings are '[κυρίως] ποιεῖν τᾳδε' γνώσιν instead of '［τις］ἀποκαλεῖ ἐνεχθὲν ταῦτα' (the LXX) and 'ἀπ' ἰδίως' instead of 'ἀπ' ἵνα ἀμήτης' (the LXX).


3 Against Torrey who argues "... Luke always uses the Greek Bible for his Old Testament quotations ...." (His Composition, p.58). Supporting Torrey, Bruce also argues "... we need not be surprised to find James, a Galilaean, speaking Gk. and quoting from the LXX, especially in the presence of the 'certain others' from Antioch (ver. 2), whose language would be Gk. ...." [His The Acts of the Apostles (London, 1970?), p.298].
But, considering the geographical difference in the location between Antioch in the Apostolic Age and Edom in the time of King David, it was so natural for James to have discarded the reading: "\( \text{ανδρες} \ \text{χειλεως,} \ \text{ακοινετε} \ \text{με}. \ \text{Συμεως} \ \text{εξηγησατε} \...."\) and chosen the alternative reading: "\( \text{ανδρες} \ \text{χειλεως,} \ \text{ακοινετε} \ \text{με}. \ \text{Συμεως} \ \text{εξηγησατε} \...."\) which the LXX translators also had accepted earlier in prospect of their mission to the Gentile. Could James possibly prepare Scriptural proofs more ideal than Acts 15:16-18a in these circumstances? Though Bruce believes James made the speech in Greek, the very fact that James refers to Peter calling him \( \text{Συμεως} \) strongly suggests that he was speaking in Aramaic at this Council. Thus, this problem passage: "\( \text{ανδρες} \ \text{χειλεως,} \ \text{ακοινετε} \ \text{με}. \ \text{Συμεως} \ \text{εξηγησατε} \...." \) (15:14), far from revealing a conspicuous touch of Luke as an impostor, upholds the accuracy of his account.

Haenchen's position becomes much clearer in his further attack on W. Bousset, another great source-critic, who attributes the

---


2 Therefore, Haenchen's confident supposition that "... er [Luke] bringt unbefangen den Schriftbeweis der hellenistischen Heidenchristen für ihre Mission ...." (his Kompositionsanalyse, s.158) breaks up even before Bultmann's argument for 'a source' does. Cf. Haenchen's concluding retort in idem: "... Damit bricht die Zuweisung dieses Verhandlungsberichtes an eine Quelle praktisch zusammen ...." 

3 'και' in "... κατάλειποι των ἀνθρώπων τῆς κυρίου, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἑβνη ...." (v.17) is 'epexegetical' one. Cf. Wendt, Apg., s.230.


5 When Wendt argues: "... Diese Benutzung der LXX an u. St. ist ein Anzeichen dafür, dass wir nicht die genaue Wiedergabe einer aramäischen Rede des Jak. vor uns haben ...." (His Apg., s.230), it is quite obvious that he believes James made this speech in Aramaic.
allegedly 'so kümmerliche Statistenrolle' played by both Paul and Barnabas at this Council\(^1\) to a 'spezifisch antipaulinisch' source\(^2\) which Luke incorporated into his work. Haenchen correctly refutes Bousset's attitude in trying to detect an 'antipauline' source in Acts 15 by retorting: "Wenn er [Luke] ihnen nur eine ((kümmerliche Statistenrolle)) gönnt, wie passt dazu, dass Paulus in Kap. 16-28 der Held der Erzählung ist?"\(^3\) According to this composition-critic, however, the 'Statistenrolle' of Paul, along with the speeches of Peter and James as well as the Cornelian story, belongs to the great Lucan composition whose aim was to relieve Paul of the responsibility for the Law-free Gentile mission and declare, at the same time, that it was none other than God Himself that made Peter, the first of the twelve apostles, carry out this mission.\(^4\) On this foundation, he argues further that the harmonious Decree was not sprouted through the negotiation at the Apostolic Council and again demands us to deal with 'a piece of tradition of special kind which Luke has ingeniously connected with the scene of negotiation'.\(^5\) Here, we do not have to wrestle any more with this piece of special tradition whose character cannot be clarified even by Haenchen himself. But, how can Haenchen, not to mention Bousset, be so sure that the Apostle Paul was excluded from the great debate mentioned at Acts 15:7? The Lucan text itself does not show us the exact scene of this debate. However, does not

---

\(^1\) See W. Bousset, "Der Gebrauch des Kyriostitels als Kriterium für die Quellenscheidung in der ersten Hälfte der Apostelgeschichte" in *ZNW* (1914), s.158.

\(^2\) See *ibid.*, s.162.

\(^3\) Haenchen, *Kompositionsanalyse*, s.158.

\(^4\) See *ibid.*, s.160.

\(^5\) See *idem.*
the Apostle's own account in the Galatians\(^1\) confirm the Lucan narration of Acts 15:7?\(^2\) It is also true that Luke does not give us any detailed description of the Apostle Paul's attitude in declaring\(^3\) 'εξε θεσεν εποίησεν μετ' αυτῶν' (15:4b), however, does this mean that the Apostle Paul was submissive to the original apostles and the elders of the Jerusalem Church? Could we not read here the great anguish of Luke trying to minimize the scandalous publicity of the tension at this Council without distorting the truth?

Haenchen is forced to push his peculiar hypothesis a little further when Bultmann, in his persistent advocacy of a source as a written document containing the four prohibitions,\(^4\) attempts to discredit his position denying the existence of such a document by arguing:

---

\(^1\) See Gal. 2:3-5, esp. v.5.


\(^3\) 'ἀναγγέλλω' here means 'declared' not 'reported'. Cf. the difference of context between 14:27 and 15:4.

\(^4\) See Acts 15:29.
Nach Dibelius ist dafür beweisend „die Adressierung lediglich nach Antiochien, Syrien und Kilikien" [Aufsätze, s. 89]. In der Tat! Wie konnte der Autor auf diese einschränkende Adresse verfallen, wenn er das Dekret als ein uneingeschränktes verstand, was nach Haenchen der Fall war.¹

According to Haenchen, the address of the letter by no means limits the district where the Decree is to be in force but expand it. He points out that, despite the fact that only the Antiochian congregation had inquired of the apostles and elders in Jerusalem, the reply names Syria and Cilicia as well.² But, he adds:

Man versteht aber diese Hinzufügung von Syrien und Cilicien erst dann richtig, wenn man den einfachen schriftstellerischen Kunstgriff bemerkt, dessen sich Lukas an dieser Stelle bedient.³

In support of this argument, he indicates that Luke is speaking all of a sudden about the presence of Christian congregations not only in Syria and Cilicia but also at Galilee (9:31), Tyre (21:3), Ptolemais (21:7), Sidon (27:3) and Puteoli (28:13), not to speak of the Roman Christians mentioned at 28:15.⁴ Nevertheless, does Luke really have to explain in his context the origins of all these churches including the one in Rome? It was at Antioch indeed that τινες καταλθέιτες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας (15:1a) came to be directly confronted for the first time with the defiant leaders of the Gentile Christians. How can

¹ Bultmann, Frage, p. 71.
² See Kompositionsanalyse, s. 161.
³ Idem.
⁴ See ibid., s. 162.
Haenchen guarantee that no Christian congregation in these two regions, especially in Syria, had been disturbed by those people from Judea until their arrival at Antioch, the capital of this imperial province? Considering the significance of Antioch's position as the geopolitical and missionary centre of these two regions, Syria and Cilicia, even if those people had come straight to Antioch without causing any trouble in other parts of this province, it is so natural that the letter was specifically addressed to the two regions, Syria and Cilicia, that formed together one imperial province whose capital was Antioch.

Besides, the whole context of Acts 15:6-21 makes it quite clear that the four prohibitions, the core of this Apostolic letter, were prepared not merely for this already troubled area but for the whole Gentile world. Haenchen does not forget to put a few more stitches into his ragged 'Kompositionsanalyse' by introducing the so-called 'reader of the Acts' (der Leser der Apostelgeschichte) again at Acts 21:25. As Dupont rightly points out, however, the existence of such a reader

1 Cf. Bruce, The Book of the Acts, p.207: "... Syria and Cilicia formed one imperial province at this time ...." and ibid., p.314: "... the province of Syro-Cilicia of which Antioch was the capital ...."  
2 Cf. Acts 21:25: "... he declare the first decree which the apostles and elders appointed ...." The words of James show that the instruction was not limited to some particular congregations.

3 Cf. esp. his Kompositionsanalyse, ss.158, 159, 160, 162, and 163.  
4 See ibid., ss.162f.: "... Bultmann will nichts davon wissen, dass hier in Wirklichkeit nicht Paulus, sondern der Leser der Apostelgeschichte an das Dekret erinnert wird. Vielleicht hatte ich deutlicher sagen sollen, dass dort die Situation nicht für Paulus, sondern für den Leser klar gemacht wird ...." He argues that Luke is using similar technique at Acts 1:18f. and 2:8ff. also. See ibid., s.163.  
5 See Dupont, Sources, p.125: "... Haenchen parle avec beaucoup d'assurance des réactions du lecteur ancien; mais on peut se demander si ce lecteur a jamais existé ailleurs que dans son esprit ...."
itself is quite doubtful. This 'reader of the Acts' had been introduced, in fact, long before Haenchen by A. Loisy.\(^1\) The difference between the two is that, while Loisy believed Luke's original work had been tremendously damaged by an unknown 'faussaire',\(^2\) Haenchen's ultimate demand is ironically nothing less than identifying this unknown 'faussaire' with Luke the physician. Nevertheless, their motives for introducing 'the reader of the Acts' can be clearly understood when we look into the already mentioned two articles of Dibelius. Here, it is none other than the seemingly irreconcilable disagreements between Acts 15 and Galatians 2 that eventually forced Dibelius to introduce 'the readers of the book' as the last and the only means of exegetical breakthrough.\(^3\)

Apart from our limited discussion until now, the various approaches to the Acts made in a number of distinguished essays contained in Studies in Luke-Acts\(^4\) confirm once again that the alleged discrepancies between Acts 15 and Galatians 2 is still the very crux of all the exegetical problems of the Acts of the Apostles. But, whether Luke's account really contradicts the Apostle Paul's story or not can receive the final verdict only after the careful examination of the concrete

---

\(^1\) See Loisy, Actes, pp.799f.

\(^2\) See ibid., pp.104f.

\(^3\) Cf. „Das Apostelkonzil" in TL, 72 (1947), cols.195, 197f. or Aufsätze, ss.86, 89f., and „Die Bekehrung des Cornelius" in Aufsätze, ss.101f., 106f.

\(^4\) The Festschrift in honour of P. Schubert.
historical situations in which both the Apostle Paul and Luke were breathing.\footnote{We can indicate especially P. Vielhauer's study, "Zum "Paulinismus" der Apostelgeschichte" [first appeared in EvTh, 10 (1950/51), ss.1-15. E.T. of this article, "On the Paulinism of Acts", is reprinted in Studies in Luke-Acts, pp.33-50], as the typical example of the complete failure in understanding the contemporary circumstances in which both Pauline epistles and the Acts had been written.} Was Luke's main object of writing the Acts limited to edifying the Law-free Gentile churches of his day and was he devoid of any sense of urgency in pursuing this aim?\footnote{Cf. esp. E. Haenchen, "The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity" in Studies in Luke-Acts, p.278: "... The question of the historical reliability of the book of Acts does not touch the central concern of the book. By telling the history of apostolic times through many individual stories, the book primarily intends to edify the churches ...." along with his \textit{Kompositionsanalyse}, s.158: "..., als Lukas die Apostelgeschichte schrieb, war Jakobus längst als Märtyrer gestorben, und die jerusalemische Gemeinde hatte ihren Einfluss verloren ...."}, \footnote{ibid., s.159: "..., für Lukas selbst und seine Gemeinde war die gesetzesfreie Heidenmission keine offene Frage mehr, und sie ist es auch nicht für die Christenheit, die er dementsprechend hier abkonterfeit ....", and \textit{ibid.}, s.163: "..., hätten sich die Heidenchristen zur Zeit des Lukas nicht um diese Verbote gekümmert ...."} This seems an inadequate motive and leads us to ask about Luke's real purpose in writing such a unique history as the Acts. Above all, what did the Apostle Paul try to achieve in his Galatian context? We have to tackle these questions throughout our present study.

2. THE SECONDARY SOURCES

Among the sources falling under this category, the following ones draw our special attention and will be consulted with utmost care in our main chapters:
i. THE GOSPELS AND OTHER LETTERS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

These sources are in any sense by no means inferior to our primary sources, but they will be consulted within certain limits only when our specific context demands it. Obviously, our information on the Apostle Paul's understanding of the Parousia, his attitude toward the Roman Empire and, above all, the kernel of his Gospel can be crucially supplemented by these sources. The Evangelists' accounts of the contemporary Jewish leaders' attitude toward Jesus and His followers are also enormously helpful to us in reconstructing the situation of the Judaism in the time of the Apostle Paul. Even the date of the Acts, which would directly affect our understanding of Luke's aim through this book, should be carefully examined in the light of Jesus' prophecy concerning Jerusalem.¹

ii. THE WORKS OF FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS

As far as the materials outside the New Testament are concerned, Josephus' statements are of paramount importance for our task of reconstructing the exact situations of both the contemporary Judaism in Palestine and the Jerusalem Church. We believe that without Josephus' help it is almost impossible to understand correctly the historical background of the Epistle to the Romans itself. Whether Josephus should be condemned as a renegade or not,² the arguments

for¹ and against² Luke's dependence on Josephus should be examined in each relevant context of our study rather than be generalized from the beginning.

iii. THE WORKS OF THE ROMAN WRITERS

In understanding the Apostle Paul's view of the contemporary Roman Empire, we can observe an unbridgeable gap between ourselves and most western, in particular, British, New Testament scholars. In this situation, some views held by the Romans themselves on their own society³ would be of vital importance for our unbiased judgement on this issue.

¹ Cf. esp. H. Holtzmann, "Lukas und Josephus" in ZWT (1873), ss.85-93 and ZWT (1877), ss.535-549.
CHAPTER III

CHAPTER III


1. *τινὲς κατελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας* AND THE JERUSALEM CHURCH

In our attempt to solve the exegetical problem of Romans 15:30-32, first of all, we had better begin with the turmoil in the Antioch Church provoked by some men who came down from Judea and declared the necessity of circumcision as the absolute prerequisite to salvation. At a first glance it is not so clear whether they were from a church in Judea or directly from the Jerusalem Church. In contrast to the B-text which does not explicitly connect these provokers with "τινὲς τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ιουδαίας τῶν Φαρισίων πεπιστευκέντος" (Acts 15:5) in the Jerusalem Church, however, the D-text positively identifies their Jerusalem origin by reading:

1 See Acts 15:1f.
1 Here, our quotation is made from the facsimile prepared by F.H. Scrivener in his Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis, being an exact Copy, in ordinary Type, of the celebrated Uncial Graeco-Latin Manuscript of the four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, written early in the sixth Century, and presented to the University of Cambridge by Theodore Beza, A.D. 1581. Cambridge, 1864. For further reference, cf. CODEX BEZAE CANTABRIGIENSIS QUATTUOR EVANGELIA ET ACTUS APOTOSTORUM COMPLECTENS GRAECE ET LATINE, Phototypice repraesentatus. Cantabrigiae, 1899. Again in v.5 the D-text reads: "... ως εὐαγγελίζοντες αὐτοὶ ἀναλίσκουσι πρὸς τοὺς προσδόκεισθαι εἰς ἀναφέρων λόγους τῆς αὐτοῦ κατὰ ἑκατέρων τεκμηρίων ....", thus making a very crude conflation with the B-text. Despite its intrinsic superiority, the B-text, unlike the D-text, does not clearly indicate the subject of ἑταῖρον in v.2. Grammatically, τινὲς κατελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας is more natural as the subject than the alternative one from τοῖς ἀνέλειφοις [Cf. Foakes-Jackson and Lake (ed.), Beginnings, Pt. I, Vol. IV, p. 170]. But, the whole atmosphere of the Lucan context (Cf. also Acts 11:29-30 and 13:1-3), together with the Apostle Paul's own statement in Gal. 2:2 ("ἀνάγκη εἶναι ἑκάστῳ ἑκατέρων ...."), points to the latter as the more proper subject of ἑταῖρον. The most decisive textual support, however, comes from v.3: "οἳ μὲν εἰς προσελκύσθην ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ....". Considering the fact that the D-text also preserves the same reading, we can assume that, though τινὲς κατελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας had demanded the Apostle Paul and others to go up to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem, even the scribe of this Western text believed it was the Antiochian Church herself not the Judaizers from the Jerusalem Church that had made the final decision to send her own delegation headed by the Apostle Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem. Therefore, when Conzelmann remarks: "... Er [Der W-Text] ersetzt die Anordnung der Gemeinde durch eine Aufforderung der Judäer, nach Jerusalem zu gehen. Dass dann auch v3 geändert werden müsste, ist nicht bemerkt worden ...." (His Apg., s.90), he does not seem to appreciate the position of the scribe of the D-text correctly.
H. Conzelmann, regarding the report of the B-text as the authentic work of Luke, argues: "... Lk vermeidet es zu sagen, dass diese Judenchristen aus "Jerusalem" kommen; er setzt das allgemeine "Judäa", um anzudeuten, dass sie nicht im Auftrage der Urgemeinde agitieren ...."¹ Then, why did the scribe of the D-text feel it necessary to defy Luke's good intention trying to cover or, at least, to minimize the publicity of the scandalous disunity between the Jerusalem congregation and its virtual counterpart in the Gentile world, the Antiochian one? According to E.J. Epp, three points emerge from the precise statement of the D-text reporting the Jerusalem origin of those provokers:

(1) ... the unity of the church is maintained and enhanced because this opposition to Paul and Barnabas comes from only one quarter — from this one small group of Judaizers. (2) The D-text minimizes not only the number of Judaizers — a single group — but, by the same token, minimizes the significance of the Judaizing view point itself when seen in relation to the church as a whole. Already the D-text reveals an interest in playing

¹ Conzelmann, Apg., s.90. Also cf. Haenchen, Apg., s.425: "... Lukas ersetzt Jerusalem (s.v.241) wieder einmal durch Judäa. Er will den Eindruck fernhalten, dass die τινες eine jüdisch-islamische Delegation sind. Jerusalemische Judenchristen, die — beträchtliche Zeit nach der 1. Missionsreise (1428) — nach Antiochia kommen, behaupten dort die Heilsnotwendigkeit der Beschneidung ...." J. Weiss, however, tries to analyse it taking the presumably delicate situations of the Jewish Christians in the Diaspora into account: "... Die έις της 'Τετελεσθής V.1 sind nicht als Judenchristen oder gar wie V.5 als pharisäische Judenchristen gekennzeichnet, sondern einfach als τινες ... και της Ἰουνίας. Dies genügt vom Standpunkt dieser Erzählung aus: was von Judäa kommt, ist für die Antiochener natürlich judenchristlich. In diesem silentium liegt ein schlagendes argumentum für hellenistisch-diasporajudenchristliche Herkunft des Berichtes ...." [His "Das Judenchristentum in der Apostelgeschichte und das sogen. Apostelkonzil" in TSK, 66. Bd., 1. Heft (1893), s.537].
down the seriousness of the whole dispute, a point which becomes even clearer as the narrative in chapter xv D proceeds. (5) Along with this tendency to devalue the Judaizing viewpoint, the D-text has, however, both sharpened up the issues involved (xv.1-2) and portrayed an increased intensity of opposition to Paul and Barnabas on the part of that Judaizing group, for the group not only accuses them at Antioch and drives them to Jerusalem to be judged, but the group also appears again in Jerusalem as the opponent of Paul and Barnabas [E. Fascher, Textgeschichte als hermeneutisches Problem (Halle, 1953), s.33], as if further to press its charges against them.1

If the tradition preserved in this Bezan text of the Acts with regard to τίνες καταλαβότες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας originated ultimately in the Antiochian Church,2 and if this tradition, despite the 'anti-Judaic tendencies' detected in the text,3 was not a completely unfounded slander maliciously fabricated by some anti-Jerusalem circle among the Antiochian Christians,4 the remarkably extensive addition of this Western text provides us with a piece of valuable information in sharp

---


2 It is quite interesting to see F.H. Chase argue that the birthplace of the Bezan text of the Acts was Antioch [See his The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae (London, 1893), pp.115-131], though his argument is rejected by most modern scholars [Cf. F.G. Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible, revised and augmented by A.W. Adams (London, 1975), pp.90, 94ff.].

3 Cf. Epp, Tendency, pp.41-171.

4 The very fact that, in Acts 15:4, the D-text reads παρευθηκαν της μεγάλης (See CODEX BEZAE CANTABRIENSIS QUATTUOR EVANGELIA ET ACTUS APOSTOLORUM COMPLECTENS GRAECE ET LATINE, F.476b) is obviously a later alteration (Cf. Scrivener, Bezae Codex, p.444, col.2)] μεγάλων [an obvious misspelling of μεγάλων]'s, thus adding μεγάλως to the reading of the B-text, dismisses any possibility of reading such an anti-Jerusalem element into this tradition in question.
contrast to that much vaguer one of the B-text. Despite the clear difference of viewpoint between the two texts, it has been generally admitted that those provokers were the Judaizers belonging to the party of the so-called 'Christian Pharisees' in the Jerusalem Church. But, were they the official emissaries of the Mother Church commissioned by the original apostles to test the quality of the new brethren at Antioch? F.F. Bruce believes that they were the delegation appointed and sent to Antioch by the Jerusalem Church. Nevertheless, considering Acts 15:6-11, Peter who was the head of the Jerusalem congregation in fact as well as in name at that time as the chief of the original apostles had neither appointed those emissaries nor approved such a movement of the Judaizers. But, the attitude of James the Lord's brother who seems to have presided at the Apostolic Council somehow leaves a doubtful impression. In contrast to the definite attitude of Peter who takes the side of the Gentile Christians from the beginning,

1 Munck, however, takes the reading of the B-text literally in regard to 'τινες καταλόγους ἀπε Ἰουδαίας' and does not associate these provokers at Antioch with 'τινες τοῖς ἀπε Ἰερουσαλήμ πεπίστευκεν' in the Jerusalem Church (See his Acts, p.137). But, cf. H.J. Holtzmann, Apostelgeschichte (Tübingen und Leipzig, 1901), ss.95f.; Foakes-Jackson, Acts, p.130; Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p.290; Williams, Acts, p.179; Conzelmann, Apg., s.90; Metzger, Background, p.200; Haenchen, Apg., s.425.

2 Cf. H. Lietzmann, A History of the Early Church, trans. by B.L. Woolf, Vol.1 (London, 1974), p.73: "... Wherever a Hellenistic mission was founded, and new Christian churches were called into being, emissaries of the original church came on the scene to test the quality of the new brethren, and to regulate intercourse with them ...."


4 Cf. Acts 15:24: "'Επειδὴ ἥκετε ὑμεῖς ἐν τινί ἐξ ἃν ἐταμαθήσατε λέγετε ἐνακαλύφθητε τῆς ἡγίας ὑμῶν, οὐς εἰ διεστείλατε;"
James appears at most as an arbitrator between the Judaizers and those including Peter who were against putting a yoke of the Law, namely circumcision, upon the neck of the Gentile Christian. B.M. Metzger argues that James

also spoke in favor of the more liberal policy pointing out that Old Testament prophets had foretold the calling of the Gentiles (Isa, 45:21; Jer. 12:15; Amos 9:11-12).¹

But James' speech in Acts 15:13-21 is by no means clearly showing his original position but simply his arbitrary summing up of the antagonistic argument of the moderate group to which Peter and his fellow original apostles belonged and that of the Judaizers respectively as a chairman of that Council. Considering his close relations with the Judaizers that can be inferred from the statement of Acts 21:18-24 together with his speech in Acts 15:20f.,² we can say he was quite sympathetic towards or even positively speaking for the Judaizers of the Jerusalem Church.

Nevertheless, James could not yet rise to an absolute position dominating over the whole congregation of the Jerusalem Church but was in the process of establishing his footing as the future leader of the Jerusalem Church keeping step with the Judaizers.³ Therefore,

¹ His Background, p.200.
³ But, W. Schmithals argues that at the time when the Apostolic Council was held Peter was in a subordinate position under James who was (cont.)
(continued from the previous page) already occupying the leading position in the Jerusalem Church. In support of his argument he indicates the fact that in Gal. 2:9 the Apostle Paul mentions James first before Peter [See his Paulus und Jakobus (Göttingen, 1963), ss.40-41]. This kind of argument, however, had already been made by Williams. See his Acts, p.181: "... Peter was in fact no longer head of the Jerusalem Church, James having taken his place ... this is corroborated by Paul putting James before Peter and John in Gal. ii.9 as well as by Peter's lapse at Antioch being due to those who had come from James and who are presumably those of the circumcision whom Peter feared! (Gal. ii.12). As head of the Church James gives the decision, vs.19 now ...."]. It is true that the blood ties of James with our Lord in His earthly life played a decisive role in his becoming without trouble a prominent figure even in the quite early days of the Jerusalem Church (Cf. Gal. 1:19) especially with the support of the Judaizers who were morbidly conscious of Jewish nation's physical privilege as the Chosen One. It is also plain that the power structure in the Jerusalem Church at the time of the Apostolic Council inevitably came to undergo a drastic change along with the departure of most of the original apostles from Jerusalem and the Judaizers' taking the leadership instead of them. When the Apostle Paul was writing the Epistle to the Galatians, James who had secured the whole-hearted backing of the Judaizers by aligning himself positively with them was already reigning over Peter with absolute authority (Cf. also Williams, Acts, p.181).

Schmithals also reluctantly considers the possibility of Peter's superiority over James even when the Apostle Paul was writing Galatians and despite James' being placed before Peter in Gal. 2:9. He says: "... Diese Vorordnung des Jakobus ist ohne Schwierigkeit und ohne zugrunde liegende Degradierung des Petrus nur vorsteller, wenn Petrus normalerweise von Jerusalem abwesend war ...." (His Paulus, s.41). But this argument of Schmithals is not only inconsistent in its logical development but also utterly unfounded in the light of Gal. 2:12. Accordingly, without doubt it is not the status of James at the time of the Apostolic Council but his present status in the Jerusalem Church which is clearly reflected in the Apostle Paul's placing James before Peter in his statement of Gal. 2:9. Here the Apostle Paul refers to the result of the Apostolic Council in his life context defending his apostleship and Gospel against the Judaizers' attack which made an illicit use of the names and authority of the original apostles (Cf. also Conzelmann, History, p.55: "... He names James first, not, however, because he was the one presiding, but because, as the representative of the strict Jewish-Christian tendency, he was the most important partner in the negotiations when the Gentile Christians' freedom from the law was the issue. Indeed, the attempt was made in Galatia also to play off James against Paul. Hence Paul emphasizes that James has recognized that freedom ....").

Nevertheless, at the time of the Apostolic Council when most original apostles were residing at Jerusalem and taking the leadership, Peter, the chief of the original apostles, was no doubt occupying the leading position with the right of the final decision, and James may have been at most the head of the Pharisaic extremists. Therefore, H.-J. Schoeps' argument that James belonged to the more moderate middle group opposed to the extreme Pharisaic one seems to be a little hasty [See his Paul, trans. by H. Knight (London, 1961), p.66].
those Judaizers who caused the serious disturbances at Antioch were by no means the formal delegation of the Jerusalem Church approved by the original apostles but a private campaigning group dispatched by the strict legalists in the Jerusalem Church with the intention of Judaizing all of the Gentile Christians.¹

2. THE MOTIVE FOR HOLDING THE APOSTOLIC COUNCIL

According to Acts 15, the Apostolic Council came to be held by dispatching a delegation from the Antiochian Church to settle the turmoil provoked by the Judaizers from Jerusalem. It is beyond question that not only the congregation of the Antiochian Church (who had no objection to make about admitting the supreme authority of the original apostles in the Jerusalem Church² in interpreting the very nature of Gospel for salvation), but also the Apostle Paul himself, who had been fighting a desperate fight to defend the Gentile freedom against the Judaizers' vicious use of the original apostles' authority for their Judaizing purpose, firmly believed that it was the best way to settle the dispute finally in the presence of the original apostles at Jerusalem.³

² Cf. H.A.W. Meyer, Acts, Vol.II, p.51: "... Jerusalem was the mother church of all Christianity; here the apostles had their abode, who, along with the presbyters of the church, occupied for the Christian theocracy a position similar to that of the Sanhedrim ...."
³ Cf. Baur, History, Vol.I, p.52. But Baur argues that the real originators of the dispute at Antioch were not certain extreme Judaists (cont.)
3 (continued from the previous page) but Peter and other original apostles in the Jerusalem Church (See ibid., pp.52ff.).

In Gal. 2:2a, the Apostle Paul declares that he went up to Jerusalem 'by revelation' ('κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν'). In his Galatian context, the Apostle must have been reckoning with the Judaizers' argument that he had already been summoned by the Jerusalem Church to give an explanation of his gospel preached among the Gentiles (Cf. Haenchen, Ἐπιτρ., Prem. Pt., p.225: "... Wahrscheinlich rechnet Paulus schon mit dem Einwand, er sei damals nicht freiwillig nach Jerusalem gegangen, sondern er sei von Jerusalem vorgeladen worden ... "). Indeed, if the Apostle had conceded that point in the argument of the contemporary Judaizers at Galatia, thus subsequently enabling them to claim the unchallenged supreme authority of the Jerusalem Church, now completely controlled by the Pharisaic Judaizers, for the interpretation of Gospel, those Judaizing campaigners from Jerusalem could surely have enforced their demand upon the Galatian congregation much more effectively.

It is not quite clear whether this revelation can be identified with either the Apostle's mysterious experience mentioned in 2 Cor. 12:2ff. or even the one mentioned in Acts 22:17-21 (Cf. Goguel, Ἐπιττ., s.448: "... Cette révélation a-t-elle quelque rapport avec celle que l'apôtre eut quatorze ans avant d'écrire la seconde épître aux Corinthiens (12, 2s) et au cours de laquelle il fut emporté au troisième ciel et entendit des paroles ineffables? La chronologie ne s'y oppose pas absolument. Y aurait-il d'autre part, une réminiscence de cette révélation dans Actes, 22, 17-21 où il est raconté qu'à son retour à Jérusalem, Paul, en extase dans le Temple, reçut du Seigneur l'order de quitter la ville sainte et d'aller prêcher l'Evangile aux païens? Le récit des Actes suppose que Paul avait prêché l'Evangile à Jérusalem, il appelle pour cela d'expresses réserves; peut-être y trouve-t-on cependant le souvenir plus ou moins confus d'une révélation qui avait joué un certain rôle dans la vie de Paul. Quoi qu'il en soit, la vision d'Antioche paraît avoir eu une grande importance. Quatorze ans après, le souvenir en est encore très présent à la pensée de l'apôtre ... "). Nevertheless, despite Goguel's affirmation, there is no single positive evidence supporting our identification of the revelation in Gal. 2:2a with that in 2 Cor. 12:2ff. Furthermore, the Apostle never explains whether the revelation mentioned in Gal. 2:2a came to him directly and personally or indirectly through some other person(s) (Cf. Acts 12:27ff. and 13:2f. Also cf. E. De W. Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians (Edinburgh, 1971, 1921), p.70; H.N. Ridderbos, The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia, trans. by H. Zylstra, (Grand Rapids, 1972, 1953), p.80: "... It is even possible that the revelation did not come to him personally (cf. Acts 13:2, 4) ... "). It is equally uncertain whether the Apostle would have gone up to Jerusalem even without this revelation (Cf. Martin Luther, A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians based on Lectures delivered by Martin Luther at the University of Wittenberg in the Year 1531 and first published in 1535 (A revised and completed translation based on the 'Middleton' edition of the English version of 1575 prepared by P.S. Watson) (cont.)
Schmithals denies the plain fact that the turmoil provoked by the Judaizers insisting on the absolute importance of circumcision as the indispensable condition for salvation was the direct cause for holding the Apostolic Council.¹ To support his argument he says:

Wäre das der Fall gewesen, so hätte für Paulus eine so alarmierende Notwendigkeit für ein Gespräch vorgelegen, dass 2, 2a ganz unverständlich wäre.

³ (continued from the previous page) (Cambridge and London, 1972⁴, 1953¹), p.92: "... unless Paul had been admonished by revelation, he had not gone up to Jerusalem ....") Munck argues: "... In a consideration of the value of the two descriptions it must be immediately noted that Paul described a meeting at which he himself was present, whereas Luke has built up his account on the basis of oral and written sources. According to Paul, a revelation caused the meeting (Gal. ii.1-2). It was God who had commanded Paul to go to Jerusalem. In Acts, it was caused by the arrival in Antioch of brethren from Judea ...." (His Acts, p.149). But, his observation is perhaps overhasty. In fact, there is no discrepancy between the Lucan account and the Apostle Paul's own statement in Galatians. If, as H.N. Ridderbos suggests, the Apostle Paul had been 'in a state of doubt concerning which direction the way of the Lord pointed' (See his Galatia, p.80), this specific revelation [against Burton's doubt. See his Galatians, p.70] as the divine confirmation of the decision reached by the Antiochian congregation must have convinced him that the matter at issue should be settled in the presence of the original apostles at Jerusalem [Cf. J.B. Lightfoot, The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians [Grand Rapids, 1974, (Cambridge, 1865¹)], p.125: "... Here however there is no contradiction. The historian naturally records the external impulse, which led to the mission: the Apostle himself states his inward motive. 'What I did,' he says, 'I did not owing to circumstances, not as yielding to pressure, not in deference to others, but because the Spirit of God told me it was right' ...."; J.G. Machen, Notes on Galatians, ed. by J.H. Skilton (Philadelphia, 1973), p.94: "... But this external occasion for Paul's going to Jerusalem does not at all exclude a divine revelation given directly to him. He was urged by the church to go; but the question whether he should comply with this request was decided, he says, by direct revelation from God. Here, as elsewhere, his apostolic independence was preserved."].

¹ See his Paulus, ss.30f. and also esp. s.91: "... Die lukanische Darstellung des 'Apostelkonzils' besitzt keinen historischen Wert. Unhistorisch ist schon, dass überhaupt die Beschenkungsforderung gewisser christlicher Kreise den Anlass des Treffens in Jerusalem bildete ...."
He asserts that we should find the real motive for holding the Apostolic Council in the practical situation of the Jerusalem Church and not in the Apostle Paul's own anxious situation nor in the Gentile Christians' painful circumstances in which in their understanding the nature of Gospel they were uncontrollably disturbed by the Judaizers. In his examining the account of the Apostolic Council, he is strongly opposed to admitting any historical reliability of the Lucan statement of Acts 15, following whole-heartedly M. Dibelius' position, and argues that we have to rely on the Apostle

1 *Ibid.*, ss.30-31. But, here Schmithals is disclosing his ignorance of the historical context of the Galatian statements in which the Apostle Paul is standing. Though we shall discuss it later in detail; briefly, his great mistake arises from his unfounded treatment of the materials of the Acts and the Galatians in his reconstructing the historical situation of the early Christianity.

2 See esp. *ibid.*, ss.30, 34., 38 and 40, etc.

3 See *ibid.*, s.34: "... Nun, wir sahen dass schon Gal. 2, 21 nahelegt, den Anlass zu der Reise des Paulus nicht in den Interessen seiner Arbeit, sondern in Problemen der Jerusalemer Gemeinde zu suchen, natürlich in solchen Problemen, die mit der Heidenmission des Paulus zusammenhingen ...." and also s.37: "... der bereits abgewiesenen Hypothese, dass Paulus nach Jerusalem gereist sei, um Schwierigkeiten auszuräumen, die Jerusalemer Abgesandte seiner Heidenmission machten ...."

4 See *ibid.*, s.44: "...Mit allem Gesagten wird die Erkenntnis, dass das Abkommen in Jerusalem im Interesse der Judenchristen lag, keineswegs korrigiert ...."

5 See *ibid.*, s.29. And esp. cf. M. Dibelius, "Das Apostelkonzil" in *TL*, 72 (1947), col.198 or *Aufsätze*, s.90 (as quoted by Schmithals): "... Die Darstellung der Verhandlung bei Lukas ist nur literarisch-theologisch und kann auf geschichtlichen Wert keinen Anspruch machen. Das Endergebnis, das Aposteldekret, stammt nicht von dieser Zusammenkunft ...."
Paul's own account in Galatians 2:1-10 alone, because if we try to place beside it Luke's statement of Acts 15 which has no historical foundation at all, it would cause only confusion in our attempt to understand the Apostolic Council itself.¹

Denying the very historical existence itself of the so-called Apostolic Decree in Acts 15:29² on the ground that the Apostle Paul never mentions it in Galatians 2:1-10,³ Schmithals jumps to the conclusion that, contrary to Luke's account, the Apostolic Council had to be held for the sake of the Jewish Christian communities both at Jerusalem and in Palestine. With the culmination of the Gentile Christian mission by the apostles to the Gentiles and the consequent rapid growth of the Gentile Christian communities enjoying freedom from the Law, they came to worry seriously over the probable severe persecution from official Judaism that would be relentlessly inflicted without delay on the Jewish Christian communities if any obvious sign of preaching freedom from the Law to Jews happened to be observed by the Jews of Judaism. He argues that the Jerusalem Church which had already witnessed so clearly the fate of the 'Ελληνωτατεία, in other words Stephen and his group, could not help giving up preaching freedom from the Law to Jews for the sake of her own existence in the midst of

¹ See Paulus, s.29: "... Grundlegend für die Beurteilung des Verhältnisses von Paulus zu den Jerusalem Judenchristen ist seine Darstellung des sogenannten Apostelkonzils Gal. 2,1-10. Daneben den entsprechenden Bericht des Lukas Apg. 15 heranzuziehen, würde nur verwirren ...."  
³ See Paulus, ss.81-85.
Judaism, but also had to check the Apostle Paul and others from preaching such a gospel even to the Jews in the Diaspora that would likewise provoke the anger of Judaism and jeopardize her. Consequently, Schmithals argues that in these circumstances the Apostolic Council was held and arrived at such a conclusion as the Jerusalem Church had wished, namely that, just as Peter relinquished the mission to the Gentiles in both Palestine and the Diaspora alike, so the Apostle Paul also had to relinquish any kind of mission even

---

1 See *ibid.*, ss.34f. and esp. s.35: "... Wenn eine christliche Mission den Juden die Gesetzesfreiheit predigte, so musste die Gemeinde in Palästina um ihrer Existenz willen mit diesem Christentum brechen und sich als unabhängige Kirche konstituieren ..."

But, J. Weiss had already pointed out such a probability of Jewish Christians' difficult situation in Judea. See his *Das Urchristentum*, nach dem Tode des Verfassers herausgegeben und am Schlusse ergänzt von Rudolf Knopf (Göttingen, 1917), s.198: "... In Judäa sah man diese Dinge mit andern Augen an. Denn in der Stephanus-Verfolgung war es klar geworden, dass die Gemeinde sich innerhalb des Judentums Judäas nur behaupten konnte, wenn sie treu zum Gesetz hielt und in dieser Beziehung keinerlei Anstoss gab. Wenn nun die Brüder drausen im Reich auf die Wege eines laxeren Hellenismus kamen, wenn sie die gesetzlichen Anforderungen erweichten, den Heiden die Tür gar zu weit aufmachten und mit Unbeschnittenen in intimsten brüderlichen Verkehr traten, so setzten sie die ganze messianische Bewegung dem Verdachte der Un treue gegen das Gesetz aus und schädigten ihre Werbekraft unter den Juden ..."

2 See his *Paulus*, ss.38f.
to the Jews in the Diaspora. He bases this argument on his wrong inference from Galatians 2:7-9 as F.C. Baur did formerly.  

3. THE DIVISION OF THE MISSION AREAS ACCORDING TO GALATIANS 2:7-9: ETHNOGRAPHICAL OR GEOGRAPHICAL?

Schmithals argues that both the Apostle Paul and Peter had never broken the agreement about the ethnographical division in their

---

1. See ibid., ss.36-40. Here lies the inconsistency of his logical development. As we have already seen, it is true that Schmithals hardly admits any historical reliability of Luke's accounts in the Acts (Cf. Acts 18:4-6, 19; 22:15; 26:20, etc.). Nevertheless, if we follow Schmithals' logic, the Apostle Paul should have come to Palestine and even to Jerusalem to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles in this region however minor their population was. Yet, we cannot find out any evidence of the Apostle Paul's activity that supports the peculiar hypothesis of Schmithals.


mission after the Apostolic Council\(^1\) and that is why

Dass Paulus später vor seiner Reise nach Spanien noch einmal den gefährlichen Weg nach Jerusalem machte, möchte zu einem wesentlichen Teil in der Absicht begründet sein, die Durchführung des Jerusalemer Abkommens auch für die Mission im westlichen Mittelmeergebiet abzusprechen und zu sichern.\(^2\)

\(^1\) But, Conzelmann, despite his being in full agreement with Schmithals on the ethnographical division of the mission area, firmly refutes Schmithals' argument by retorting as follows: "... when Paul comes into a city where Jews reside — and this is the case in every larger city — must he then refrain from addressing himself to the Jews? He did not do so: 1 Cor. 9:20! And his theology made it impossible for him to do so: Rom. 9-11! But this means that conflicts become almost unavoidable — and they do break out ...." (History, p.86). Earlier, Cullmann also said this ethnographical agreement made at Jerusalem could not be put into practice because ".... wohl sämtliche Gemeinden schon bei der Entstehung gemacht waren ...." (His Petrus, ss.43f.) and this decision taken without sufficient consideration of 'die unvermeidliche gemischte Zusammensetzung der Gemeinden' eventually caused 'die ganze tragische Auseinandersetzung' echoed in all Pauline epistles (See Ibid., s.45).

\(^2\) See his Paulus, ss.43f. He also argues that "... Wenn Petrus und Paulus gemeinsam in Rom waren, ist das kein Zufall! ...." (Ibid., s.44) relying on the early church tradition [Die Notiz des Papias (bei Euseb K.G. III, 39, 15)] and Cullmann's argument [Petrus, s.78ff. (Lit.)] (See Ibid., s.41). Also cf. Conzelmann, History, pp.154f.

But the possibility of Peter's visit to Rome should be considered not in the context of Schmithals' hypothesis but in the historical context of the transition of power structure in the Jerusalem Church which we shall discuss later in detail. It is very convincing that with the incident at Antioch Peter must have come to be decisively disqualified for his leadership in the Jerusalem Church which had been virtually handed over to James already before the incident. Accordingly, considering Peter's exceedingly awkward situation among the Jewish Christians in Palestine produced by losing his credit irrecoverably through the unfortunate incident at Antioch, it is highly probable that Peter, whose authority came to be no longer acknowledged among the Jews in Palestine, was compelled to leave Palestine and go to the Gentiles and Jews in the Diaspora as the Apostle Paul did. Then, even though we do not agree with Schmithals at all, we cannot totally exclude the possibility of Peter's visit to Rome and his martyrdom in that city in the last (cont.)
2 (continued from the previous page) phase of his life. Anyway, according to Schmithals' hypothesis, the situation is unlike that of Peter's visit to Antioch where Lietzmann argues the possibility that Peter's visit was for the purpose of inspecting the quality of the Antiochian congregation and arranging the contributions (Cf. Gal. 2:10) imposed on the Gentile Christians [See History, Vol.1, pp.73f.]. In spite of the demarcation of the mission areas between the Jerusalem leaders and the Apostle Paul, Lietzmann seems to admit Peter's authority as the supreme superintendent over all the churches in and outside Palestine, at least, up to the decisive split arising from the incident at Antioch. Also cf. Weiss, Urchristentum, s.205: "... Man hat diesen Besuch (Peter's visit to Antioch) als eine offizielle Inspektionsreise aufgefasst, und in der Tat scheint die Urgemeinde ein gewisses Aufsichtsrecht über die Gemeinden, wenigstens die von Syrien und Cilicien, für selbstverständlich gehalten zu haben, und auch Paulus hat sich nicht dagegen aufgelehnt ..."]. Schmithals believes that Peter had to visit Antioch for his mission to the Jews at Antioch according to the agreement at the Apostolic Council. It is true that Lietzmann also says it is highly probable that Peter had visited even Rome on his missionary campaign against the Apostle Paul, as he had already done in Corinth, after the incident at Antioch. He indicates the highly probable resentment of Peter at the rebuke he had had to swallow at Antioch as the very motive of his anti-Pauline campaign (See History, Vol.I, p.111). But, unlike Schmithals who argues that the Apostle Paul and the leaders of the Jerusalem Church, in other words the pillars and other original apostles, were always anxious to preserve their unity and actually could preserve it without any remarkable antagonism even up to the Jewish revolt against the Roman Empire in A.D. 66 (See Paulus, ss.85f.), Lietzmann believes that after the Apostolic Council the leaders of the Jerusalem church, Peter and other original apostles, without consulting with the Apostle Paul, revised the original agreement by incorporating it with the Apostolic Decree and reissued it. Consequently, the Apostle Paul could not but regard such behaviour on the part of the Jerusalem leaders as an obvious breach of the former agreement at the Apostolic Council and, from then on he carried out his mission in the face of serious antagonism (See History, Vol.I, pp.108ff.). Thus, Lietzmann never admits any possibility of such a happy unity of the Apostle Paul and the Jerusalem leaders as Schmithals conjectures.
But, in Galatians 2:7-9 the Apostle Paul never reports any ethnographical or geographical agreement made at the Apostolic Council on the division of the mission areas for the future mission.¹

As we know, God had chosen Paul, the Jew from the Diaspora, and entrusted him with the apostleship to preach the Gospel mainly outside of Palestine where the absolute majority of the inhabitants were composed of the Gentiles as He had chosen Peter and made him work from the beginning mainly in Palestine where Jews formed the absolute majority.²

¹ Cf. J.G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion (Grand Rapids, 1973, 1925¹), p.99: "... This division of labor has often been egregiously misinterpreted, especially by the Tübingen School and all those in subsequent years who have not been able to throw off the shackles of Tübingenism. The question has often been asked whether the division was meant geographically or ethnographically ... But the very raising of the whole question is in itself a fundamental error. The division was not meant in an exclusive or negative sense at all ...." Also cf. his Galatians, pp.131f.

² Cf. John Calvin, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians, trans. by T.H.L. Parker (Edinburgh, 1965), pp.31f.: "... this seems to conflict with the command of Christ when He bade the twelve to go into all the world. I reply that that command was not intended for each individual but describes generally the purpose of the office: that salvation must be proclaimed to all nations by the teaching of the Gospel ... as there were other apostles in that district, which was almost completely inhabited by Jews, Paul travelled through Asia, Greece and other distant regions and therefore he was in a special way ordained to be the apostle to the Gentiles. In fact, when the Lord first commanded him to be set apart, he directed him to leave Antioch and Syria and to go away to far countries for the Gentiles. Ordinarily, therefore, his apostolate was to the Gentiles; extraordinarily, to the Jews. But the others took the Jews for themselves, though on the understanding that, when an opportunity occurred, they would extend their ministry to the Gentiles. This last, however, was for them extraordinary, so to say. But if Peter's apostleship pertained peculiarly to the Jews, let the Romanists ask by what right they derive from him their succession to the primacy. If the Pope of Rome claims the primacy because he is Peter's successor, he ought to exercise it over the Jews. Paul is here declared to be the chief apostle of the Gentiles; yet they deny that he was bishop of Rome. Therefore, if the Pope would enter into the possession of his primacy, let him assemble Churches from the Jews ...."
What the Apostle Paul is in fact saying in Galatians 2:7-9 is 'simply a general recognition of the dispensation of God which had so far prevailed'\(^1\) not any kind of a new agreement or a reconfirmed provision that will regulate artificially the division of future church mission ethnographically or geographically.\(^2\)

Therefore, notwithstanding his wrong suggestion that the demarcation of the two spheres of activity was the main subject of agreement at the Apostolic Council, Bruce is correct in his understanding that the demarcation was mainly geographical.\(^3\) Accordingly, such

---

\(^1\) Machen, Origin, p.99.

\(^2\) Cf. Luther, Galatians, p.109. Also cf. Weiss, Urchristentum, s.201: "... Darum ist es auch verkehrt, hierin eine versteckte Einschränkung zu sehen, dass nur ja nicht Paulus an Juden oder Petrus an Heiden das Evangelium predigte, oder dass sie das Gebiet des Weltreichs geographisch unter einander aufgeteilt hätten. Nichts davon ist angedeutet, nur das positive erfreuliche Ergebnis der Arbeitsgemeinschaft und der gegenseitigen Anerkennung ...." and Bornkamm, Paulus, s.60.

\(^3\) See his History, p.255. Burton also favours the geographical demarcation from a grammatical point of view. Noticing that the accusatives ('τὰ ἑθνὰ' and 'τῆν περιτμῆν'). See v.9b) are used after 'εἰς' (thus with personal designations, meaning 'among', i.e., 'to and among'. See his Galatians, p.97), Burton, who assumes 'ἐλθὼν' or 'ἐναποστελθέν' (or 'κηρύσσειν') is omitted before 'εἰς τὰ ἑθνά' and 'εἰς τὴν περιτμῆν' [H. Lietzmann, however, believes 'ἀπόστελη' is missing again before 'εἰς τὴν περιτμῆν' in the light of v.8. See his An die Galater (Tübingen, 1923), s.13. Nevertheless, in v.8 the sentence structure is different. First of all, it is not an accusative ('τῆν περιτμῆν') but a genitive ('τῆς περιτμῆν') that follows 'εἰς ἀπόστελην'. Secondly, 'εἰς τὰ ἑθνά' may be considered a shortened form of 'εἰς ἀπόστελην τῶν ἑθνῶν' as Lietzmann suggests (See idem. Also cf. Burton, Galatians, p.94: "... εἰς τὰ ἑθνά is manifestly a condensed expression equivalent to εἰς ἀπόστελην τῶν ἑθνῶν, or the like, used for brevity's sake or through negligence ....''), however, even in this verse 'ἀπόστελη' can only be inserted very oddly between 'ἐναποστελθέν καὶ ἔκατ τε' and 'τὰ ἑθνά' (not 'τεῖς ἑθνεστιν') in clear disharmony with the preceding 'εἰς ἀπόστελην τῆς περιτμῆς'. Above all, the grammatical (cont.)
3 (continued from the previous page) structure of v.9 itself does not allow any place for 'ἀποσταλῆ'. Therefore, Lietzmann's argument is not convincing], declares "... The use of the phrase εἰς τὰ ἔθνη rather than τῶν οἰκίας ἐθνεῶν [or πρὸς τῶν ἔθνων] thus indicating 'personal approach or address' to the Gentiles [See idem], therefore favours the conclusion that the division, though on a basis of preponderant nationality, was nevertheless territorial rather than racial ...." (Ibid., p.98).

Haenchen's argument is much more radical than others. According to him, the Apostle Paul's formula in Gal. 2:9: "... μὴ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοῖς δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτέχνην" is not 'der offizielle Wortlaut der Übereinkunft von Jerusalem' but the one coined by the Apostle himself from his point of view governing the whole section of Gal. 2:1-20, namely, making him (and Barnabas) of the same rank with the 'pillars' (See his Apg., s.451). He bases this argument upon the foundation that, not to mention the ethnographical interpretation (See idem: "... Sie [the ethnological solution] hätte es Paulus verboten, in den Synagogen anzuknüpfen, und ihm damit den Zugang zu den am besten vorbereiteten Heiden, den ἔθνεσιν, genommen. Andererseits, hätte sie diese Heiden auch nicht für die jerusalemsche Mission freigegeben, da sie ja Heiden waren! ...."), even the geographical one is unacceptable because "... Dann hätte Jerusalem für sich Palästina beansprucht. Wenn man sich von 1 Petr 5:13 inspirieren liessen, konnte man dazu noch Babylonien mit seiner zahlreichen Judenschaft schlagen, und die Adresse des 1 Petr würde noch Pontus, Galatien, Kappadozien, Asia und Bithynien hinzuflügen. Freilich käme man dann auch nicht darum herum, nun auch noch ganz Syrien mit Antiochia als judenchristliches Missionsgebiet anzusehen. Damit würde aber zugleich sichtbar werden, wie törtich eine solche geographische Interpretation wäre, welche die antiochenische Heidenkirche mit ihrem Missionsgebiet und den ganzen Bereich der paulinschen Mission in Kleinasien dem Barnabas und Paulus verschlossen hätte. Dabei wäre noch gar nicht einmal die andere Schwierigkeit mit bedacht, dass die Jerusalemer doch nicht die ganze jüdische Diaspora im Westen der heidenchristlichen Mission ausgeliefert hätten ...." (Ibid., s.450). But, unfortunately, Haenchen's fatal mistake in making such an energetic but false argument is due to his wrong inference from "... ἐκείνης τῆς παρεπιθέμενης διαπερατοῦ Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας καὶ Βιβενίας" (1 Pet. 1:1) that this epistle was addressed to the Jewish Christians scattered in those provinces. As F.J.A. Hort rightly points out, this inference is not supported by the contents of 1 Peter generally, nor is it an intrinsically probable interpretation [See his The First Epistle of St. Peter I.1 - II.17 (London, 1898), p.16. Cf. esp. 1 Pet. 1:17 and 2:11. Also cf. C. Bigg, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude (Edinburgh, 1975, 1901), pp.90f.; J.N.D. Kelly, The Epistles of Peter and of Jude (London, 1969), pp.40f.]. Peter's association with the Christians in those particular provinces [The exegetical difficulties deriving from the seemingly peculiar order of the listed names of these provinces are no longer unsolvable if we are not entirely unjustified in assuming that this order reflects Silvanus' (Cf. 5:12) expected itinerary (Cf. Hort, J Peter, p.17) beginning with his landing at Sinope in Pontus (Also cf. idem: (cont.)
a possibility as Bruce and Conzelmann conjecture, that there might have been sufficient ambiguity in the terms of their agreement on their separation of responsibilities to have caused misunderstanding and led to serious conflicts later,¹ is merely a hypothetical product based on their unfounded inference from Galatians 2:7-9 that the division of the mission areas was one of the main agreements at the Apostolic Council. This is without doubt alien to the Apostle Paul's

³ (continued from the previous page) "... Provincial Pontus, that is, the seaboard of the district best known as Paphlagonia, contained several ports at which Silvanus might naturally enter Asia Minor, the most important being Sinope, which was a Roman colony ... it needs no further explanation than the active commerce between the harbours of Pontus and the West if the starting-point was Rome. A few years earlier Aquila, originally a Jew of Pontus, is found apparently settled at Rome, and holding an important position among the Roman Christians; between whom and the Christians of Pontus communications were thus likely to arise. Unknown circumstances due to such intercourse may well have made Pontus, rather than Provincial Asia, the primary destination of Silvanus's journey ....") after his voyage from Babylon (Cf. 5:13), i.e. Rome (not Babylon in the literal sense as Haenchen interprets, or as Hort also admits the possibility of such an interpretation. See his 1 Peter, p.17) [Also cf. Bigg, Peter and Jude, pp.75ff.; Kelly, Peter and Jude, pp.33f.] should be understood not in terms of any division of the mission areas but in the light of the change of the power structure in the Jerusalem Church and Peter's subsequent departure from Palestine at some time after the incident at Antioch.

¹ See Bruce, History, p.255 and Conzelmann, History, p.87. In fact, this unlikely hypothesis had been established much earlier by Holtzmann. See his Apg., s.103: "... Die Judenchristen, welche die Scheidung Gal. 2, ethnographisch verstanden hatten, konnten dem PIs, dieser, welcher den geographischen Maassstab anlegte, jenen vorwerfen, den Bruch verschuldet zu haben. Demgemäss hatte PIs in gemischten Gemeinden, wie in den galatischen und zuvor in Antiochia, die Judenchristen vom Gesetz losgesprochen und zur Uebung heidenchristl. Gesetzesfreiheit veranlasst, während andererseits die jerusalemschen Emissäre den Heidenapostel auch auf seinem ausschliesslich eigenthümlichen Arbeitsfeld, in den heidenchristl. Gemeinden Galatiens und bald auch Vorderasiens und Achaiaes, zu bekämpfen anfingen ...." Before pointing out his ignorance of the transition of leadership in the Jerusalem Church, we cannot but seriously question his mental structure itself which could develop such an argument that the Apostle Paul and the original apostles had not only launched their eschatological mission so irresponsibly but also tried to settle their dispute by appealing to those kinds of childish tactics.
life context in which he had to fight a desperate fight against the Judaizers of the Jerusalem Church whose ultimate and consistent aim was from the beginning to Judaize thoroughly the whole of Christianity not for the sake of their survival in the face of the official Judaism as Schmithals conjectures but because of their morbid consciousness of the Jewish nation's physical privilege of birth as the divinely Chosen One.\footnote{Also cf. Weiss, \textit{Urchristentum}, s.198: "... Es Handelt sich nicht um die Übernahme einer einzelnen Gesetzespflicht sondern darum, da die Heiden erst Juden werden müssen, um Christen sein zu können. Dies alles war in seiner Weise konsequent gedacht, und wir sind nicht berechtigt, diese Nationalisten auf Herrschsucht oder Mangel an Menschenliebe zu verklagen. Sie mussten so denken, wenn sie echte Juden waren, und sie konnten so denken, obwohl sie Jünger Jesu waren. Denn aus der Messianität Jesu folgte streng genommen dies alles. Und sie kannten sein Wort, dass er nur zu den verlornen Schafen vom Hause Israel gesandt sei (Mtth. 15,24). Sie glaubten zu wissen, dass er sich für den Bestand jedes Tittelchens am Gesetz verbürgt hatte (Mtth. 5,18) ...."}

\footnote{Cf. Schmithals, \textit{Paulus}, s.38: "... Dass aber der Christ, der noch die Beschneidung predigt, erfahrungsgemäss vor Verfolgung sicher war, bezeugt Paulus ausdrücklich Gal. 5, 11 und 6, 12 ...." But in Gal. 5:11 the Apostle Paul indicates that preaching circumcision means nothing but the denial of the grace of God revealed in Jesus Christ, as it were, preaching that man can be saved by being circumcised, i.e. by observing the Law. Consequently, renouncing the Cross of Jesus Christ is the inevitable prerequisite for this "another gospel" (Cf. Gal. 1:8) preaching circumcision. Here, the Apostle Paul is firmly opposed to any possibility of attempting to proclaim the Cross of Jesus Christ along with the circumcision as the indispensable condition for man's salvation. Man has to choose the Cross of Jesus Christ or the circumcision, i.e. the Law, for his salvation. He has to select one alternative because no room for compromise exists. And even in Gal. 6:12 the Apostle Paul is only (cont.)
were also by no means so servile as to beg the mercy of Judaism for their temporal existence in the world that would soon pass away, as Schmithals conjectures, unless they had been ready to abandon all their hope of the imminent Advent of Jesus Christ.


Schmithals argues concerning the Apostolic Decree in Acts 15 that the Decree itself did not originate in the Apostolic Council as Luke describes, because not only the Apostle Paul's own account in Galatians 2:6 and the discussion in 1 Corinthians 8-9 but also the statement of Acts 21:25 itself disprove plainly the statement of Acts 15:19ff.1 Mentioning the well-known historical fact that the Christians in the second century had strictly observed those requirements that we can find in the Apostolic Decree of the Acts, he says the Christians by no means did so for the satisfactory relationship

2 (continued from the previous page) pointing out the foolish attitude of the false apostles who try in vain to find out the common grounds between circumcision and the Cross, i.e. the worldly glory and the Heavenly truth. Nevertheless, he never says that they could avoid persecution by preaching circumcision together with the Cross of Jesus Christ. For, unlike Schmithals and, if his conjectures were right, the Jewish Christians in Palestine, neither the Apostle Paul nor contemporary Judaism had the least idea of such coexistence even for a moment. Therefore, Schmithals' indication is completely missing the heart of the question presented in the Galatian context.

1 See ibid., ss.82f.
between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians\(^1\) but in their

"... der Kampf gegen die Gnosis hier, die Abwehr heidnischer Vorwürfe


It is needless to say that Haenchen never considers the Lucan narration of the Apostolic Decree historically reliable in any sense (See *ibid.*, ss.452ff. and esp. his *Kompositionsanalyse*, ss.157-164). If, as Haenchen argues, these four conditions as 'eine lebendige Tradition, die man wahrscheinlich schon damals auf die Apostel zurückgeführt hat' (See *Apg.*, s.454) did not originate from the Apostolic Council, do we then have to trace their origin back to, as Holtzmann suggests, 'eine ursprünglich von den sog. *σεβομένοι* ausgebildete Lebensordnung' which was gradually accepted also by the Gentile Christians who had been indeed frequently situated in such a relationship to Judaism (See his *Apg.*, s.98)? But, even this alternative hypothesis can hardly be tenable under the circumstances that it can never be proved, as Holtzmann frankly acknowledges, that "... es sich bei der Passung des Decrets nur um Bestätigung einer bereits bestehenden Praxis gehandelt habe ...." (*Idem*). In fact, Holtzmann is quite convincing when he starts analysing as follows: "... Von der einen Seite wird nun behauptet, solche Bestimmungen hätten nur erdacht und geübt werden können, wo eine Bevölkerung von vorwiegend jüd. Herkunft, eine Oertlichkeit mit jüd. Traditionen, also etwa Verhältnisse, wie sie am Sitze der Urkirche vorlagen, statt hatten; sie hätten dagegen in dem Maasse, als das Heidenchristentum Überwog, nicht mehr genützt; unmöglich habe letzteres trotz seiner Machtstellung sich auf die Stufe der δ' ἰη συμβουλεύειν überabdrücken, nach Maassgabe der mosaischen Fremdengesetzgebung behandeln lassen können. Um so mehr seien wir damit in die früheste Zeit der Kirche gewiesen ...." (*Idem*). What does really then make it impossible for him to push this positive conclusion forward in (cont.)
Then he concludes:

Wie es sich im einzelnen damit auch verhalten mag, so oder so kommt dem 'Dekret' keine gewichtige Bedeutung für die Frage nach dem Verhältnis zwischen Judenchristen und Heidenchristen zu; denn nach allem Gesagten ist es nicht nur zweifelhaft, ob es im Urchristentum entstanden ist, sondern auch, ob es dort jemals überhaupt in Geltung gestanden hat.

Conzelmann also, denying any historical reliability of Luke's account of the Apostolic Decree in Acts 15 on the assumption that both the statement of Galatians 2:6 and the incident at Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14) support the argument for their origin from the Apostolic Council as described by Luke? It is, according to him, none other than the incident at Antioch (See idem: "... dass ein derartiges Entgegenkommen der judenchristl. Muttermuttergemeinde auf einem so frühen Punkte der Entwicklung durch Gal. 212, wonach die Möglichkeit einer Speisegemeinschaft zwischen beiden Theilen erst in Antiochia zur Debatte gelangt, ausgeschlossen erscheint ....") and, as we have already seen briefly, this misjudged analysis is no doubt the inevitable consequence of his failure in understanding the transition of leadership in the Jerusalem Church. It is not, therefore, strange at all that, despite their rejection of the Lucan account, none of these critics can present any convincing substitute for it.

1 (continued from the previous page) support of the argument for their origin from the Apostolic Council as described by Luke? It is, according to him, none other than the incident at Antioch (See idem: "... dass ein derartiges Entgegenkommen der judenchristl. Muttermuttergemeinde auf einem so frühen Punkte der Entwicklung durch Gal. 212, wonach die Möglichkeit einer Speisegemeinschaft zwischen beiden Theilen erst in Antiochia zur Debatte gelangt, ausgeschlossen erscheint ....") and, as we have already seen briefly, this misjudged analysis is no doubt the inevitable consequence of his failure in understanding the transition of leadership in the Jerusalem Church. It is not, therefore, strange at all that, despite their rejection of the Lucan account, none of these critics can present any convincing substitute for it.

1 Cf. The testimony of the martyr BİGAΔ in Eusebius, History, V, i.26: "... 'τὸ ἐν πάντες φασεὶν αἱ συνεδρίες, εἰς πρὸς ἐκεῖνον, ζῆν εἰς, εἰς φασεῖν ζῆν;' ...." For other references, cf. Haenchen, Apg., s.455 and Hanson, Acts, p.155.

2 His Paulus, s.83.

3 Ibid., s.85.

4 See his Apg., s.93: "... Dass das Dekret auf dem Apostelkonzil beschlossen wurde, ist durch Gal. 2:6 ausgeschlossen. Es geht ja auch gar nicht auf den Hauptstreitpunkt, die Beschneidung, ein ...." Also cf. his History, pp.88f.

5 See Apg., s.93 and History, pp.89f.
strongly exclude all possibility of the argument which attributes the Decree to the Apostolic Council, declares that

The decree has a later history. It prevailed, to a large extent. In a later time, when the church consisted predominantly of Gentile Christians and the battle over the law had ceased to resound, people no longer understood it as a cultic regulation but as a moral commandment, namely as a prohibition of idol worship, bloodshed, and fornication. Therein the distinction between mortal sins and lesser sins is portrayed. On the positive side the prohibitions were expanded with the "Golden Rule". The decree was incorporated into some manuscripts of the New Testament in this new version.¹

But this puzzling exegetical problem due to the contradiction between the Acts and the Apostle Paul's epistle, which Schmithals and others are constantly attempting to point out, had already been clearly indicated by Johannes Weiss.² Despite the minor discrepancies in their conjecturing that the concrete historical context in which this Decree might have been incorporated into the original work of Luke was in answer to a practical need for the existence of the Gentile Church at a later time, they are unanimous in arguing that, judging from Luke's own contradictory statement in Acts 21:25 and the Apostle Paul's accounts in the Epistle to the Galatians (2:6, 2:11-14), the Apostolic Decree was never issued at the Apostolic Council.

¹ History, p.90
² See his Urchristentum, ss.194f., 206.
On the contrary, Bruce, in his effort to solve the exegetical
problem of Acts 21:25, not only advocates strongly the historical
reliability of the Lucan account of Acts 15 but also refutes the
argument that "this was really the first time that Paul was told of
the terms of the apostolic decree"¹ saying that

The repetition of these terms is perfectly
natural in the present context. The leaders
of the Jerusalem church wish to assure him that
their misgivings concern his teaching given to
Jewish converts only. We are glad to know, they
say in fact, that you do not teach Jewish believ¬
ers to abandon the law, and we should like you to
make this quite clear to the Jewish believers
here. As for the Gentile believers, of course,
we have already agreed that nothing is to be im¬
posed on them apart from the abstentions detailed
in the apostolic letter.²

Moreover, in regard to this exegetical deadlock caused by Luke's
statement in Acts 21:25, we can also say that the following remark

des Kyriostitels, ss.158f.: "... er [der Verfasser der Apostel¬
geschichte] 21, 25 Wohll nach einer ursprünglicheren, von ihm selbst
verwischten Tradition erzählt, dass die Leute in Jerusalem dem
Paulus das Aposteldekret mittheilen, als wäre es für ihn etwas Neues,
und als habe er es gar nicht mit beschlossen. Es scheint in der
Tat sich in Apg 15 um ein Ereignis zu handeln, bei dem weder Paulus
noch Barnabas dabei gewesen sind ...." and Lietzmann, History,
Vol.1, pp.109f.

² Bruce, The Book of the Acts, p.431. Also cf. Williams, Acts,
pp.240f. Nevertheless, Williams considers the other probability,
as Loisy had formerly argued (See his Acts, pp.799f.) and later
followed by Haenchen (See his Apg., s.454), that here, in fact, Luke
the author is speaking, through the mouth of James, only to his
readers [See his Acts, pp.240f. : "... Probably ... (or Luke was
reminding his readers) of them ...."] as well. Is he, then, still
conceding the legitimacy of such an argument of Hanson: "... It
seems distinctly odd that the Jerusalem Christians should have had
to remind Paul of this decree, if he himself, as Ch. 15 relates, had
been present when it was composed and had later circulated it (16"
....") (His Acts, p.211)?
of Machen calls in question the charge of a lack of logical consistency on the part of Luke which lies at the very core of other scholars' arguments:

it is a grave question whether the author of Acts was unskillful enough to allow contradictory representations to stand unassimilated in his book, as the hypothesis demands.¹

Therefore, unless we can definitely prove that Luke was plainly lacking even in a rudimentary knowledge of logical reasoning or that James in the context of Acts 21:20-25 could not say so on any account, it is much more reasonable to admit the historical reliability of Luke's account that the Apostolic Decree originated in the Apostolic Council than to deny it impetuously on the basis of superficial reasoning in the sphere of formal logic and to wander about in the dark of unfounded hypotheses rashly destroying the whole structure of the Acts.

¹ His Origin, p.91. Also cf. Schmithals, Paulus, s.83: "Dass Lukas das 'Aposteldekret' dem Paulus zweimal zum ersten Male mitgeteilte sein lässt, ist selbst einem so grosszügigen Schriftsteller, wie Lukas war, nicht zuzutrauen ...." But, can we imagine Luke having been totally inconsiderate of such a logical conclusion confidently reached by Schmithals: "... Wir erfahren also von Lukas in Wahrheit überhaupt nicht, wo das Dekret entstanden ist, da es auf dem Apostel-konzil jedenfalls nicht entstanden sein kann ...." (Idem)? Even the curious hypothesis of Weiss regarding this verse as 'ein stehengebliebener Rest der Quelle, den der Herausgeber eigentlich hätte tilgen sollen' (See his Urchristentum, s.195, n.1) is nothing but an arbitrary solution and is obviously incompatible with his own previous criticism of others (See idem: "... Die neuerdings ohne jede Begründung vorgetragene Hypothese, 21, 25 sei eine Glosse, ist eine allzu bequeme Beseitigung des Widerspruchs in der Apostelgeschichte. Jedenfalls kann sie nicht von dem Herausgeber der Apostelgeschichte herstammen, der sich schwerlich selbst so in Widerspruch mit seiner eigenen Darstellung gesetzt haben würde. Wie aber sollte ein Glossator auf diese mindestens überflüssige Notiz gekommen sein, die dem Leser von Kap. 15 doch sehr auffallen musste ....").
Besides, does the Apostle Paul's account in Galatians 2:6 really disprove that the Apostolic Decree was issued at the Apostolic Council as Schmithals¹ and others² argue? In Galatians 2:6, it is clear that the Apostle Paul had not the slightest intention to disparage Peter and other original apostles out of the antagonistic feeling which we infer from the argument of Baur and Lietzmann.³ But, in the presence of the Judaizers who were detestably playing off the authority of the original apostles against him he is merely wishing to stress clearly the mutual agreement between himself and the original apostles at the Apostolic Council.⁴ Thus, when Machen says:

---

¹ See Schmithals, Paulus, s.82: "... Dass es [the Decree] auf dem 'Apostelkonzil' beschlossen wurde, scheitert rundweg an Gal. 2, 6 ...."

² In fact, those critics including Conzelmann recently have managed to jump on none other than another clamorous bandwagon of the ever-destructive Tübingen Schule, this time, driven by C. Weizsäcker (See his Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche [Freiburg i. B., 1902³, 1886¹], ss.178ff. and esp. 186ff.). Though Haenchen diagnoses Weizsäcker's conjecture as suffering from 'ein methodischer Fehler, den auch die meisten Anhänger Weizsäckers nicht vermieden haben' (See his Apg., s.452), we have to admit that this distinguished successor to F.C. Baur's chair at Tübingen (1861) had brought forward an argument far better founded than any of those illogical ones made later by his confused supporters, not to mention that of Haenchen himself (See ibid., ss.452ff. and esp. his Kompositionsanalyse, ss.160ff.). Nevertheless, does the Apostle Paul's statement in Gal. 2 (esp. vv.6 and 11-14), together with the silence of Luke on the incident at Antioch, really have to lead to the conclusion that the Decree was prepared only after Peter's great embarrassment at Antioch as a belated measure for the table-fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians? Apart from his obvious failure in understanding both the change of power structure in the Jerusalem Church and Luke's aim in the Acts, Weizsäcker also misinterpreted the Apostle's words in Gal. 2:6. Cf. Weiss, Urchristentum, s.194: "... So ist dieser Bericht des Paulus, weil ein höchst persönliches, allzu-persönliches Dokument, zwar an sich eine Quelle ersten Ranges, für uns aber sehr schwer, nur mit äußerster Vorsicht und nicht ohne die Gefahr des Irrtums benutzbare ...."


⁴ Cf. Ridderbos, Galatia, p.86; Calvin, Gal., Eph., Phil. and Col., pp.28ff. and esp. p.30: "... he is not here treating of the nature of apostles or what must be thought of them apart from this controversy; but he tears off the masks that the false apostles wore ...." Also cf. 1 Cor. 15:9: "Επε γὰρ εἰμὶ καὶ ἐκλαίγως τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐκ ἐκείνων καλεθεὶς ἀπόστολος, διότι ἐδίδω μιᾷ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ."
The question, therefore, in connection with the Apostolic Decree is not whether the Decree was or was not something important that the Jerusalem leaders imparted to Paul, but only whether it constituted an addition to his gospel, then it is excluded by Paul's words in Galatians, and is unhistorical.¹

he is exactly hitting the blind spot of Schmithals and Conzelmann's hypothesis. In Galatians 2:6 the Apostle Paul simply says that when the original apostles came to listen to the very Gospel that he had been preaching among the Gentiles until then, they could not add anything new to what the Apostle had already received directly from the Risen Lord because it was so perfect in itself, so they immediately embraced his Gospel humbly perceiving the will of God revealed in this new apostle for the Gentiles. Accordingly, "... ἐκόλοου ... ἀνατεναίω..." (Gal. 2:6b) should be understood in this light. The Apostle Paul never regarded the Apostolic Decree as something that could constitute an addition to his Gospel but merely as an attempt to solve the practical problems of the churches in which Jews and Gentiles were mixed together.

By placing restrictions on such heathen abominations closely connected with the well known practices in the contemporary pagan cult which used to wound Jewish sentiment so deeply, the apostles wished to settle the troublesome question that used to destroy the amicable unity of Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians particularly in the mixed

¹ His *Origin*, pp.95f.
congregations. It is also highly probable that this decision which was made mainly for Jewish Christians at the Apostolic Council had contributed not a little to the winning of the non-Christian Jews and pious Gentiles in the pagan world. And this aim of the Apostolic Decree is in full accord with the Apostle Paul's admonitions to the Gentile Christians of the churches in which the Jewish Christians were only in the minority.

As we have seen so far, it is also improper to attempt to infer from Galatians 2:6, not to mention Acts 21:25, any decisive ground for denying the origin of the Apostolic Decree from the Apostolic Council.

1 Cf. Holtzmann, *Apg.*, ss.99: "... Nach gewissen Vorschriften des Gesetzes müssen sich die mit Judenchristen zusammenlebenden Heidenchristen richten, sonst wird der Anstoss für jene zu gross ...." Here he is referring to A. Ritschl [*Die Entstehung der alikatholischen Kirche* (Bonn, 1857², 1850¹), s.192], and also to B. Weiss, and H.H. Wendt.

2 Cf. 1 Cor. 8:9-13, 9:19-23; Rom. 14. Therefore, when Munck, in his desperate attempt to break the exegetical deadlock of Acts 21:25, argues: "... This announcement of the Apostolic Decree, however, serves a very definite purpose in this context. It serves to demonstrate that the leaders in Jerusalem had also gone to great lengths to meet the wishes of the mission to the Gentiles, and that they by no means saw eye to eye with the non-Christian Jews. We are, moreover, likely to learn the historical truth about the Apostolic Decree from this context and not from Chapter xv: it is a Jewish Christian attempt at maintaining the common meals in the predominantly Jewish Christian congregations in that part of the world — an undertaking entrusted to Peter and having nothing to do with Paul ...." (His *Acts*, p.210), it is quite clear that this Danish Lutheran scholar is completely distorting the earliest part of Church history.

Can we still, however, deduce from the incident at Antioch that, as J. Weiss argues: "... dieser Vorfall ist auch der schlagende Beweis, dass damals noch nicht das Aposteldekret beschlossen sein und für Antiochia Geltung gehabt haben kann ..."? To answer this question, we need to understand the exact context of this unhappy dispute at Antioch.

5. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE INCIDENT AT ANTIOCH

Who were ῥίβας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου (Gal. 2:12)? Machen says:

It is not said that these men were commissioned by James, and some readers have thought that "from James" means merely "from Jerusalem", James being named merely as representative of the church over which he presided. But even if the newcomers stood in some closer relationship to James, or even had been sent by him, it is an unwarranted assumption that James was responsible for the trouble that they caused, or had sent them to Antioch with the purpose of limiting the freedom of Peter's conduct. They may have abused whatever commission they had received.²

When we also consider Lightfoot's suggestion: "... It is not improbable, however, that they came invested with some powers from James which they abused ...."³ with Machen's argument, it is undeniable that both of them

---

¹ His Urchristentum, s.206.
² His Origin, p.101.
are admitting that it is highly probable that they had abused the commission which they received from James. But, we cannot find any single positive evidence in Galatians 2:11-14 that these Jewish Christians from the Jerusalem Church had abused the commission given by James even though they had been invested with some powers and sent to Antioch on a special mission. Was the origin of the incident at Antioch Peter's participation in a meal with the Gentile Christians at which the Jewish food requirements were not observed?

Identifying Judas and Silas\(^1\) with the representatives of James, Lietzmann who believes that the Apostolic Decree providing the definite regulations for the table-fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians in the mixed society was drawn up at Jerusalem soon after the departure of the Apostle Paul and Barnabas\(^2\) contends that those representatives of James "required the Gentile Christians to observe the Jewish food requirements before table fellowship would be permitted. Peter and Barnabas recognized this requirement as justified".\(^3\) Weiss also points out the practical problem of the mixed churches when he says "... für die Judenchristen sei die Teilnahme an einer Mahlzeit, bei der auch verbotene Speisen auf den Tisch kommen konnten, verunreinigend ...."\(^4\) Unlike Lietzmann, he says "... ob sie dadurch [Peter's table-fellowship with the Gentile Christians] überrascht waren, oder ob sie gerade dieser Sache wegen nach

---

\(^1\) Cf. Acts 15:27, 32f.


\(^3\) Idem.

\(^4\) Urochristentum, s.205.
Antiochia gegangen sind, ist nicht zu erkennen ...."¹ But both of them seem to believe the men from James were mainly (rather 'solely') concerned about the Gentile Christians' observing the Jewish food requirements which makes their table-fellowship with Jewish Christians available. Nevertheless, such a conclusion can be justified only on the assumption that the Apostolic Decree had never been issued at the Apostolic Council and consequently, the Gentile Christians at Antioch did not observe the instructions of the Decree at all.

But, as we have seen through our examining the exegetical problem of Acts 21:25 and Galatians 2:6 which many scholars have used so far as the most decisive textual proofs that can disprove the historical reliability of Acts 15, there is not any positive evidence that can deny the origin of the Apostolic Decree from the Apostolic Council. Therefore, they cannot produce anything more by way of decisive proof than that already suggested by Weiss, namely Galatians 2:11-14.

Accordingly, in our discussing the exegetical problem of Galatians 2:11-14, so long as we cannot offer any positive evidence to deny directly Luke's account in Acts 15, it is not so improper to begin to examine the context on the assumption that the Apostolic Decree had been issued at the Apostolic Council. Anyway, in Galatians 2:12 there is not even a vague hint which suggests that the Gentile Christians were infringing the terms in the Apostolic Decree

¹ Idem.
in their meal. And it is quite clear that both Peter and others
were not expecting the visit of those from James at all. Their
visit was a complete surprise. As we know, no sooner had Peter seen
those from James than he drew back and separated himself from the
Gentile Christians. ¹ Therefore, it is utterly unfounded to infer
any hypothesis arguing the possibility of the Gentile Christians.

¹ In regard to 'ὑπέστηλεν', Burton argues: "... The imperfect tense
is very expressive, indicating that Peter took this step not at
once, immediately on the arrival of the men from James, but gradually,
under the pressure, as the text phrase implies, of their criticism.
The force of the tense can hardly be otherwise expressed than by the
word "gradually" ...." (His Galatians, p.107) [thus also Lightfoot
(See his Galatians, p.112: "... 'gradually withdrew' ... the words
['ὑπέστηλεν καὶ ἀφίγητον'] describe forcibly the cautious withdrawal
of a timid person who shrinks from observation ....."), Machen (See
his Galatians, p.135: "... The tense of the verbs may indicate that
the process of withdrawal was a gradual one; possibly Peter at first
merely made his table companionship with the Gentiles less frequent
than it had been before; possibly we are meant to understand that
he entered upon a policy of withdrawal rather than that there was any
sudden or definite break ....")], and Ridderbos (See his Galatia,
p.96: "... The first word [ὑπέστηλεν] suggests an unobtrusive
retreat ....")]. Nevertheless, his grammatical analysis on this
occasion reveals, though we never doubt his competence in handling
the New Testament Greek, the narrowness of his understanding of the
imperfect tense which was without doubt prompted by his ignorance
of the recent change of power structure in the Jerusalem Church.
Here, the imperfect tense of 'ὑπέστηλεν' should not be understood
as the one denoting 'a past action being in progress' (Cf. Bl.-Debr.
§.527) but as the case which can be substituted by the Aorist tense
[ Cf. also J.H. Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol.III:
Syntax by N. Turner (Edinburgh, 1963), p.64: "... The contrast
between the indicatives of the imperfect and aorist illustrates the
difference between linear and punctiliar Aktionsart in its most acute
form ... Although it is usual to distinguish various kinds of im-
perfect, and for convenience we preserve these divisions, the
classification is not inelastic and the chief determining factor for translators will be the context itself ...." and p.67: "... Habit
rather than logical principle appears to govern the choice of impf.
or aor. with verbs of speaking ....'"]. Even so, the phrase
'ὑπέστηλεν καὶ ἀφίγητον' is unquestionably implying all the wretched
perplexity (which we can vividly imagine) of Peter in this very
moment of his being caught by those from James.
violation of the Jewish food laws from the simple statement of Galatians 2:12. Peter had drawn back and separated himself from the Gentile Christians simply because he had been afraid of the men from James.

Then, why? In Galatians 2:12 the Apostle Paul calls those from James 'τοις ἐκ περιτομῆς'. Schmithals argues that 'τοις ἐκ περιτομῆς' indicates the Jews of Judaism not Jewish Christians.¹ He emphasizes this because he believes that Peter was by no means afraid of the party of James but was afraid of the highly probable persecution of the non-Christian Jews that may be inflicted upon the churches of Judea by his behaviour at Antioch.² But, as we have already said,³ this conjecture of Schmithals is a quite distorted description of Judaism. Throughout the four Gospels and Acts we can never find such a flexible and generous aspect of Judaism as Schmithals imagines.

Furthermore, 'τοις ἐκ περιτομῆς' in Galatians 2:12 is indicating without doubt the Jewish Christian extremists in the Jerusalem Church belonging to 'τινες τῶν ἐκ τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν Ἰουδαίων πεπιστευκτές', these are the equivalent of the 'Christian Pharisees' mentioned in Acts 15:5. These Judaizers of the Jerusalem Church always insisted on the necessity of Gentiles' being circumcised as the indispensable

¹ See his Paulus, ss.54f.
² See ibid., ss.55f.
³ See Present Thesis, pp.121f.
condition for salvation and the obligation to keep the Mosaic law. According to these Judaizers' view, the uncircumcised Gentile Christians were little better than non-Christians. Admittedly, just as the Pharisees in the New Testament period who "in their fidelity to the Law, separated themselves from uncleanness and especially from 'the people of the land' (ἱπποταμίας)"¹ and had refused to sit at table with the tax collectors and sinners² who belonged to the crowd accursed in their ignorance of the Law,³ so these Christian Pharisees, that is to say the Judaizers of the Jerusalem Church, had strongly refused to participate in a meal with the uncircumcised Gentile Christians, namely those who do not keep the Mosaic law.⁴ Without doubt this bitterly disappointing instinctive and instantaneous behaviour of Peter was directly due to the entirely sudden appearance of the Judaizers from James without any notice. And it is needless to say that to the Judaizers who could not but stare wide-eyed at this stunning scene which they could never allow, Peter was, without doubt, the intolerable transgressor of the Law who was denying their ancestral hope by shaking the very foundation itself.

But participation in a meal with the uncircumcised Gentile Christians itself is by no means the transgression of the Apostolic

¹ Taylor, Mark, p.206.
² See Mk 2:15 and Mt. 9:11f. ἱπποταμίας' in the plur. "is used ... to denote people who neglect to observe the Law according to the Pharisaic ideal" (Taylor, Mark, p.205).
³ Cf. Jn 7:49.
⁴ Cf. Ridderbos, Galatia, p.96.
Decree. ¹ Then, how on earth did this great apostle who once so majestically defended the truth of the Gentile freedom as the supreme leader of the Jerusalem Church come to behave himself so pitifully in the presence of these Judaizers from James?


But, if, as Goguel (See his *Acts* 15, pp.143f.) and Manson (See his *Studies*, pp.185f.) argue, the Apostolic Decree was the answer to the question raised by the incident at Antioch and not to the issue raised in Acts 15:1, what does 'πορεία' have to do with the table-fellowship? Are they trying to say the Apostolic Decree makes it clear that the table-fellowship between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians can be allowed only on the condition that Gentile Christians do not commit fornication? Moreover, under the present circumstances that the so-called Golden Rule in the Western Text [Codex Bezae omits 'καὶ πνικτῶν' and adds 'καὶ οὐλομένων θελετε ἑαυτοίς γείνσθαι (γίνεσθαι) ετερίς, μη ποιεῖν' in Acts 15:29 (In v.20, however, 'καὶ οὐλομένων εὑρετε ἑαυτοίς γεὶνσθαι ετερίς μη ποιεῖτε')]. But Tertullian, after omitting 'καὶ πνικτῶν', does not add this Golden Rule] is considered a redactional addition in the later generation [Cf. Dupont, *Problèmes*, p.70: "... S'il est bien difficile de situer le décret apostolique par rapport au Concile de Jérusalem, une question du moins paraît définitivement résolue: les auteurs sont pratiquement unanimes aujourd'hui à considérer comme seul authentique le texte (oriental) du décret (en quatre termes) et à interpréter ses prescriptions dans un sens non pas moral mais rituel ..." and Conzelmann, *Apg.*, s.92: "... Die kultische Fassung (mit vier Bestimmungen) ist die ursprüngliche, da sich die Entwicklung von ihr zur ethischen verstehen lasst, nicht aber die umgekehrte ...."], even the very dispute over the question whether the four prohibitions were ritual or ethical is entirely out of place in our context for the same reason. We can hardly understand the logic of those critics, including Dupont and Conzelmann, who can read a 'ritual' condition into the prohibition against 'πορεία'.
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It is true that most scholars are unconsciously unaware of the plain fact:

The first two chapters of Galatians are not intended to furnish complete biography. Only those details are mentioned which were important for Paul's argument or had been misrepresented by his Judaizing opponents.¹

in their attempts to reconstruct the historical situation of the early church. It is remarkable that even Bruce, who, unlike Lietzmann and Schmithals, seems to advocate strongly the historical reliability of Luke's account in Acts 15 is also making a serious mistake to expect a complete biography without omitting anything from the Galatians. In his attempt to solve the insuperably contradictory exegetical difficulties that would surely be invited when he identifies Galatians 2:1-10 which makes no allusion to the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem with Acts 15:1-29, Bruce argues that Paul had written the Epistle to the Galatians shortly before the Apostolic Council.² But his decisive mistake is to

¹ Machen, Origin, p.71. In this respect, despite his misjudged conclusion due to his failure in handling the historical materials of both the Galatians and Acts the following remark of Weiss is quite correct: "... Der Galaterbrief wird meist so behandelt, als ob er eine schlichte Erzählung der Vorgänge sei für Leute, die noch nie etwas von ihnen gehört haben. Dies ist der erste Fehler. Denn es ist mit Händen zu greifen, dass Paulus die groben Umrisse der Ereignisse als bekannt voraussetzt und sich gegen eine Entstellung oder Missdeutung derselben wehrt. Darum erzählt er nicht lückenlos, sondern hebt nur die Punkte heraus, die ihm aus irgend einem Grunde wichtig sind ...." (His Urochristentum, s.193).

² See Bruce, The Book of the Acts, pp.298ff. He argues that the Galatians was written in c.48 and the Apostolic Council was held in c.49 (See his The Acts of the Apostles, p.55).
identify 'τινες κατελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας' (Acts 15:1a) with 'τινος ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου' (Gal. 2:12a). He argues that when Peter first came to Antioch he ate freely with the Gentile Christians because of his past experience on the roof of Simon's house at Joppa and in the house of Cornelius at Caesarea (Cf. Acts 10:9-48), but "when the Judaeans arrived and expressed their viewpoint so dogmatically, he withdrew from Gentile society and sat at table with circumcised persons only".

1 See The Book of the Acts, p.303.

2 According to Loisy, Peter, accompanied by Mark and Silas, left Jerusalem in haste and fled to Antioch immediately after his miraculous escape from the prison in the Tower Antonia (Cf. Josephus, War, V, v.8) (See Acts 12:4-11), and, shortly after this, the disastrous incident at Antioch occurred [See his La Naissance du Christianisme (Paris, 1933), pp.182f. and also his Actes, pp.484-492, esp. 491f.]. Porter also, like Loisy, believes 'ἐπεσε τένευ' in Acts 12:17 indicates Antioch, thus linking up with Gal. 2:11, however, according to him, Mark did not go to Antioch with Peter but with the emissaries of James (Ga. 2:12) to deliver a decree 'allowing table-fellowship on Jewish terms' (See his Apostolic Decree, pp.172f.).

3 Goguel, however, does not regard the conversion of Cornelius as a historical fact. It is quite interesting to see him still argue: "... Si la conversion de Corneille par Pierre ne peut pas être retenue comme historique, il n'en résulte pas d'une manière absolument nécessaire qu'il faille rejeter comme entièrement légendaire tout ce qui est raconté des contre-coups de cette histoire au sein de l'Eglise de Jérusalem ... On peut parfaitement admettre que l'histoire de la conversion de Corneille étant légendaire, une controverse comme celle qui est rapportée au chapitre 11 des Actes ait réellement eu lieu à Jérusalem ...." [His Actes 15, pp.142f.]. In fact, this queer argument of Goguel is directly connected with his dilemma in understanding Peter's attitude at Antioch.

4 His The Book of the Acts, p.303. Also cf. Loisy, Naissance, p.184: "... Qu'ils [des émissaires de Jacques] aient voulu, en alléguant l'autorité de Jacques, annuler la décision de Jérusalem et contraindre à la circoncision les convertis du paganisme, rien, sauf les inductions suspectes de l'Épitre aux Galates, n'invite à le penser. Ils entendaient seulement que les Juifs ne devaient pas se soustraire aux obligations de la Loi juive, interprétée selon la tradition pharisaïque. Comme ils avaient pour eux une certaine logique et beaucoup de fanatisme héritéditaire, Pierre se rendait à leurs oburgations; ainsi firent les autres croyants circoncis; ainsi aurait fait même Barnabé, estimant, sans doute, comme les autres, que cette séparation pour les repas était préférable à un schisme vis-à-vis de la communauté-mère pour un litige dont l'objet pouvait sembler accessoire ...." But, as we have already (cont.)
But, in the light of our discussions so far, such an argument is not so convincing. More than anything else, this timid and inconsistent behaviour of Peter mentioned above by Bruce displays, in my opinion, a lack of backbone and it can never explain his incomparably grand attitude when he takes a firm stand as the leader of the original apostles against the Judaizers at the Apostolic Council. Furthermore, it seems to be against common sense to imagine that, in the hope of the possibility of another new decision, the Gentile Christians of the Antiochian Church could still send a delegation to Jerusalem to discuss and decide the whole issue at the highest level. They had already

\(^1\) (continued from the previous page) observed, the withdrawal of Peter and other Jewish Christians from the Gentile Christians with whom they were eating was a purely instinctive and instantaneous reaction to the sudden intrusion of the Jerusalem Judaizers.

\(^2\) See also Goguel, *Actes 15*, pp.143ff.: "... Il est facilement concevable que l'incident ait eu son contrecoup à Jérusalem et que ... Pierre ait été accusé par les Jérusalémites d'avoir été trop large à l'égard des chrétiens sortis du paganisme. On peut supposer que ce sont les discussions qui se produisirent à cette occasion qui ont été transposées dans le chapitre 11 des Actes et qui ont amené la réglementation qui, nous l'avons vu, paraît beaucoup plus en rapport avec les relations que Pierre avait eues avec des païens convertis qu'avait le fait des missions pauliniennes. Cette réglementation ne peut être antérieure à l'incident d'Antioche qui, si elle avait été en vigueur, n'aurait pas pu se produire. Elle marque un progrès par rapport aux décisions de la conférence de Jérusalem telles qu'elles sont rapportées dans Galates 2 ..."; Manson, *Studies*, pp.186ff.: "... All that can be done is to reconstruct the probable course of events, taking Paul's narrative as the foundation. On that basis it may be said that the incident at Antioch as described by Paul furnished the occasion for the Council meeting whose decisions are given in Acts xv. I think it probable that Paul and Barnabas were present at that meeting. Whether or not the issue of circumcision was raised on this occasion, as related in Acts xv, we cannot say. If it was, it was a side issue and was ignored. The matter of table-fellowship was settled by the decree. In this way table-fellowship was restored, which was what Paul wanted: but it was a kosher table, which was what James wanted ...." [Was it really a matter of a kosher table, as Manson believes, that had caused all the turmoil at Antioch? Surely, a kosher table in such terms was by no means the Jerusalem Judaizers' concern]. Nevertheless, according to Loisy, the Apostolic Council was held before
seen so vividly with their own eyes the shocking state of things that even the chief of the original apostles himself (undoubtedly holding the supreme right of the final decision in interpreting the Gospel for salvation) also came because of their uncircumcision to refuse to have table-fellowship with them, or strictly speaking, to refuse 'to admit them to church membership' or in other words, 'to recognize them as Christians' at all.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) (continued from the previous page) Agrippa I's persecution [Also cf. M. Goguel, "Essai sur la Chronologie Paulinienne" in RHR, Tome 65 (1912), p.508: "... La conférence de Jérusalem ayant eu lieu à la fin de 43 ou au commencement de 44 ...." along with p.507] and, Peter, after his escape from prison in the spring of A.D. 44, never returned to Jerusalem (See his Naissance, pp.179 and 183). F.W. Beare also supports Loisy's argument [See his "The Sequence of Events in Acts 9-15 and the Career of Peter" in JBL, LXII (1943), p.299] and, at the same time, attempts to interpret Gal. 2:11ff. from a different angle. He suggests that we should assume James the Lord's brother did not take part in the agreement mentioned in Gal. 2 [According to him, James in v.9 is the son of Zebedee. But cf. Loisy, Actes, pp.481ff.: "... Jacques de Zébédée n'est point mentionné dans l'épître aux Galates. Il ne s'ensuit pas qu'il fût déjà mort quand vint en discussion l'affaire des observances, mais seulement que, dans l'opinion de Paul, c'était une autorité moins considérable que son frère Jean, que Jacques frère du Seigneur et que Pierre. Il peut très bien être compris parmi les notables avec lesquels Paul a conféré, bien qu'il ne soit pas une des trois ((colonnes)) (GAL. II,9) ...."] and never conceded anything substantial to the Apostle Paul and his associates. Therefore, he argues, James the Lord's brother, though he was the real head of the contemporary Jerusalem Church, was unmolested even during the Agrippa's persecution (See also Loisy, Naissance, p.182), whereas the two sons of Zebedee, James and John, were beheaded [See also Loisy, Actes, pp.482ff. and Naissance, p.182, n.4; E. Meyer, Ursprung, III. Bd.: Die Apostelgeschichte und die Anfänge des Christentums (Stuttgart und Berlin, 1923), ss.174-178] and Peter was also foredoomed to the same fate in the prison (See his Sequence, pp.299-305). It was so natural, in Beare's view, that strife was later stirred at Antioch by this James' emissaries, and if he were one of those three who gave the Apostle Paul the right hand of fellowship (Gal. 2:9), it is beyond all comprehension that the same man should afterwards dispatch his legates to Antioch to make trouble (See ibid., p.306). Regrettably, for all their elaborate suggestions, none of these critics convinces us enough.

\(^1\) Bruce, The Book of the Acts, pp.304f.
But what even the most unsophisticated readers never skip over in Galatians 2:12 is the surprising change of Peter's attitude toward the Judaizers of the Jerusalem Church in comparison with that at the Apostolic Council. Does this mean that in the light of the statement of Galatians 2:12 we have to give up our efforts, in company with Bruce, to advocate the historical reliability of Luke's account in Acts 15? One thing quite clear is that Peter who had once possessed the supreme authority as the leader of the original apostles in the Jerusalem Church is now virtually subordinate to James the Lord's brother. As Weiss argues, 'τινὸς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου' can be understood not only as those dispatched and authorized by James but also as those belonging to the group which followed James' opinion.¹ The

¹ See his Urchristentum, s.205. Also cf. Goguel, Actes 15, p.143: "... l'arrivée de partisans ou d'émissaires de Jacques, c'est-à-dire de représentants d'un judéo-christianisme plus rigoureux ...." But, Manson accepts the singular readings in Gal. 2:12, namely 'τινὰ' and 'Ἐλθε' instead of 'τινᾶς' and 'Ἐλθοῦ', arguing that "... The weight of evidence in favour of Ἐλθε is very great — almost overwhelming: and if Ἐλθε be accepted, it automatically creates a presumption in favour of τινὰ ...." (His Studies, p.179. See also p.178. He concludes, on this basis, that "... the 'somebody' of 12a was a messenger (Paul describes him in this vague way most probably because he did not know or had forgotten the man's name). He brought the message from James to Peter which broke up the happy relations till then subsisting between Jewish and Gentile Christians in Antioch ...." (Ibid., pp.179f.). Indeed, the reading Ἐλθε is securing weighty textual evidence including P⁴⁶ Ῥ Ῥ (also D* 33 330 2492 al) (See Metzger et al., Textual Commentary, p.592), however, 'the sense of the passage' demands Ἐλθοῦ (See idem. Also cf. Ibid., p.593: "... The singular number Ἐλθε is probably due to scribes who either imitated ὅτε ὁ Ἐλθεν ἐκκοσμος of ver. 11, or were unconsciously influenced by careless assonance with the immediately preceding and following verbs that end in -εῦ ....") and 'τινὰ', despite the support from P⁴⁶ which Manson relies on heavily, "... seems to have originated along with the erroneous reading Ἐλθε ... obviously the result of scribal oversight ...." (Ibid., p.592). Furthermore, according to Manson, it was (cont.)
Apostle Paul's account in Galatians 2:12 is without doubt strongly implying that the Christian Pharisaic party of these extreme Jewish legalists (they could become Christians without relinquishing their distinctive beliefs by simply adding to what they had been believing in Judaism the belief that Jesus of Nazareth had been raised from the dead and had thus been divinely proclaimed to be Lord and Messiah¹) had already succeeded in gaining the leadership in the Jerusalem Church by overwhelming the moderate party following Peter's line in their understanding of the Gospel since the Apostolic Council. And by the time when the Apostle Paul was writing the Epistle to the Galatians, James who had appeared "as the representative of the strict Jewish-Christian tendency" at the Apostolic Council² was already reigning over Peter with the Judaizers' full support. With the departure from Jerusalem of the most 'original' apostles for

¹ (continued from the previous page) the message of James delivered by the 'someone' of v.12a that threw Peter into a panic, however, there is no way to know the purport of this message (perhaps even Paul, he says, did not know) (See his Studies, p.180). If we assume, as Manson suggests, 'οἱ ἐκ περὶ τετραμής' mentioned in v.12b were "either Jewish Christian members of the Jerusalem community (cf. Acts x.45; xx.10ff.) or Jews outside who could find in Peter's behaviour a new ground of complaint against the Church, namely that its leaders were apostatizing from Judaism [as followed later by Schmithals. See his Paulus, ss.55f.]" (Idem), then, what were the exact situations of these two Jewish groups at Jerusalem? Above all, do we really believe such a shaky hypothesis of Manson would remove our bewilderment caused by Peter's embarrassing behaviour?


But, unlike Schmithals' conjecture, though James was already a well-known personality when the Apostolic Council was held, he was not yet the leader of the Jerusalem Church (Cf. ibid., p.156). Also cf. Loisy, Naissance, p.179, n.4: "... La prépondérance de Jacques, frère du Seigneur, n'a dû s'établir dans la communauté qu'après la disparition des trois principaux disciples de Jésus."
their mission in their expectation of the imminent Parousia, the
downfall of Peter's authority was accelerated. These apostles had
powerfully supported Peter in his suppression of the Judaizers'
movement.

Interpreting the motive of Peter's disappointing behaviour in
Galatians 2:12, Bruce argues that "... No doubt he believed he was
doing so in order to conciliate the consciences of his 'weaker'
Judaean brethren ...."¹ But such an appreciative argument cannot
explain sufficiently the Apostle Paul's account: "... ἐσεῖλησεν
[γεύσει] τις ἐκ περιτυχείς".

The plain fact is that even the authority of the Judaizers
appointed and sent by James was powerful enough to frighten Peter
and to influence his behaviour in the presence of the Apostle Paul
and other Gentile leaders of the Antiochan Church.² This significant
change in the power structure in the Jerusalem Church brought about
after the Apostolic Council alone can explain all the exegetical
problems due to the serious tension between Paul and the Jerusalem
Church including the crisis produced in Corinth and Galatia by the
Judaizers' continuous campaigns despite the agreement at the Apostolic

² Also cf. Burton, Galatians, pp.107f.: "... That Peter should have
been to such an extent under their domination illustrates both his
own instability and the extent to which the legalistic party had
developed and acquired influence in the Jerusalem church and Jewish
Christianity generally ...."
Council. It is quite natural that those Judaizers of the Jerusalem Church, who had to make a serious concession at the Apostolic Council by reason of the powerful objection of the original apostles who strongly supported Peter along with the moderate majority following faithfully the decision of the original apostles, should resume their Judaizing campaigns towards all the churches in a situation where they now had the command of the Jerusalem Church as a result of the departure of most of the original apostles from Jerusalem. How could these spirited Christian Pharisees be satisfied merely with the uncircumcised Gentile Christians' observing the Apostolic Decree?¹

Circumcision was the very visible seal of God's election and observing the Mosaic Law was the sign of the chosen one in everyday life.

¹ Refusing to identify the Apostolic Council of Acts 15 with the conference of Gal. 2, W.L. Knox argues: "... there were good reasons why the Jewish Christians should not accept the decision of the 'pillars' of the Church recorded in Gal. ii, if that decision was reached during the famine-visit. In the first place that decision had failed to produce a final settlement in view of Peter's failure to stand by it (or by Paul's interpretation of it) at Antioch. In the second place that decision had been reached at a time when the Pauline missions were confined to a fairly small area in Syria and Cilicia. It might reasonably be hoped that their proximity to Palestine would lead them to see the wisdom of accepting the Torah as a safeguard against the danger of relapsing into the vices of the Gentiles; in any case that proximity and the influence of the Jewish Church and Jewish converts in these Churches would do much to counteract the danger. It was quite another matter if Paul was to travel up and down the world converting all and sundry; there would be far more Gentiles than the Church could hope to absorb without a grave danger to her whole standard of morality. This was a danger in the face of which Judaizers might well renew their perfectly sincere attempt to preserve the Church from what they reasonably regarded as an appalling menace ...." (His Acts, pp.44f.). If, as Knox indicates, the anti-Jewish prejudices found in many continental scholars (though we feel quite doubtful about this accusation) make them fail to appreciate the positive aspect of the Judaizing position (See ibid., p.45, n.1), perhaps his own pro-Jewish prejudices lead him to paint too rosy a picture of those 'Christian Pharisees'.
Unless they cast away all their ancestral hope like dirt, how could they admit to church membership those unclean Gentiles who daringly deny the Jews' privilege as the chosen people? It is not too much to say that it was the last thing they could accept. Therefore, we can say, the following argument of Goguel is an unfounded conjecture owing to his failure to recognize such a serious change in the power structure in the Jerusalem Church:

L'incident d'Antioche rendit les relations de Paul avec l'Église de Jérusalem de plus en plus difficiles. Les Jérusalémites paraissent avoir estimé que l'attitude prise par Paul à Antioche annulait l'accord que les colonnes de l'Église avaient conclu avec lui en 43-44 et qu'on n'était plus tenu de garder aucun ménagement à son égard.

The Judaizers could by no means find any way of shuffling off the responsibility of breaking the agreement at the Apostolic Council upon Paul even with this unfortunate incident at Antioch, because the transgressors of the agreement were themselves and none others from beginning to end. But, despite his mistake in judging the change of the situation in the Jerusalem Church, Goguel is quite correct in perceiving the significance of the incident at Antioch with which the previous antagonistic relations between the Apostle Paul and the Jerusalem Judaizers had been irrevocably intensified with increasing speed.

Lietzmann conjectures that Peter, in 'resentment at the rebuke he had had to swallow in Antioch', came to engage in open conflict.

1 Cf. also Present Thesis, pp.106f.
against the Apostle Paul in Corinth and even in Rome through systematic campaigns. But in Galatians 2:14, as Ridderbos indicates, rebuking Peter's momentary hypocrisy, the Apostle Paul "pointed it out to Peter, apparently on the assumption that Peter would agree". What the Apostle Paul is trying to emphasize through his account in Galatians 2:11-14 is not the fundamental disagreement between himself and Peter, the chief of the original apostles whose authority the Judaizers are playing off against the Apostle Paul himself, but the complete fundamental agreement between the two. Therefore, this wrong inference of Lietzmann from Galatians 2:11-14 is quite alien to the Apostle Paul's own aim in the Galatian context. It is true that in later Jewish Christian writings we can find an extremely hostile relationship between Peter and the Apostle Paul which is without doubt the reminiscence of the unfortunate incident at Antioch described in Galatians 2:11-14.

---

1 See Lietzmann, History, Vol.1, p.111.
2 His Galatia, pp.97f.
3 Cf. also Loisy, Naissance, p.185: "... Paul y apparaît isolé, très fier de cet isolement, se grandissant en lui-même par la conscience d'une vocation unique dont cet isolement est comme la rançon naturelle; il se voit et il se dit poursuivi par une opposition ardente qu'il s'efforce de discréditer en l'imputant à une divergence sur les principes essentiels du salut, et à des intentions répréhensibles, mais que l'on pressent avoir été surtout personnelle, causée par l'espèce de schisme que Paul a réalisé pour lui-même à l'égard des autres missionnaires ...."
4 See esp. Pseudo-Clement, Homiliae Viginti, ed. by A.R.M. Dressel (Gottingae, 1853), XVII.19: "... εἰ μὴ ἀντικείμενος ἂς, οὐκ ἐν μὲ 

---
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in the Psuedo-Clementine texts, Schoeps says: "... The arguments are clearly aimed at gnostics who have invoked in their defence the vision of Paul ...." But Schoeps here seems to miss the heart of the Clementine Peter's polemic. As he indicates, the Psuedo-Clementine texts had appeared after the patristic consensus in favour of the Apostle Paul. Accordingly, it was impossible to expect that those churches in which the overwhelming majority of Gentile Christian followers of the Apostle Paul's line would accept the polemic of Clementine Peter which was characterized by such an extreme anti-Paulinism just in order to face the Gnostics effectively. After all, the main object of the later Judaizers through these writings was not simply to attack the Gnostics, as Schoeps argues, but to regain their lost leadership in Christianity by making the Gentile Christians identify the Apostle Paul with the Gnostics. This aim was pursued

1 His Paul, p.84. Also cf. his Das Judenchristentum (Bern und München, 1964), s.49: "... Die Argumente contra Paulum sind nämlich zwischenzeitlich von den Erben contra Marcionem und Gnostiker ausgeschlachtet worden ...." and esp. ss.97-103.

2 See his Judenchristentum, ss.42f. He believes that the Pseudo-Clementine texts came into existence, at the earliest, in the second century. (See Paul, p.84). Also cf. E. Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha, ed. by W. Schneemelcher. E.T. ed. by R. McL. Wilson, Vol.2, (London, 1974), pp.110f.: "For the determination of the date [of the Κηρύγματα Πέτρου] there can be mentioned as terminus ad quem the Pseudo-Clementine basic writing, which was written c.260 (between 220 and 300). To the fixing of the terminus a quo there is no certain clue. We should not go too far up into the second century, for then we should not be able to understand why there is no evidence for the Kerygmatia outside the basic writing. In addition a clue to the dating can be secured through comparison with the date of the remaining sources of the basic writing: besides the ΚΠ-source there underlies it inter alia the Bardesanian dialogue Περὶ Εἰρήνην, which was composed probably in the year 220. An ordination schema which the author of the basic writing used came into being c.200. For the Kerygmatia the same dating may be assumed ...."
recklessly by the Judaizers who could never relinquish their morbid consciousness of themselves as the chosen nation.

Though these accounts of the Pseudo-Clementine texts are quite helpful to our understanding of the irrevocably increased hostility of the Jerusalem Judaizers toward the Apostle Paul on the unfortunate incident at Antioch, we cannot, as Lietzmann conjectures, develop any irresponsible hypothesis about Peter's response consequent upon the Apostle Paul's bitter rebuke to him at Antioch.

Apart from this malicious slander of the later Jewish Christians' writings we cannot find any single positive evidence that would support the unfounded hypothesis of Lietzmann condemning Peter as a despicable moral bankrupt of double personality who had sacrificed the true nature of the Gospel to his individual remorseful feeling. On the contrary, the whole subsequent history of the early Church indicates their unchangeable mutual understanding and unity, irrespective of their bitter experience at Antioch.¹

Consequently, not only Baur, who argues that the Apostle Paul and the elder apostles in the Jerusalem Church were extremely antagonistic to each other, but also Schoeps, who conjectures that only the Jewish extremists of the Jerusalem Church (but not Peter and James who belonged together to the more moderate middle group) were violently

opposing the Apostle Paul,\(^1\) has failed in reconstructing the real situation of the early Church.

Schoeps' decisive mistake lies in his lack of understanding James' relations with the Judaizers in the Jerusalem Church. If we judge James simply by his external appearance described in Acts 15:13-20 and 21:20-25, we are liable to omit the significance of the Apostle Paul's account in Galatians 2:12 in which James' inseparable unity with the Judaizers and his superiority to Peter is so clearly indicated.

6. JAMES THE LORD'S BROTHER AND HIS RELATIONSHIP WITH THE JUDAIZERS OF THE JERUSALEM CHURCH

Even though Conzelmann refuses to call James a 'Judaizer',\(^2\) since, as we can see in the Apostle Paul's own account, he was closely connected with the Judaizers' movement, he is not treated as a mere sympathizer with the Judaizers' movement, but as the virtual chief of all the Jewish extremists in the Jerusalem Church and Judea. In this role he practically organized and directed all the systematic campaigns towards the Gentile churches including those founded by the Apostle Paul himself. James had never followed Jesus during His earthly life.\(^3\)

\(^1\) See Schoeps, *Paul*, pp.66, 74-82.
\(^3\) Also cf. S.G.F. Brandon, *The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth* (London, 1968), pp.51f. and esp. p.52: "... tradition agrees that he was not an apostle of Jesus during his lifetime ...."
and only after he had seen the Risen Lord he became a convert. As we mentioned before, he was a totally unexpected freak of nature produced, strange as it may sound, by the Christian Pharisees, in other words, the monsters in the Jerusalem Church who dared destroy the very nature of the Gospel itself in their utter ignorance of the divine grace revealed in Jesus Christ.

The various coarsely coloured fabrications of the later Jewish Christians’ myth describe James as the first Bishop of Jerusalem directly appointed by Jesus Christ¹ and, at the same time, as the lord reigning with supreme authority over Peter and all other original apostles from the beginning.² According to this fabricated myth, James was not only holding the right of final decision as the examiner of the lawful preaching of the word of Jesus Christ³ but was proclaimed as the very One ‘for whose sake heaven and earth came into being’.⁴

³ Cf. Recognitiones, IV. 34,1f.: "propter quod observate cautius, ut nulli doctorum credatis, nisi qui Iacobi fratri domini ex Hierusalem detulerit testimonium, vel eius quicumque post ipsum fuerit. nisi enim quis illuc ascenderit et ibi fuerit probatus quod sit doctor idoneus et fidelis ad praedicandum Christi verbum, nisi, inquam, inde detulerit testimonium, recipiendus omnino non est ...."
Therefore, in the later Judaizers' myth James had been indeed raised as a kind of Messianic king who has succeeded to David's throne as the very representative of Jesus Christ on this earth.¹

Even though we cannot admit any validity of those later Jewish Christians' writings as reliable historical documents for our understanding of the practical situation of the early Church, we can imagine to some extent how subtly James' ties of blood with Jesus in His earthly life and the Judaizers' ancestral hope had been connected with each other in the Jerusalem Church. Such a reasoning comes to carry much stronger power of persuasion when we consider that even after the death of James the relatives of Jesus after the flesh still could enjoy the privilege of succeeding to the place of James.²

No matter what these Judaizers' real intention may have been, their hardened mind must have been much more abominable than that of non-Christian Jews in the Apostle Paul's eyes.³ If we can be justified in assuming that not only the later Jewish Christians' polemical anti-Paulinism but also their frantic idolization of James was fundamentally standing in the tradition of the early Jerusalem

1 Cf. ibid., p.422.
3 The Apostle Paul believes that the unbelief of Jews was caused by the positive will of God to bring the salvation to the Gentiles (Cf. Rom. 11:8-11). According to the Apostle Paul, however, the Christian Pharisees can find no excuse for their distorting of the true nature of Gospel. The Apostle is therefore led to express his detestation in the strong words of Gal. 5:12: ""Ογελον και ἀπειρούντως εἰς ἀναστάτων ἦς"".
Judaizers' arguments and so long as we can never find out any remarkable friction between James and the Jerusalem Judaizers, no one can refute the argument that the most formidable foes in the Apostle Paul's life-long battle for the freedom of Gentile Christians were James\(^1\) and his followers, the Judaizers in the Jerusalem Church. And these Christian Pharisees' Judaizing campaign came to be intensified openly with the decisive withering up of the mild group's influence consequent upon the departure of the greater part of the

---

\(^1\) Considering his attitude in the Galatian accounts, the Apostle Paul by no means thinks James is correctly understanding the nature of Gospel and preaches it properly. Just before his account of the incident at Antioch the Apostle Paul is writing: "καὶ γένεσθαι τὰς ἡ διαθήκης μὲν Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ Ἰακώβου οἱ ἐκ ἰουδαίων στόλοι εἶναι, δεῦτε ὑμῖν γεῖτον καὶ διαφορὰς καὶ διοικήσεις, ...." (Gal. 2:9). But, the Apostle Paul himself neither first called James a pillar nor regarded him as a true pillar (Cf. Gal. 2:6: "... τὰς ἐκκλησίας εἰναὶ τι, — ἐπισκόποι ...." and Lightfoot, Galatians, p.108: "... Here it is depreciatory, not indeed of the Twelve themselves, but of the extravagant and exclusive claims set up for them by the Judaizers ....") Here he mentions James as a pillar only to make the Judaizers provoking turmoils in Galatia along with the foolish Gentile Christians in the Galatian Church realize clearly that his authority as the apostle for the Gentiles had been acknowledged even by James who is the chief of those Judaizers (and needless to say, by Peter and John whose apostolic authority the Judaizers are trying to play off ludicrously against him) and, at the same time, what they call, 'a pillar'. As we have already indicated, the Apostle Paul's aim in placing James before the two original apostles, Peter and John, should be understood only in his Galatian context in which he has to fight against those Jerusalem Judaizers whose head is none other than James. Barrett comments on this situation: "... He [The Apostle Paul] is prepared to grant, indeed he cannot deny, the unique eschatological status of James, Cephas and John as "pillars"; they are the indispensable connecting links between the historical Jesus and the community of the New Age. As such they must be consulted, and fellowship with them must be maintained, at almost any cost ...." ["Paul and the "Pillar" Apostles" in Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis De Zwaan septuagenarii, ed. by J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik (Haarlem, 1953), p.18]. In our judgement, this comment fails to show a proper understanding of the Galatian context.
original apostles from Jerusalem and developed in full scale with the incident at Antioch and without doubt reached the peak on the verge of the catastrophe of A.D. 66.

It is a well known fact that Schmithals argues that the Apostle Paul's opponents who intruded themselves into the churches founded by him were 'Jewish or Jewish-Christian Gnostics' who had nothing to do with the Jewish Christians in the Jerusalem Church and James. And he interprets the later Jewish Christians' attitude idolizing James as follows:

But a serious defect in his argument is that, despite his confident denial of any positive value of the accounts in Acts and Galatians from which we can deduce so clearly the strong evidences for the Jerusalem Judaizers he could not prepare any convincing historical foundations of his hypothesis of Jewish or Jewish-Christian Gnostics that would

---

1 See Schmithals, Paulus, ss.89ff.
2 Ibid., s.95.
3 Cf. ibid., s.91: "... In jedem Fall kann Apg. 15,5.24 ebensowenig wie Gal. 2,4f. die Existenz einer schroff judaistischen und ultra-jakobinischen Gruppe von Judenchristen in Jerusalem beweisen ...." Also cf. idem, n.1: "Erst recht lässt sich aus Gal. 2,11ff. nicht mit W.G. Kümmel eine "radikal konservative Minderheit der Jerusalemer Gemeinde" erschliessen ...."
surely weaken the theory of the Jewish Christian extremists, in other words, the Christian Pharisees in the Jerusalem Church. Furthermore, a convincing refutation of Schmithals' hypothesis of Jewish or Jewish-Christian Gnostics can be found in the words of R. McL. Wilson in his discussing the Apostle Paul's opponents in Corinth and Galatia:

The Tübingen school saw the whole history of the early Church in terms of a conflict between the Judaizing and the Hellenistic wings. More recently the attempt has been made, particularly by W. Schmithals, to identify Paul's opponents in almost every case as Gnostics... But to describe all Paul's opponents as Gnostic without further qualification is to ignore distinctions which both can and ought to be made, and to run the risk of interpreting the embryonic and undeveloped in the light of the mature and fully developed system of a later age.

Though Marxsen is also identifying the Apostle Paul's opponents mentioned in the First Epistle to the Corinthians with Gnostics, his argument is merely based on guesswork without any positive textual and historical evidences. Before trying to deduce hastily from 1 Corinthians 15:12 that such a view denying a future resurrection was without doubt one of the characteristic features of the Gnostics, Marxsen has to ask himself, as Wilson indicates correctly, whether it

---

1 Cf. ibid., ss.85-99.
3 See Marxsen, Introduction, p.75: "... The opponents can certainly — though indirectly, by the kind of inquiry that is made and the scandals that have arisen — be identified as Gnostics... The very varied problems that Paul deals with in 1 Cor. can therefore be interpreted in the light of this one underlying aim — to repel the Gnostic influence that has penetrated the Church in Corinth...."
is a proper way of understanding the Apostle Paul's Corinthian context to 'interpret the teaching of Paul's opponents by a wholesale introduction of ideas from the second-century systems' even though we cannot definitely deny the possibility that there might have already existed the fertile soil into which the very seeds of the later Gnosticism were ready to fall and grow. But such a Gnosticism as Marxsen and Schmithals conjecture had not yet come into existence in Corinth and it is much more proper to understand the view denying the future resurrection mentioned in 1 Corinthians 15:12 not as that of Gnostics but as the common "Greek view of the immortality of the soul over against a resurrection of the body". Also, refuting the attempt to identify the 'wisdom' section in 1 Corinthians 1f. with 'Sophia' in the later Gnosticism, Wilson argues:

his whole discussion begins from an Old Testament quotation which seems to have no connection with any Sophia myth, and it can be quite adequately expounded, without introducing a hypostatised Wisdom at all, in terms of the wisdom upon which men pride themselves and the 'foolishness' of God which yet is superior to all the wisdom of this world. It is only the identification of Christ as 'the power of God and the wisdom of God' which prompts the question of 'Gnostic' influence, in the sense that Paul is claiming for Christ the titles and attributes applied by his opponents to their hypostatised Sophia; but the alternative surely bears

---

1 Cf. Wilson, Gnosis, p.52.

2 See ibid., p.53. Wilson argues that: "... The most natural rendering of 1 Cor. 15:12 is not that some say there will be no resurrection (because it is already past), but that in their view there is no such thing. The verb is in the present tense, not the future ...." (Idem).

3 See idem.
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examination, that the identification arises naturally out of the context of the whole discussion.¹

Moreover, can we uniformly identify the immorality of some member of the Corinthian congregation who was openly living with his father's wife (5:11ff.) and some member's indiscreet behaviour to appeal to the heathen courts of law against his brother in Jesus Christ (6:1ff.) or the spiritual confusion owing to their ignorance of the true nature of idols (ch.8) and the various spiritual gifts (chs.12-14) with Gnostic influence? In his First Epistle to the Corinthians, the Apostle Paul is trying to solve the practical problems which these Achaian Christians were faced with in the circumstances in which all kinds of immorality, idolatry and chaotic philosophical speculation closely connected with the heathen myths were mixed up.

Therefore, Schmithals and Marxsen's Gnostic argument is a distortion of the historical context in which the Apostle Paul was standing. At the same time, unlike Lietzmann's conjecture, from the statement of 1 Corinthians 1:11-13 alone we cannot find any clear evidence of Peter's visit to Corinth or systematic campaigns led by the Jerusalem Judaizers.²

¹ Ibid., p.54.
² From this view point, Machen is correct in suggesting: "... Paul was perhaps combating not any definite parties, but only the spirit ... Evidently the faults of the 'parties' were not due at all to those whose names the parties used ...." (Origin, pp.108f.).
But we cannot deny the possibility that when the Apostle Paul was writing this epistle there might have already existed some antagonistic relationship between those who declared themselves to be the followers of Peter and the others who remained faithful to the teaching of the Apostle Paul. Nevertheless, in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians the Apostle Paul is clearly indicating the Judaizers' campaign toward the Corinthian Church fully supported by the Jerusalem Church. Those Judaizers from the Jerusalem Church who without doubt had been appointed and dispatched by James not only had brought letters of recommendation written by James himself but also

1 Baur believes that the Judaizers had come to Corinth and the several parties had arisen as the result of Judaizers' campaign. According to his argument, even though Peter was never at Corinth at all, the party which bore the name of Peter was the main opposition group confronted with those who remained faithful to the Apostle Paul's teaching and this party of Peter and the so-called party of Christ were essentially one and the same (See History, Vol.1, p.61). But we can never find such an extreme antagonistic relationship between those following Peter and the Apostle Paul respectively as Baur conjectures in 1 Cor. Nevertheless, we cannot totally exclude any possibility of Judaizers' disturbances in the Corinthian Church even though we do not think that there was any systematic campaign of Judaizers esp. in the light of the character of the Apostle Paul's polemic in 1 Cor. But Baur's unfounded hypothesis which would set the Apostle Paul in the utmost antagonistic relationship to Peter and other original apostles is due to his failure in perceiving the change of the power structure in the Jerusalem Church and the Jerusalem Judaizers' favourite cunning trick to play off the original apostles' authority against the Apostle Paul in their attempt to deny his apostleship.

2 Cf. esp. 2 Cor. 3:1ff.; 11:5, 22ff.; 12:11f.

3 Machen argues that: "... The letters of recommendation (2 Cor. iii.1) may have come elsewhere than from the apostles; indeed the mention of letters from the Corinthians as well as to them would seem to make the passage refer to a general habit of credential-bearing rather than to any special credentials from Jerusalem ...." (Origin, p.108). But Machen cannot indicate in the concrete from where the letters of recommendation had come. If the bearers of these letters had been recommended by some others rather than those in the Jerusalem Church, (cont.)
began to play off the authority of Peter and other original apostles against the Apostle Paul.¹

Unlike their strategy in Galatia the Judaizers did not insist on the necessity of being circumcised but confined their campaign to the denial of the Apostle Paul's apostleship along with bitter personal attacks against him.²

³ (continued from the previous page) the Apostle Paul would have neither mentioned the 'superlative apostles' (See 11:5; 12:11) nor boasted especially the fact: "... Ἐβραῖοι εἰσίν; κἀγαλ. Ἰσραηλῖται εἰσίν; κἀμ. ἄπειρα Ἅρωμεν εἰσίν; κἀμ. ἐπίκοιν. κριστοῦ εἰσίν; παραφράγματι λαλῶ, ὡς ἐγώ..." (11:22f.). His aim to refute Baur's radical hypothesis which sets the Apostle Paul and the original apostles in extremely antagonistic relationship is understandable, but it is his great mistake to develop just the counter-hypothesis without any convincing foundation. Schoeps also asserts that "... It is probable that these letters had not been issued by James ... but by leaders of the Jerusalem Judaistic group who were the real ancestors of the Ebionites ...." (Paul, p.75). Both Machen and Schoeps should have realized the transition of power structure in the Jerusalem Church. Here in 3:1, the bearers of the letters came without doubt from Jerusalem [Cf. W.J. Conybeare and J.S. Howson, The Life and Epistles of St. Paul [Grand Rapids, 1971 (reprinted)], p.439; Bruce 1 and 2 Cor., p.189; C.K. Barrett, The Second Epistle to the Corinthians (London, 1973), pp.277ff.] and recommended by James, the head of Judaizers.

¹ Cf. 2 Cor. 11:5 and 12:11ff. Machen argues that: "... The Tübingen exegesis of 2 Cor. 11.5; 12.11, by which 'the chiepest apostles' were identified with the pillars of the Jerusalem Church should be rejected; and the phrase (which is rather to be translated 'those who are apostles overmuch') should be taken as designating simply the Corinthian agitators themselves. Thus, the 'apostles overmuch' of 2 Cor. 11.5 become the same as the 'false apostles' of verse 13, the latter verse being used in order to interpret the former ...." (Origin, pp.108). But Machen is not aware of the Apostle Paul's practical context in which he could not but declare that he was not in the least inferior to those superlative apostles to silence the Judaizers who played off the authority and fame of the original apostles. Also cf. Bruce, 1 and 2 Cor., p.237: "... By this time, perhaps, none of the Twelve was actually resident in Jerusalem, but Jerusalem would still be regarded as their home base ...."

² Cf. 2 Cor. 10:10. Also cf. 11:6. Conybeare argues that the Judaizers first had to confine themselves to personal attack against the Apostle Paul denying his apostleship because if they had insisted upon circumcision first, it would have appeared as a barbarous superstition in the eyes of such a great and civilized community as that of Corinth (See Life and Epistles, p.378).
But even in this epistle we cannot find any positive evidence of the Gnostics' disturbance as Schmithals argues. In his Epistle to the Galatians, the Apostle Paul is clearly indicating the Judaizers' great success in their Judaizing campaign led in this young church founded by himself. The Galatian Christians came to accept not only Jewish ritual observances (Cf. 4:10) but also the circumcision itself (Cf. 5:2-12) by the Judaizers from the Jerusalem Church who, under the instructions of James, so cunningly and effectively played off the authority of the original apostles against the Apostle Paul.

In his examining the campaigns led by the Judaizers in Corinth and Galatia, Goguel argues:

Mais si le sens général de l'action entreprise est clair, il est très difficile de reconnaître quel rôle y ont joué l'Église de Jérusalem et ses chefs, d'une part, l'apôtre Pierre de l'autre. Une chose cependant est certaine, c'est qu'entre 44 et 58, date où Paul y est venu pour la dernière fois, les dispositions de l'Église de Jérusalem à son égard sont devenues de plus en plus défiantes et hostiles ... L'attitude de l'Église de Jérusalem en 58, autorise à supposer qu'elle ne fut pas entièrement étrangère aux compagnes antipauliniennes de Grèce et de Galatie.

Mentioning the Galatian crisis, he also asserts that:

il est impossible de reconnaître si Pierre et Jacques avaient inspiré la campagne s'ils l'appréciaient ou bien, au contraire, la jugeaient inopportune. Il n'est même pas certain qu'ils en aient eu connaissance. La seule chose que l'on puisse tenir pour établie, c'est que les autorités de l'Église de Jérusalem partageaient, en principe au moins, les vues des contre-missionnaires.

---

1 *Naissance*, p.333.
But, as we have indicated before, Goguel also failed, as others did, to grasp all the development of the situation after the Apostolic Council because he is unaware of the great changes in the power structure in the Jerusalem Church. Consequently, he could not escape from Baur's hypothesis after all, despite his cautious approach. He was so correct in his pointing out the exegetical key which Luke's account in Acts 21:21-26 implies along with the undeniable fact:

Avant qu'il n'ait été transféré à Césarée et pendant les deux années où il fut prisonnier dans cette ville, le livre des Actes ne mentionne aucune démarche qu'aurait faite l'Église de Jérusalem pour lui venir en aide ou pour adoucir son sort. Ce silence et significatif. Dominé qu'il est par l'idée d'une parfaite harmonie qui aurait toujours régné entre l'apôtre Paul et l'Église de Jérusalem, l'auteur des Actes n'aurait pas manqué, s'il avait pu le faire, de mentionner ce que les Chrétiens de Jérusalem auraient fait en faveur de Paul.  

but because of his failure in perceiving the most important fact that James had been the very head of the Jerusalem Judaizers who had virtually organized and directed all the systematic campaigns to Judaize the whole Gentile churches including those founded by the Apostle Paul after the ruin of Peter's power, he could not solve in the least the exegetical problem which Luke is so clearly implying in the Acts.

Concerning the attitude of Judaism toward the Jerusalem Church after the arrest of the Apostle Paul Goguel says:

1 See Present Thesis, pp.133ff.
2 Naissance, p.346.
Ce qui n'est pas moins significatif, c'est que, au moment où la haine juive était déchaînée contre Paul, la tranquillité dont jouissait l'Eglise de Jérusalem ne paraît avoir été en rien troublée, ce qui prouve que les Juifs ne l'ont pas tenue pour solidaire de Paul plus qu'elle-même ne se sentait solidaire de lui.¹

Nevertheless, as we already saw in discussing the problem which Schmithals suggests,² this argument of Goguel is quite unconvincing because it is wrongly inferred from Luke's silence in the Acts and fails to examine carefully the concrete historical situation in which the contemporary Judaism and the Jerusalem Church were standing.

Do we, then, have to understand Luke's silence on the attitude of Judaism toward the Jerusalem Church after the arrest of the Apostle Paul as due to his tendentious aim consistent from beginning to end to make the Roman Empire recognize Christianity as a new sect of Judaism certainly permitted by the Roman law and hence as a religion equally legitimate and fully entitled to share all those religious privileges accorded to Judaism?³ If not, is there any special reason for Luke's silence? If the Jerusalem Church could really continue to enjoy peace without being disturbed even after the arrest of the Apostle Paul and despite the constant hostility of Judaism toward Christianity, what on

¹ Idem.
³ Cf. Tertullian, Apologeticus, XXI.1. Also cf. Schmithals, Paulus, s.48: "... Es ist deutlich: Die Tendenz des Lukas, das Christentum als das wahre Judentum darzustellen, ist noch nicht hinreichend gedeutet. An dieser Tendenz selbst aber kann kein Zweifel sein ...."
earth was the decisive factor that compelled contemporary Judaism to tolerate the existence of the Jerusalem Church in the very midst of Judaism? Without answering these critical questions we can never solve the exegetical problem which Romans 15:30-32 presents to us when compared with Luke's account of the Apostle Paul's arrest in Acts 21:27ff.
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THE POLITICO-SOCIAL SITUATION OF PALESTINIAN JUDAISM AND ITS ATTITUDE TOWARD THE JERUSALEM CHURCH FROM THE TIME OF THE MARTYRDOM OF STEPHEN DOWN TO THE APOSTLE PAUL'S FINAL VISIT TO JERUSALEM

1. Ἐφάραοι AND Ἑλπισται

Many scholars have been concerned about the relationship between the Jerusalem Church and contemporary Judaism in the history of the early Church before A.D. 66. They have asked how in spite of the serious persecution immediately following Stephen's martyrdom the original apostles who must have been the ultimate objects of the persecution and should have been the first to be seized could have remained in the vortex of persecution which had scattered all the congregation of the Jerusalem Church throughout the region of Judea and Samaria (Acts 8:1), and also how such a great persecution could have ceased shortly afterwards and in spite of all these persecutions the Jerusalem Church could maintain incredibly peaceful relations with hostile Judaism up to the fall of Jerusalem.
Indeed, it is very amazing that the Apostolic Council had not been disturbed at all by the non-Christian Jews and even before the Apostle Paul's last visit to Jerusalem the Jerusalem Church could achieve such a rapid growth as Luke mentions in Acts 21:20.

In his attempt to answer the critical question how the original apostles could have remained at Jerusalem during the persecution of Jews and how the persecution had ceased so soon and "the church throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria had peace and was built up" as Luke indicates in Acts 9:31, Goguel argues:

Reconstructing the development of the situation since Stephen's martyrdom, he contends that when the persecution took place, (contrary to Luke's account in the Acts), the Jerusalem Church had not yet grown up as a well organized institution that can be compared with the Jewish synagogue but merely consisted of a small group of people who continued to worship in meetings at each others' houses. In this situation, when the persecution took place, the Christians could avoid it so easily that it might have gone on without any contact taking place between the persecuting Jews of Judaism and the Jerusalem Christians. The persecution came to an end with the emigration of the Hellenists who were the very object of the persecution and from then on the church was able to grow rapidly.2

1 His Naissance, p.499.
2 See ibid., pp.500f.
But, despite his criticisms of the alleged compiler's failure in understanding the character of the persecution Goguel also could not give any satisfactory explanation. Furthermore, unlike F.C. Baur and others, Goguel does not seem to exclude the possibility of the persecution directed against the whole church regardless of the Hellenists and the Hebraists, but he asserts that with the emigration of the Hellenists not only the persecution came to cease but also the church began to grow up rapidly.

Then, what on earth was the character of the non-Christian Jews' persecution directed against the Hebraists who had been left behind at the emigration of the Hellenists, and what was the ultimate aim of the Jews' persecution? Goguel could not suggest any convincing explanation. More than anything else, his hypothesis defining the existential situation of the Jerusalem Church at the time of Stephen's martyrdom as at most a small minority group which continued to meet at each member's house (thus avoiding the non-Christian Jews' observation) is quite contradictory to Luke's account of the primitive Jerusalem Church in Acts 2:1-6:7. Before discussing the legitimacy of Goguel's hypothesis in detail, we should examine the definition of "Εβραῖος" and "Ελληνισταῖ" in Acts 6:1. Goguel argues that "... Bien qu'elle

---

ne soit pas directement attestée, l'interprétation d'après laquelle il n'y aurait eu entre Hellenistes et Hébreux qu'une différence de langue, reste la plus vraisemblable ...." But Schmithals connects the definition of 'Εφραιμικοί and 'Ελληνισταί far more positively with the character of the persecution. He argues that 'Εφραιμικοί indicates 'gesetzestreue Judenchristen' and 'Ελληνισταί 'gesetzesfrei lebende Christen' whether they were Jewish or Greek by origin and language. According to him, the persecution was directed only against these 'Ελληνισταί represented by Stephen who came forward as an antinomian because their pronounced antinomian attitude denied not only Israel's special relationship with God but also jeopardized the national existence itself by rejecting the Law as a whole.

He argues:

Hinter der lukanischen Formulierung, Stephanus schläge mit seinen Reden den Tempel und das Gesetz (Apg. 6,14), verbirgt sich demnach der Antinomismus der theologischen Einstellung des Stephanus."

---

1 His Naissance, p.191 against H.J. Cadbury who believes 'Ελληνισταί to be the Gentile converts in the Jerusalem Church [See his note "The Hellenists" in Foakes-Jackson and Lake (ed.), Beginnings, Pt.1, Vol.V, pp.59-74 and esp. p.69: "... The author is perhaps here for the first and nearly the only time distinguishing within the Church those who were formerly Jews and those who were formerly Gentiles ...."]. Cadbury's view was later rejected more specifically by C.F.D. Moule [See his "Once More, Who Were the Hellenists?" in ExpTim, 70 (1958/59), pp.100-102]. Also cf. Conzelmann, Apg., s.49: "... Die "HELENISTEN" sind Juden. Als solche sieht sie auch Lk; das entspricht seinem Geschichtsbild (noch kann kein Heide bekehrt sein) und entspricht der historischen Wirklichkeit. Eine heidenchristliche Gruppe ist in Jerusalem zu dieser Zeit noch nicht vorzustellen. Die Hellenisten sind Juden griechischer Muttersprache (gegen Beg V 59f.) ...."

2 Paulus, s.19.

3 See ibid., ss.18ff.

4 Ibid., s.19.
Here Schmitals seems to insist stubbornly that Luke had concluded that Stephen was a complete antinomian without even having examined the validity of the Jews' false accusations against Stephen. Can he apply the same logic to the Jews' false accusation raised against Jesus?¹ In his speech, Stephen proclaims that in the light of the divine history of God's salvation Jesus Christ is the only true Temple. Paradoxically, He is not only the invisible one but He also becomes the ultimate and visible consummation of this salvation history. In making this claim Stephen confronts those Jews whose ignorance gives rise to that self-righteousness which is inseparably tied to the visible Jerusalem Temple and he also demolishes root and branch the whole spiritual foundation of Jewish national existence based on the visible Jerusalem Temple.² Nevertheless, except for the fact that he is standing firmly in the teaching of Jesus³ and the tradition of the Old Testament prophets we cannot find any statement that can justify Schmitals' bringing the accusation of antinomianism against

---

¹ See Mt. 26:59-63. Also cf. Jn 2:19-22.

² We need also to make it very clear that there is no single textual evidence that would justify some critics' attributing this particular part of Stephen's speech to some time after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Cf. J.C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting* (London, 1961), pp.83ff. and esp. p.89: "... all the evidence shows that Stephen's theology of the Temple only arose after its destruction in A.D. 70. This is not the same as saying that Luke composed the speech out of his own head; on the contrary, he seems to have been using sources for his framework and, where he was forced to reconstruct, he did his best to give what a Hellenistic Jew would have said. There is no doubt that Stephen was martyred and that Luke possessed an account of the lynching. The theology of the speech and even the wording also come in some way from a source or sources, though it is doubtful if those sources go back to Stephen ...." Also cf. Loisy, *Naissance*, p.145 and Haenchen, *Apg.*., s.281.

Stephen. Besides, if Schmithals had not mentioned the attitude of Judaism toward the Temple and the Law as follows:

Die Aufhebung des Temples in der letzten Zeit durfte jeder Jude verkündigen. Selbst die Missachtung des gegenwärtigen Opferkultes war im Judentum nichts Ungewöhnliches. Das Judentum war längst keine Religion des Kultus mehr, sondern des Gesetzes.¹

he might have been able to connect clumsily Stephen's interpretation of the significance of the Temple with abolition of the Law. But, so long as Schmithals himself makes use of the above mentioned facts, he must suggest more positive evidences to justify his argument.

It is remarkable that Schmithals does not provide any convincing textual evidences for his hypothesis that Stephen's very antinomian attitude was the very cause of the Jews' persecution, but only suggests his unfounded hypothesis that Jews' accusation raised against Stephen in Acts 6:13f. belongs to the pre-Lucan tradition² as the sole foundation of his argument. After all, so far from examining the validity of the Jews' false accusation raised against Stephen, Schmithals is committing an egregious error when he charges Stephen with the same offence with which the Jews' false witnesses had charged him. But he cannot suggest any positive evidence that can prove the historical reliability of the Jews' false accusation in Acts 6:13f. as a pre-Lucan tradition. Therefore, all his arguments based on the hypothesis that

¹ His Paulus, s.13.
² See idem.
'Ελληνισταί' represented by Stephen were the extreme antinomians who separated themselves from the original Church even before the persecution with Stephen's martyrdom¹ should be refuted in our reconstruction of the historical situation of the Jerusalem Church.

But it is highly improbable to expect such an extreme and open split of the Jerusalem Church under the powerful leadership of the twelve apostles (Cf. esp. Acts 2:43ff., 4:32-5:16) shortly after the Holy Spirits' advent on the day of Pentecost. As Bruce indicates, the whole congregation had chosen these seven men of honourable reputation and ability as deacons.² Also it was a very wise decision made by the whole congregation of the Jerusalem Church for the sake of the satisfactory unity of 'Ἐβαπτισμοί', Jews who were natives of Palestine, and

¹ See ibid., s.10. Also cf. Loisy, Naissance, p.141f.: "... le premier groupe de croyants hiérosolymitains ne tarda pas à se dédoubler parce que son recrutement n'était pas homogène ... Les croyants hellénistes eurent bientôt leurs réunions à part et leur organisation propre ...." and p.142: "... les Sept n'ont pas été les auxiliaires des Douze, c'était le comité directeur du groupe helléniste une fois constitué à part ...."; Kümmel, „Das Urchristentum“ in TR, N.F., 17 (1948/49), ss.25f.: "... So sicher das frühe Vorhandensein einer in der Hauptsache aus hellenistischen Judenchristen bestehenden christlichen Gruppe in Jerusalem und ihr ebenso früher Gegensatz zu der strenger gesetzlich denkenden Mehrheit der Gemeinde ist, so wenig vermögen wir die Entstehung und Entwicklung dieser Spannung nachzuzeichnen; und auch das ursprüngliche Verhältnis der strengeren und der weniger strengen Richtung innerhalb der von Petrus und den galiläischen Jüngern geführten palästinisch-judenchristlichen Mehrheit der Jerusalemer Urgeeminde bleibt für uns ebenso im Dunkel wie die Rolle der sicherlich auch zur ältesten Gemeinde gehörenden in Jerusalem beheimateten Anhänger Jesu ...." and his Theologie, s.113: "...... der Bericht von der Wahl der hellenistischen „Sieben“ (Apg. 6,1ff.) verrät nach einer sehr wahrscheinlichen Annahme auch einen gewissen Gegensatz zwischen diesen beiden Gruppen der Urgemeinde ...."

² See his The Book of the Acts, p.128.
'Ελληνισταί', Jews who were from the Diaspora, under the guidance of the twelve apostles who were 'Εφραῖος. Particularly, it is noteworthy that Nicolaus, the Gentile who was a proselyte of Antioch, was also chosen by the congregation.

1 The habitual language of most 'Εφραῖος was without doubt Aramaic and that of most 'Ελληνισταί was Greek [Cf. Holtzmann, Apg., s.51; Weiss, Unchristentum, ss.119ff.; Lietzmann, History, Vol.I, p.70; Loisy, Naissance, pp.140f.; Conzelmann, Apg., s.49; Bruce, The Book of the Acts, pp.127f.; Williams, Acts, pp.95f.; Hanson, Acts, p.89; Haenchen, Apg., ss.253f.; and also Kümmel, Theologie, s.113]. Schmithals indicates the fact that the Apostle Paul calls himself 'Εφραῖος (See Phil. 3:5. Also see 2 Cor. 11:22: '"Epv. eίναν; καί ...''), but he should realize the difference between the Pauline context and the Lucan one. Luke's context in Acts 6:1 should be understood in the sphere of geographical division, but the Apostle Paul's in the sphere of his lineage.

2 We assume, as Loisy argues with great plausibility, those Hellenists' way of thinking and customs may have been somewhat different from the Hebrews' (Cf. Loisy, Naissance, pp.140f.). Nevertheless, these aspects should not be exaggerated. We believe the work of the Holy Spirit through the twelve apostles was powerful enough to tear down these insignificant human barriers and even the heart-breaking complaint made by some members of this poverty-stricken early community was completely dissolved by the whole-hearted response of the congregation to the apostles' instruction. It is, however, understandable that both the painful reality of poverty-stricken life and the twelve apostles' leadership full of the Holy Spirit have been repeatedly ignored by most modern theologians living on the fat of a land devoid of the work of the Holy Spirit. Also cf. Munck, Acts, pp.56f.: "... Attempts have been made to interpret the tension between Hebrews and Hellenists as a tension between Jewish and Gentile Christians or at any rate to see in the Hellenists a kind of preparation for the Gentile mission. This is wrong ... The church in Jerusalem was a Jewish Christian church with the salvation of Israel as its sole concern. The conflict between the two groups arose from differences over the support given to the widows. As mentioned above, this tension was resolved by the establishment of a committee made up of members of the congregation, who were to take over the duties of the social services, thereby relieving the apostles who had admitted that they could not cope with both the service of the word and with their task as well ...."
2. THE OBJECT OF THE NON-CHRISTIAN JEWS' PERSECUTION
FOLLOWING THE MARTYRDOM OF STEPHEN: 'ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΤΑΙ ALONE
OR BOTH 'Εβραϊς AND 'ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΤΑΙ?

The exegetical problem of Acts 8:1 ("... πλην των ἀντιστέλων") is most significant for our understanding the character of this persecution. Also Luke's indication of "... πλην των ἀντιστέλων" has played a decisive role in many scholars' establishing the hypothesis that Jewish persecution had been directed only against the antinomian 'ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΤΑΙ led by Stephen but not against the 'Εβραϊς, who had been opposed to the antinomianism of the 'ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΤΑΙ and who could remain unmolested.1

Concerning 'πλην των ἀντιστέλων', Bruce also believes that the apostles could remain at Jerusalem, partly because, "the popular resentment was directed not so much at them as at the leaders of the Hellenists in the church".2 Unlike others Meyer emphasizes the following fact:

This [πλην των ἀντιστέλων] is explained (in opposition to Schleiermacher, Schneckenburger, and others, who consider these statements

1 Cf. Julius Wellhausen, Kritische Analyse der Apostelgeschichte, Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, N.F., Bd. XV, Nro. 2 (Berlin, 1914), s.14: "... Die Verfolgung, die auf den Mord des Stephanus folgt, richtet sich nur gegen die Hellenisten und nicht nur sie zerstreuen sich. Nicht bloss die Zwölf bleiben in Jerusalem, sondern die hebräischen Christen überhaupt werden nicht behelligt...."
2 See his The Book of the Acts, p.175.
improbable) by the greater steadfastness of the apostles, who were resolved as yet, and in the absence of more special divine intimation, to remain at the centre of the theocracy, which, in their view at this time, was also the centre of the new theocracy. They knew themselves to be the appointed upholders and ἐπιτάγματιστοι (Oecumenius) of the cause of their Lord.\(^1\)

Even though we admit the apostles' indomitable will trying to fulfill their eschatological mission in this critical situation, in what way could they who should have been the first to be persecuted by the Jews of Judaism as the ultimate originators of all these tumults manage to remain at Jerusalem, the very midst of the whirlpool of persecution?

Without doubt, as Williams thinks highly probable,\(^2\) the apostles also had to hide themselves to avoid being persecuted by the hostile Jewish authorities and were in hiding at Jerusalem throughout the time of persecution. Does Luke necessarily have to say that the

---

\(^1\) H.A.W. Meyer, Acts, Vol. I, p.223. Also cf. Bruce, The Book of the Acts, pp.174f.: "... The twelve apostles remained in Jerusalem, partly no doubt because they conceived it to be their duty to stay at their posts ...." and Munk, Acts, p.71: "... the apostles alone remained behind when all the others fled ... If they were not allowed to leave Jerusalem until this promise [the promise of the Father in Acts 1:4f.] had been fulfilled, and if this unfulfilled promise were concerned with the conversion of Israel, that would explain why the apostles alone remained ...."

\(^2\) See Williams, Acts, p.114: "... Luke implies that the stricter Jewish Christian apostles were not affected, as were the Hellenists, by persecution, as though the observance of Temple worship safeguarded the apostles. On the other hand it may be that all the apostles fled and the last three words of vs.1 were added in view of vs.14; but more probably the Jewish-Christians went into hiding, either in Jerusalem or elsewhere ...."
twelve apostles who had shaken the whole of Jerusalem until then came to hide themselves suddenly to avoid the Jews' persecution in the context of the time when as yet the amazing experience of the work of the Holy Spirit was so vividly retained in the people's memory through these apostles? Despite all those severe ordeals of Jewish persecution beyond description the twelve apostles had firmly stayed at Jerusalem without escaping abjectly from Jerusalem to save their lives, and this is what Luke wishes to emphasize to his readers.

Luke's statement in Acts 8:1 should be supplemented by the Apostle Paul's confession in the presence of Agrippa II (Herod, son of Agrippa I and Cypros)¹ which incontrovectibly confirms the severity of the Jews' persecution directed against the whole Jerusalem Church with Stephen's martyrdom. The Apostle Paul's own account in Acts 26:10b strongly implies that other unknown numbers of the Jerusalem Christians besides Stephen were murdered by the Jews of Judaism.²

---

² Weiss argues that: "... Aber auch hier vermisst man genaue Angaben über die Rechtsgründe, über den weiten Verlauf und den Ausgang dieser Prozesse. Solche Verfolgung lässt sich auf dem Papier leicht malen, aber in der Wirklichkeit standen ihr erhebliche Hindernisse entgegen. Das Synedrium, das ja Hinrichtungen überhaupt nicht vollziehen durfte, musste sehr vorsichtig sein in der Austragung von Ketzerprozessen — der Prozess Jesu zeigt ja, wie schwer es war, dem Statthalter derartige Anklagen plausibel zu machen. Die römische Verwaltung sah ihre Aufgabe auch darin, die Bevölkerung gegen willkürliches Wüten der ihr parteiisch erscheinenden Obrigkeit zu schützen ...." (His Urchristentum, ss.123f.). But he is really committing a serious mistake trying to prove Luke's account to be unreliable on the assumption that the Jews of Judaism had been always composed enough to go through patiently all the due formalities of legal process under the rule of the Roman administration in their executing Christians. Stephen's martyrdom itself shows so clearly how Jews had murdered him on the spur of the moment and unlawfully [Goguel says "... le récit ne (cont.)
(continued from the previous page) permit pas de reconnaître si Étienne a été exécuté à la suite d'un procès régulier ou massacré au cours d'un mouvement populaire ...." (His Naissance, p.195). This admits the possibility of a lawful trial in regard to Stephen's death on the false historical assumption that the contemporary Sanhedrin possessed capital jurisdiction, including the power of execution. (See esp. Loisy, Naissance, pp.145f.: "... Il mourut lapidé, en vertu de la sentence rendue par le tribunal juif. Jusqu'à ces derniers temps, l'on a volontiers admis que le sanhédrin n'avait pas le droit de porter une condamnation capitale, ou tout au moins de la faire exécuter, sans la ratification du procurateur. Or, comme il n'est point parlé ici de Ponce-Pilate ni de son successeur, on suppose que le supplice d'Étienne aura eu lieu en dehors de toute forme et tumultueusement, ainsi que le donne à entendre la conclusion du récit. A quoi l'on ajoute souvent que le fait eut lieu probablement en l'an 36, dans le temps qui s'écoulait entre le départ de Pilate et l'arrivée de son successeur, comme si, en pareille occurrence, l'autorité romaine avait manqué de représentant. Il parait, au contraire, certain que le sanhédrin conservait une juridiction complète en matière religieuse sur les Juifs de Palestine et que sa compétence n'était limitée qu'en matière politique. La fausse perspective où les évangélistes ont placé le jugement de Jésus a contribué plus que toute autre cause à induire sur ce point la critique en erreur. C'est seulement après la ruine de Jérusalem que l'autorité religieuse du judaïsme a perdu, avec son conseil national, le droit de condamner à mort pour délit en matière de religion ..."), however, this assumption vigorously advocated previously by J. Juster in his Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain (Paris, 1914) (Cf. also Loisy's reference in his Naissance, p.146) could not obtain much support. We agree with A.N. Sherwin-White that the contemporary Sanhedrin under the rule of the Roman procurators had been allowed only 'a limited criminal jurisdiction, both for police purposes in the Temple area and for the maintenance of the Jewish law' [See Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament (Oxford, 1963, pp.41f.)] and even the exceptionally allowed right to execute any Gentile violator of the Temple including Roman citizens (See Josephus, War, V, v.2 and VI, ii.4) cannot be cited in support of Juster's assumption because, as Sherwin-White rightly retorts, "... if the Sanhedrin had the general right to execute offenders against the religious law, this special concession would not have been necessary. At best it proves nothing about its ordinary jurisdiction over Jews, because the concession concerns police powers over 'gentiles', not over Jews ...." (Roman Society, p.38) Even the Apostle Paul's account itself: "... ἀναρρογέων (when they were killed) τε αὐτῶν κατηγορόντα (Acts 26:10b) is vividly indicating that many Christians had been executed brutally without delay through summary conviction omitting all the legal process that could be expected in the contemporary lawful court under the rule of the Roman Empire. It is also quite clear that the Jews must have been prepared for some severe punishment by the Roman authorities in the worst case while they had been executing Christians in the defiance of the Roman authorities. Nevertheless, their religious zeal must have overcome their fear of the probable punishment by the Roman authorities.
It is quite remarkable that even the writing of the later Jewish Christians who had been without doubt standing firmly in the tradition of the Pharisaic extremists in the early Jerusalem Church clearly indicates that even those 'Ἐβραῖοι' who observed the Law strictly also had to escape from Jerusalem to avoid the persecution.¹

Therefore, we can say the argument that Jewish persecution following Stephen's martyrdom was directed solely against 'Ἑλληνισταί' is completely unfounded.²

¹ According to the so-called Ebionite Acts, while James the Lord's brother was making a speech instead of Stephen, 'homo quidam intimo' (Simon Magus whom the later Jewish Christians identified with the Apostle Paul) appeared with other Jews of Judaism and attempted to kill James by throwing him down suddenly from the highest step of the Jerusalem Temple. Persecution broke out and the Jerusalem Christians as a whole had to flee to Jericho carrying the half dead James (See Pseudo-Clement, Recognitiones, I. 70,1-71,2).

² On the foundation already discussed that if the persecution had been directed against the whole Jerusalem Church, the apostles who were surely to be the primary victims as we can see in Acts 12:1ff. could never have been spared by the persecutors, Goguel concludes that: "... le rédacteur, pour réduire la différence entre les deux groupes dans l'Église, a transformé assez maladroitement le récit en parlant d'une persécution générale ...." (See Actes, pp.195f.). But, as we have seen earlier, "... πάντες Ἰδιοκαταρρίπτοντες ... πᾶν ἡν τις τῆς εἰσπραγμένης " (Acts 8:1b) by no means reveals an 'intervention redactionnelle'. Also cf. Munck, Actes, p.71: "... It is hard to explain why the words in vs. 1b have been taken to mean that this persecution was only concerned with the Hellenists in the church. They all suffered persecution ...."
First of all, we should remember that Stephen was originally a Jew who was born and grew up in the Diaspora outside Palestine even though he was converted to Christianity and settled in Jerusalem later. Those who accused him from the beginning and played the decisive role in murdering him were none other than the Jews of the Diaspora who came to visit Jerusalem for their worship in the Jerusalem Temple. H.C. Kee and F.W. Young indicate in detail the morbid attachment of the Diaspora to the visible Jerusalem Temple. This attachment seems to have been part of their destiny:

The fact that they [the Jews from the Dispersion] were not from Palestine seems to have increased the importance that they attached to the Temple, since it provided them with a visible, durable, world-renowned symbol of the faith adhered to by only a small minority in the Gentile lands from which they came. When their Gentile neighbours regarded them as queer because of their refusal to be assimilated into Graeco-Roman life, the Dispersion Jews could always point with pride to the Temple at Jerusalem whose splendour, in spite of the absence of images, reminded the whole world of the enduring power of the religion whose followers refused to "bow down unto any graven image".

It is not so difficult to imagine what an unbearable shock Stephen's critical attack against the visible Jerusalem Temple gave to them.

---

As we have already seen from the Apostle Paul's attitude before his conversion,¹ the Diaspora Jews' zeal for the Law was by no means weaker than that of the Palestinian Jews.² On the contrary, the former was far stronger than the latter. It is also undeniable that this zeal of the Diaspora Jews gave rise to a conflict between a morbid and uncontrolled passion for the Jerusalem Temple on the one hand and a desire to adjust themselves to their delicate social status in the Gentile world on the other hand. In many cases this conflict was somewhat superficial and self-contradictory. How could those who would never permit others to speak against the Jerusalem Temple tolerate one who designated themselves as the very murderers who had killed the Son of God, the true Temple? It was this uncontrolled passion of the Diaspora Jews that had murdered Stephen.

Even during the time of persecution following Stephen's martyrdom, it seems quite improbable that the Diaspora Jews would have taken the initiative in persecuting the 'Ἑβραῖοι'. Their persecution must more probably have been concentrated on the 'Ἑλληνισταί'. But the situation of the Jews in Jerusalem including the authorities of the contemporary Judaism was somewhat more restricted by their recent experiences of the events surrounding the death and resurrection of Jesus.

¹ Cf. Gal. 1:13f.; Phil. 3:4-6; Acts 26:4f., 9-12, etc.
² Also cf. Markus, Roman World, pp.16f.
We used to commit the mistake of regarding all or most inhabitants of Jerusalem as Judaizers extremely zealous for the Mosaic law and ready to die to protect the law. But the majority of the Jerusalem population variously estimated between 25,000 and 95,000 were neither Pharisees nor Sudducees, but what is called 'the common people' (יָּשָׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל).

As Metzger indicates:

The antipathy of the Pharisaeic elite for the common people finds expression in John 7:49, where the designation "this crowd" is applied with scornful contempt to the ignorant masses who do not know the law. So deep-seated was the Pharisee's disdain for the people of the land, whom he regarded as immoral and irreligious, that he avoided as far as possible all contact with them. According to rabbinical law they were not to be summoned as witnesses, nor their testimony admitted in court. No secret was to be entrusted to them, nor should one of them be appointed guardian of an orphan. A Pharisee could not eat with an 'am ha-ares, and marriage between the two classes was condemned in terms of abhorrence (the Pharisees' judgement was that "their women are unclean vermin").

They were the so-called abandoned social out-casts deprived of all kinds of social privileges; and the Christian Gospel of Life had

---

1 Metzger estimates that the total population of Palestine in the first century was between 1.5 million and 2 million persons and of this number approximately 500,000 to 600,000 were Jews. According to him, more than ninety per cent of Palestinian Jews were this common people unaffiliated with any of the political parties or sects (i.e. the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Essenes, the Herodians, the Zealots) but the number of adult males belonging to the sect of Pharisees in the days of Herod the Great was slightly above 6,000 (See Background, pp.39-45).

2 Ibid., pp.45f.
infiltrated into the society of these untouchables regarded as being no better than beasts by the Pharisees and other privileged classes. At the same time, there were also many others who had never been allowed to join even this common people's society. In the light of Acts 2:41, 4:4, 5:14, 6:7, etc. we can realize that a lot of these untouchables and abandoned ones had been accepted into the early Jerusalem Church. This oppressed class, 'the flocks of lost sheep'\(^1\) abandoned by Judaism, was silent but made up the most powerful supporters of Christianity in contemporary society.

We also have to consider that the traditionally antagonistic relations between the Pharisees and the Sadducees not only in religious matters but also in political interests\(^2\) may have caused a lot of unexpected troubles in their establishing any unified and consistently systematic policy against Christianity which would be strongly supported by the silent majority.

Besides, as we can see in Acts 5:33-40, the leaders of the Pharisees at Jerusalem themselves were wrapped in great uneasiness and doubt in determining their attitude toward the Jerusalem Church. Gamaliel's discreet warning itself exactly reflects the extremely anxious mental state of the Pharisaic leaders in the presence of the

---

1 Cf. Mt. 9:36; Mk 6:34
powerful works of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, according to Acts 6:7, a lot of the priests of Judaism were converted to Christianity.

Accordingly, even though the Palestinian Pharisees and other Jewish authorities came to join the Diaspora Jews in their zeal for the Law and the Temple in persecuting Christians, from the beginning their persecution itself, which could not expect support from the majority of the inhabitants, could by no means overstep the inevitable limit under the rule of the Roman Empire. The persecution must have been carried out rapidly and making the most of the traditional Roman policy not to intervene in the Jews' religious problems unless any direct animosity was detected toward the Roman Empire itself.

Nevertheless, because of the consequent strengthening of the Roman authorities' surveillance and the departure of the Diaspora Jews, the prime movers in the persecution, from both Jerusalem and Palestine, the Jewish leaders could no longer persecute Christians openly as before. Soon after the persecution, the Jerusalem

---

1 Cf. Acts 5:39: "εἰ δὲ ἐκ θεοῦ ἐστιν, οὐ διαφέρεσθε καταλέγειν αὐτὸν, μὴ δὲ καὶ θεμίστως εὑρεθῇ ...."

2 Also cf. Hanson, Acts, p.104: "... The government of the Roman Empire was the most efficient that the world had up to then seen, and immensely impressed many even of those who benefited little from it, such as Josephus. But its police forces, in as far as it had any, were very inadequate, extremely inefficient by modern standards, and much more likely to punish a few individuals in a haphazard way after violence had been done than to take measures beforehand to prevent the violence. It is therefore quite easy to imagine an able man like Paul, armed with the fury of religious bigotry, conducting a minor and covert campaign of terrorism without attracting the serious attention of the authorities, especially if the Sanhedrin could represent him as simply enforcing local law upon local inhabitants who were not Roman citizens ...."
Christians came to regain their peace and, guarding themselves cautiously against another possible persecution, began to return to their homes. Despite the horrible persecution their faith was much more strengthened in their heightened expectation of the imminent Parousia.

With the lapse of time healing the wound the number of Christians in Jerusalem went on increasing remarkably. Even though they had to suffer again under the rule of King Agrippa for a while,\(^1\) the Emperor Claudius' decision to make Judea revert to its former provincial status under the direct rule of the Roman procurator by dispatching Cuspius Fadus after Agrippa's death\(^2\) had opened a new phase in the history of the early Jerusalem Church.\(^3\)

---

1 See Acts 12:1ff.
2 Cf. Lk. 12:21f. and Josephus, Antiquities, XIX, viii.2. The agreement of these two writers' accounts on the essential points (Agrippa in glorious attire was hailed a god at Caesarea, but impiously accepting this appalling flattery as his due, died suddenly in a great pain) is striking. But, the disagreements between the two writers on the details of the story are equally remarkable. To begin with, Josephus is undoubtedly giving much more detailed descriptions in regard to Agrippa's royal attire and its visual effect which eventually ensnares him to death by inviting divine retribution ('... σταλὴν ἐνδόῃ ἐκ ἀγαλμάτων ρομαίων ταῦταν, ὡς θανάτῳ ὄψιν εἶναι, παρῆλθεν εἰς τῇ θαλάσσῃ ἁλγέμενος ημέρας. Εἶναι ταῦτα πρώτως τοῦ κυρίαρχου ἀκινήτων ἐπιβολής ἐκ ἀγαλμάτων κατασκευῆς θανάτῳ ἀπόσταλε μαραθῶν τῷ φεβέρῳ καὶ τεῖς εἰς αὐτὸν ἀπενεύετο φρονήσεις ...'), whereas Luke does not show much interest in Agrippa's appearance [hence, simply describes: "... ἐνυψώσαμεν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ βασιλείαν ..." (v.21)] but is more concerned with his royal speech (which is completely ignored by Josephus and even Luke himself does not tell us what the specific message was) and the crowds' immediate response to it [considering the Lucan context in the light of v.20, we can safely assume that Agrippa's message was delivered in a soothing tone to the great relief of both Tyrians and Sidonians, and their subsequent shouts of "θανάτῳ καὶ σῶ ἀνθρώπῳ" (v.22b) were in fact neither spontaneous exclamations triggered off by the king's glittering robe nor mere (cont.)
2 (continued from the previous page) flattering tributes paid on this occasion, as can be inferred from Josephus' account, but the cries timely orchestrated for their peace with this king]. Besides, according to Josephus, shortly after his being hailed a god, Agrippa saw an owl (ὁ βουβλὼς) sitting on a rope over his head [Eusebius corrects this part of Josephus' text as follows: "... ἁνεκύφας δὲ μετ' ἐλήγον, τὴς ἑαυτοῦ κεφάλης ύπερκαβατόμενον εἶδεν ὁμηλον ..."

(History, II,x)] and, no sooner had he recognized this as an omen of his speedily approaching death than he felt unbearable pains in his heart and stomach. In contrast to Josephus' lengthy and quite emotional account of the subsequent development of affairs until his final death after five days, Luke reports very bluntly that he was eaten by worms immediately after being smitten by an angel of the Lord [Apart from Agrippa, Antiochus Epiphanes (See 2 Macc. 9:9) and, probably, Herod the Great (See Josephus, Antiquities, XVII, vi.5 and War, I, xxxiii.5) were also eaten by worms and died]. Furthermore, while Josephus says it was at a festival held in honour of Caesar that this incident occurred, Luke is recording that it was when Agrippa granted a royal audience to the Tyrians and Sidonians at their petition through Blastus his chamberlain. Thus, the disagreements between the two writers are far more conspicuous than their agreement and, at the same time, their almost equally informative accounts of the details of this incident strongly suggest that they do not depend on each other. As far as the present writer is concerned, it does not seem to be unreasonable to assume finally that the Tyrians and Sidonians were received in audience by Agrippa at the same festival mentioned by Josephus. In conclusion, Luke's account appears more original and reliable [In particular, considering the above-mentioned five days' suffering of Agrippa before his death together with the same writer's earlier account of a German prisoner's prediction concerning the future of Agrippa who was in chains at that time (See Antiquities, XVIII, vi.7: "... μυθομυθεύειν δέ, ὅποτε εἰσαθής τὸν ὄμιν θεάσαι τοῦτον, πέντε ἡμέραι διό θην τελευτήν ἑσμένην ..."), Luke's report of the instant death of Agrippa by worms (Codex Bezae adds 'ἐτι ἑων' after 'εἰσαθής τοῦτον', thus bringing the horror of this divine retribution to the climax) commends itself to the readers more easily than its counterpart clearly revealing a redactional touch of the writer himself who wished in good conscience to restore the honour of this wretched king. It was quite natural for Josephus unspiring in his over-enthusiastic praise of Agrippa (See Antiquities, XIX, vii.3) to have tried to relieve his favourite king of the same divine retribution that had befallen Herod the Great whom he utterly detested (See idem). Instead of condemning Josephus for having deliberately distorted the truth, we would rather say he could never convince himself that such an honourable king as Agrippa deserved the horrible divine retribution reported in the Acts].

3 Cf. Antiquities, XX, i.1 and War, II, xi.6. Also cf. Schürer, Geschichte, I. Bd., ss.564f.; Bruce, History, pp.319f.; and esp. W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem (Cambridge, 1925), p.179: "... The new ruler, Cuspius Fadus, showed no signs of favouring those elements in the country which constituted the chief danger to the Church. The more violent forms of nationalism were sternly repressed ...."
4. A NEW POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SITUATION CREATED BY THE
REVERSION TO THE DIRECT RULE OF THE ROMAN PROCURATORS
AFTER THE DEATH OF KING AGrippa

It is not so surprising that the Apostolic Council could be
held in Jerusalem without being disturbed by the Jews of Judaism.
The direct rule of the Roman procurator did not allow Jews to disturb
public order whatever pretext they might present to justify their
action. Under the administration of the Roman procurator, the more
unsettled the society became, the more strictly the Roman authorities
tightened the control of Jews' activity. And the Romans' control was
intensified more and more with the increase of tension between Romans
and Jews in Palestine. Thus, the return, after King Agrippa's death,
to the direct reign of the pagan authorities which was so objectionable
to the Jews came to bear entirely unexpected fruit in shielding
Christians from the future persecution of Jews.

Now, the Jews' remarkably increased resentment and hostility
toward the Roman Empire after the reversion to the direct rule of the
Roman authorities came to create a new political and social situation
in Palestine. Under the rule of Cuspius Fadus, the first Roman
procurator after the death of King Agrippa, the false prophet, Theudas,
incited Jews to join the Second Exodus from the Roman oppression and
led the crowd to the Jordan River. Fadus who regarded this tumult as
open mass rebellion against the Roman rule in Palestine dispatched a
squadron of cavalry without delay and slew many resisting Jews and
beheaded Theudas at the scene. The strained relationship between Jews and Romans worsened much more under the administration of Ventidius Cumanus through a series of unfortunate incidents. The Jews' riot caused by an insolent Roman soldier who deliberately insulted Jews from the porticoes of the Temple by showing his genitals (probably urinated) towards the Jews assembled to be served unleavened bread at Passover time ended with the massacre of twenty thousand Jews by Roman soldiers. The other incident was caused by another Roman soldier who was one of those dispatched by Cumanus to the villages to plunder and arrest the most eminent men in those villages in revenge for the robbing of Caesar's slave on the public highway near those villages by some rebellious Jewish revolutionaries. After plundering the villages a soldier brought out a copy of the Torah which he had found in one of these villages and tore it up uttering blasphemies in the presence of all Jews. The infuriated Jews gathered in large numbers and marched towards Caesarea to see Cumanus. Cumanus had to execute the soldier to prevent another uprising. The fight between Jews and Samaritans due to a Galilean pilgrim's being slain added more confusion to already worsened relationship between Romans

---


2 See Antiquities, XX, v.3. But in War (II, xii.1) it is said that more than thirty thousand (ἐνεκτὸς προς Ἀντιοχείαν) [In the light of PAM Lat. (Eus.), 'ten thousand' (τέκνα) also should be considered] Jews were killed. Anyway, Josephus is no doubt trying to conceal the Romans' ruthless holocaust. If not, he is extravagantly exaggerating the number of the victims. Cf. E.J. Goodspeed, Paul (New York, 1947), pp.163f. and S.G.F. Brandon, Jesus and the Zealots (Manchester, 1967), p.104.

3 See Antiquities, XX, v.4. Also cf. War, II, xii.2.
and Jews in Palestine. The subsequent disorder spread and ruthless suppression by large scale execution was carried on by the Romans throughout Palestine.\(^1\) Under the rule of Felix an abortive armed revolt, that had decisively aggravated the political situation in Palestine, took place. An Egyptian Jew stirred Jews to revolt and attempted to capture Jerusalem with his followers (probably most of them were Sicarii\(^2\)). The Egyptian Jew managed to escape but a lot of Jews were slain by Romans.\(^3\) It must have happened shortly before the Apostle Paul's last visit to Jerusalem.\(^4\) But the resistance by the Sicarii to Roman rule became bolder and bolder. They incited Jews to fight against Romans and executed not only those who cooperated with Romans but also those who refused to support their

---

\(^1\) Cf. Antiquities, XX, vi.1-3. Also cf. War, II, xii.3-5.


\(^3\) See Antiquities, XX, viii.6. Also cf. War, II, xiii.5. In regard to the number of the insurgents, there is a great gap between Luke's four thousand and Josephus' thirty thousand. But we do not necessarily have to conclude simply that Luke's figure is the more probable [Cf. Foakes-Jackson and Lake (ed.), Beginnings, Pt.1, Vol.II : Prolegomena II • Criticism (London, 1922), p.357; Bruce, The Book of the Acts, p.436; Williams, Acts, p.21]. According to the Roman tribune in Acts 21:38, these four thousand led out into the wilderness by the Egyptian Jew were all Sicarii ("... οἱ τετασκεκίλησις ἄλφηριν τῆν σικαρίιν") not common dupes. Therefore, we assume that these four thousand Sicarii did indeed form the most effective combat unit of the thirty thousand rebel force. Thus, the whole story of the Roman tribune can be easily fitted into Josephus' more detailed account. Nevertheless, we should not suppose that this thirty thousand rebel force including the four thousand Sicarii was composed solely of the inhabitants of Jerusalem at that time. This abortive insurrection must have been a rebellion on a national scale and shaken the whole nation.

movement. The horrible atmosphere produced by Sicarii is vividly described in the writing of Josephus:

> έτερων εἰδες ληστὰς ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ ἔπεφτε, εἰ καλοὶ ἤρθαν σικάριοι, μεθ' ἁμέραν καὶ ἐν μεση τῆς πέλει φολειτείς ἀνθρώποι.
> καὶ ἀλλ' ὑπερδύναμοι τῆς μάλιστα ἐκ τῶν ἐκτοις, κατεδρίσαν τὰ τά χάλα καὶ τοὺς ἐσφράν <u>ἐπερηπτέοντος</u> μικρῶν ἐθνῶν, τότε χέραι τοῖς ἐπιφυλακτοῖς, ἐπιτε τοῖς σωτέταις μέρος ἐσφίνετε περι.

1 See *Antiquities*, XX, viii.6. Analysing Josephus' account of the Zealot movement, S.G.F. Brandon concludes that this Jewish historian's embarrassingly hostile attitude toward the Zealots was due to two causes: first, Josephus, who was by nature cautious and calculating, was well aware of both the strength of the Roman Empire and the folly of challenging her dominion. Secondly, as the deserter who eventually surrendered to the Romans and became a client of the Imperial house, he was "uncomfortably conscious that the Zealots had sacrificed themselves and their nation, inspired by an uncompromising religious faith that he himself did not possess. In self-justification, therefore, he sought to misrepresent their motives." (See "The Zealots" in *Religion*, p.289. Also cf. "Josephus: Renegade or Patriot?" in *ibid.*, pp.298-309). But, if Josephus, foreseeing the irrevocable destruction of Israel as a nation by the Roman army and the ruthless retribution on the part of this mighty pagan empire with a view to stamp out the source of the unquenchable risings once for all, had come to choose the life of a quisling not simply for his individual welfare but rather for the far greater cause of protecting the moderate majority of his fellow-countrymen from the imminent holocaust by smothering the towering resentment of the Roman Empire against this rebellious nation, his painstaking attempt to try to make the Roman authorities distinguish the peace-loving majority from the minor rebels should be appreciated rather more positively. Therefore, the fact that the Zealots, most of whom were no doubt hot-blooded patriots in the eyes of Jews, were referred to as 'λησταί' ('bandits' or 'brigands') by Josephus cannot be interpreted one-sidedly as Brandon does (Cf. also his *ibid.*, pp.289ff.). Moreover, as we can see frequently in many revolutionary movements of our day, not a few of the so-called dregs of the contemporary Jewish society (namely beggars, slaves, and other idle villains) joined or rather took advantage of the Zealot movement [Cf. *War*, II, xiv.1, xvii.6 and 9. For the reference for such a social factor in the Zealot movement, cf. also J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, trans. by F.H. and C.H. Cave (London, 1969), pp.109ff., 116ff. and esp. 118f.] also should be taken into account.
On the one hand, the prevailing abuse of the Jewish Messianic hope, distorted by the various false political Messiahs, had unceasingly roused riots and tumults against the Roman rule and the Romans had pursued and massacred people ruthlessly. On the other hand, being faced with the armed Sicarii's intensified assaults on the Romans and the Jews supporting the Roman policy, the Roman authorities had to take all kinds of measures to root out the Sicarii's resistance all over Palestine. Consequently, the Roman authorities had to watch nervously every movement of Jews not only to lay bare the plot of the Jews hostile toward the Roman Empire but also to protect the other Jews who were cooperative toward the Roman rule in Palestine.²

¹ War, I, xiii.3.

² Considering "... the general custom of the Empire, which was largely based upon the necessity of preventing anti-Roman groups from eliminating the leaders of the pro-Roman factions in the cities by judicial action ...." (Sherwin-White, Roman Society, p.37), the Sanhedrin's jurisdiction over the Jews itself also must have come to be significantly restricted in practice by the Roman authorities stationed at Jerusalem. According to Josephus' account of the people's reaction to the high priest Ananus' murder of James, the contemporary high priests under the Roman procurators seemed to have been deprived of even the right to convene the Sanhedrin unless they had been granted the permission in advance by the procurators (See his Antiquities, XX, ix.1: "... τις δ' αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ἐπιστήμων καὶ τὴν Ἀλεξανδρέαν ἐπιστήμωτα καὶ διδασκάλωτα, ὥσπερ ἐγένετο καὶ Ἀνανίας τὴν ἑκείνην ἑγγύτην καθίσας κώμῃ συνήκειον ....") [Also cf. G.D. Kilpatrick, The Trial of Jesus (Oxford, 1953), pp.9, 18]. It is also quite
Under such circumstances, the plain fact is that it was no longer possible for the Jews of Judaism to persecute Christians. With the increase of Jewish resistance against the Roman Empire, the Romans no longer came to assume the attitude of onlookers toward the internal struggle among the Jews regardless of political and religious matters. The Romans came to realize how inseparably Jewish religion and political ambition were connected. Therefore, in the eyes of the Roman authorities who regarded Christianity as a mere sect of Judaism the non-resistant mild attitude of Christians was much more desirable in comparison with other hostile sects of Jews. Moreover, Christianity which denies any ambition for the worldly power was in striking contrast to Judaism which aspired to establish a Jewish Messianic Kingdom in this world. So long as the Roman authorities were firmly convinced that all Jews' resistance against the Roman Empire was directly connected with this worldly Messianic hope of Judaism, it is highly probable that Jewish persecution directed against Christians must have produced the impression that it was nothing but the preliminary operations of the radical Jewish party to consolidate a battle line against the Roman Empire. The aim was to get rid of the moderate party cooperative toward the Roman rule with a view to the more efficient conduct of a Jewish war of independence against Rome itself. From the viewpoint of the policy of the Roman rule in Palestine, the Roman authorities could not but protect positively the moderate party from the attack of the radical one.

2 (continued from the previous page) certain that all the progress of the meeting had been closely watched by the Roman authorities attending as observers.
Shortly before the Apostle Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, the practical situation of contemporary Judaism was more critical than at any other time before. Even the high priest Jonathan had been murdered by Sicarii and most Jews were also at a loss in the midst of continuous riot and tumult, the Romans' ruthless suppression through massacre, and the Sicarii's intensified armed revolt and plunder and assassination.

In the situation where the existence of Judaism itself had been continuously threatened and the nervous Roman authorities were ready to crush down any individual activity that was liable to develop into tumult or riot, how can we expect from the Jews such a bold persecution as was raised against Stephen and the whole Jerusalem Christians?

Nevertheless, in the very vortex of all this chaos and confusion, the Jerusalem Church continued to grow up more rapidly than at any time before and, finally, she came to secure 'ποιμήνικος' (Acts 21:20) of Jewish Christians zealous for the Law as James said.

Accordingly Goguel's question should be approached in this historical context but not in the sphere of such an unfounded hypothesis.

---

1 Cf. Antiquities, XX, viii.5. Josephus is indicating the fact that Felix had plotted against Jonathan's life and made the Sicarii murder him. Felix got rid of the high priest who got on his nerves and, at the same time, it is highly probable that he must have aimed to secure the maximum of efficiency in justifying the persecution of Sicarii and alienating Sicarii from the moderate Jews of Judaism.

2 See Naissance, p.499.
as follows: Goguel argues that the peace enjoyed by the Jerusalem Church after the departure of the Hellenists came to be disturbed again by the pillars' concessions to the Apostle Paul and Barnabas made at the Apostolic Council. He says that Agrippa I wished to give satisfaction to the Jews who were enraged at the pillars' concession by killing some leaders of the Jerusalem Church (Acts 12:1f.).

But, we should remember that this persecution had taken place under the rule of Agrippa I and the Apostolic Council was held under the direct reign of the Roman procurator after his death. And, as Luke explains, King Agrippa had killed James and attempted to kill Peter, too, only to win Jews' favour. Therefore, Goguel's conjecture

---

1 See *ibid.*, pp.503f. Also cf. Loisy, *Naisance*, p.182. "... On peut croir qu'il ne s'y décida pas de lui-même, mais parce que les autorités religieuses du judaïsme l'en avaient sollicité. Cependant, comme il régnaient depuis l'an 41, il est permis de se demander pourquoi les prêtres et le sanhédrin n'avaient pas eu plutôt recours à lui. Il est assez naturel de supposer que les succès de la propagande chrétienne en dehors de la Palestine commençaient à les inquiéter; peut-être même l'affaire d'Antioche, avec la solution qui y était intervenue, était-elle arrivée à leur connaissance et leur avait causé une particulière irritation ...."

2 Cf. Conzelmann, *History*, p.82: "... The death of Agrippa I in the year 44 apparently precedes the council ...."

3 Cf. Acts 12:1ff. Despite Josephus' statement extolling his pieties (See esp. *Antiquities*, XIX, vii.3: "... ἁγιείς πεθεράς ὀλιγαρχία ἐν τήν Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐν χρήσει μικρίᾳ δουλείας ἐγένετο, τον πάντας γενέσθαι ἵνα ἔχεις ἀγιείας εἶναι ἀρχηγός τῶν παρείδευσιν αὐτῷ τῆς νόμων ἀρχηγείας βουλῆς ...."), Agrippa was far from being a sincere believer and all his Pharisaic pieties performed in public were nothing but carefully calculated political gestures to woo his most troublesome Jewish subjects. Cf. also Schürer, *Geschichte*, I. Bd., ss.560ff. and esp. ss.560: "... Dass Agrippa's pharisäische Frömmigkeit Herzenssache war, ist nach seinem früheren Leben mehr als unwahrscheinlich. Wer fünfzig Jahre in Schlemmerei verbracht hat, von dem ist nicht anzunehmen, dass er am Abend seines Lebens aus innerem Trieb das pharisäische Joch auf sich genommen hat. Ueberdies haben wir die sichersten Beweise, dass des Königs jüdische Frömmigkeit (cont.)
should be refuted. He continues to argue that the Jerusalem Church could again enjoy peace with Judaism by transferring her leadership into the hands of James, who was a strict Jewish legalist, after Peter's departure from Jerusalem.¹ Even when the Apostle Paul was arrested during his last visit to Jerusalem, the Jews did not regard the Jerusalem Church as being associated with him.² Indicating "La protestation de ceux qui étaient le plus attachés à la Loi contre l'acte du grand-prêtre"³ made when the high priest Ananus had killed James the Lord's brother out of jealousy,⁴ Goguel arrives at the conclusion that:

le christianisme jérusalémite était considéré comme une secte juive que l'on ne songeait pas à exclure et que certains Chrétiens, au moins, jouissaient dans la ville d'une grande popularité.⁵

³ (continued from the previous page) nur bis an die Grenzmark des heiligen Landes reichte. Jenseits derselben war er, wie sein Grossvater, ein freigebiger Förderer griechischer Cultur ...." and ss.561f.: "... Aus alledem erheilt, dass seine Zugeständnisse an den Pharisäismus lediglich Sache der Politik waren ...." At the same time, such a character could hardly become a determined per¬secutor burning with the zeal to exterminate Christianity. This would partly explain why the Jerusalem Church had not been seriously disturbed until A.D. 44.

¹ See Goguel, Naissance, p.505. Cf. also Loisy, Naissance, p.182. But, Goguel (Loisy as well) could neither explain the transition of power structure in the Jerusalem Church nor the very reason of Peter's departure from Jerusalem.

² See his Naissance, p.505.

³ Idem. See also Antiquités, XX, ix.1: "... ἔστι δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπιθεμένως ταῖς κατὰ τὴν πέλαν εἰς ἑαυτήν καὶ περὶ τοὺς ἰδίους ἀκριβῶς μισεῖς χέφυγαν ἐπὶ τᾶς ἔτην ...."

⁴ Cf. further Brandon, Trial, pp.54f.

⁵ His Naissance, p.505.
Even J. Weiss argues that after the persecution connected with Stephen the Jerusalem Church came to realize that she had to remain loyal to the Law to maintain herself within the Judaism of Judea and for her own existence she came to have more and more conservative colour as time went on. He believes that in this situation James came to take up the leadership of the Jerusalem Church.1

As we have seen so far, in their ignorance of all the development of the contemporary political and social situations in Palestine, Goguel and others made a really preposterous mistake by admitting the possibility of peaceful co-existence of Christianity and Judaism in the very heart of Judaism. What is the significance of Jesus Christ as 'the stumbling stone'2 then? Why did the Jews have to cry out with a loud voice and stop their ears before stoning Stephen?3 How could they stand Stephen's saying: "... ὗδὼς ὀπίσω τῶν οὐρανῶν διηγήματος καὶ πέτων τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκ φερόν ἐστίν τις θεόν?"? Unless this stumbling stone had been removed, however strong a legalistic colour the Jerusalem Church might have had, contemporary Judaism could not but have stumbled over that stone, Jesus Christ. This

---

1 See Urchristentum, ss.124, 197f.
2 Cf. Rom. 9:32f.; 1 Pet. 2:6-8; Mt. 21:42; Lk. 20:17f.; Isa. 28:16 and also 8:14f.
3 See Acts 7:57.
4 Ibid., 7:56. Here, did the Jews stop their ears simply not to hear any more blasphemy (Cf. St.-Bil., II, s.684)? Such an instantaneous action can be taken spasmodically only by those who are completely overtaken by the utmost terror and perplexity.
stumbling stone can never be avoided. All but those who believe in this stumbling stone stumble over it. So long as the Jerusalem Church proclaimed the message of this stumbling stone, the Jews of Judaism could not but stumble over it. We can say that the Jerusalem Church did not proclaim the message of the stumbling stone and contemporary Judaism did not stumble over it. We cannot, however, ever say that the Jerusalem Church proclaimed the message of the stumbling stone, but contemporary Judaism did not stumble over it. The marked common characteristic of the attitude of those who stumble over this stone is to show utmost hostility not only towards this stumbling stone itself but also towards those who believe in this stumbling stone. This arises because their wicked heart cannot stand the proclamation of the stumbling stone, and still have no way of escaping from it. The only thing they can do is to make a vain attempt to silence by hook or by crook those who proclaim the message of the stumbling stone. We should keep in mind that even though the Judaizers in the Jerusalem Church could never shake off the morbid consciousness of their physical privilege as the chosen nation, they had not the slightest intention to beg mercy of Judaism by ceasing to proclaim the message of the stumbling stone. So long as they believed in the stumbling stone, they could not stop proclaiming the message of the stumbling stone even for a moment. Otherwise, they would also stumble over this stone and be crushed by it. Therefore the hypothesis put forward by Goguel and others that with the Jerusalem Church's having a more and more legalistic colour in the presence of

1 Cf. Mt. 21:44; Lk. 20:18.
Judaism, the Jews of Judaism came to regard her as one of its sects and allowed her the right to coexist without showing any hostility is the last argument to be justified in our reconstructing the historical situation of the early Jerusalem Church.

The peaceful existence and growth of the Jerusalem Church had been achieved at a very critical time when Jerusalem and all Palestine were in the throes of struggling with the utmost political and social confusion. Both the leaders of contemporary Judaism and common Jews in Judaism were in a situation where they could only stand by helplessly. Even the high priest Ananus' murder of James and the Jewish response to that murder cannot support the unfounded hypothesis of Goguel and others. Because this murder which had been committed, as Josephus indicates, out of jealousy of the Sadducean leader who could not have been supported by the Jews of Judaism at all though he had been appointed by the personal decision of Agrippa II, took place when the former Roman procurator, Festus, was dead and Albinus, the new procurator, was still on the way.¹ As we can see, only the temporary gap in the security arrangements of the Roman authorities allowed this exceptional incident to happen.² We do not know whether James and others were arrested by the authorities of Judaism

¹ See Antiquities, XX, ix.1.
² Cf. idem: "... Ἀρσινὲς δὲ πεισθεὶς τεῖς λεγενδάς γράφει μετ' ἐργῆς τῷ Ἀνανίῳ Δισεθναί παρ' αὐτῶν δίκαια ἀπειλῶν. καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀγrippᾶς διὰ τοῦτο τὴν ἀρχιερείαν ἀφελθέντες αὐτῶν ἄρσατο μάλις τρεῖς Ἰησοῦν τοῦ τοῦ Δαυίδος κατέστησεν ...."
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and brought before the high priest or whether they presented themselves without perceiving any serious danger. Considering the general situation at that time, the latter case is much more probable. James' fame in Jewish society at Jerusalem and the Jews' reaction to Ananus' hideous crime is quite understandable and convincing especially in the light of Luke's account in Acts 21:20.
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THE APOSTLE PAUL'S FINAL VISIT TO JERUSALEM AND ITS RELATIONS WITH THE DELIVERY OF THE CONTRIBUTION RAISED FOR THE JERUSALEM CHURCH

1. WAS THE CONTRIBUTION A CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATION LAID UPON THE APOSTLE AT THE APOSTOLIC COUNCIL?

C.H. Dodd argues that the contributions of the Gentile churches had been not only a moral obligation but a contractual one. Then, how could the Jerusalem Church still expect the Apostle Paul to perform

---

1 Also cf. Knox, Church of Jerusalem, p.183: "... It was agreed that Barnabas and Saul should be allowed a free hand in their dealings with Gentile converts ... In return it was to be understood that the Gentiles were morally bound to support the Mother-Church in its poverty by their alms, as they had already shown themselves willing to do. They would thus testify their loyalty to the Church from which they had learnt the faith, and their adherence to the doctrines which it taught, and also their admiration for that ideal of poverty, which was realized in practice at Jerusalem, though impracticable elsewhere ...."

that contract in the situation that the agreement at the Apostolic Council had been already onesidedly annulled by the Jerusalem Church? Before answering this question we need to examine another aspect very briefly. As we can see in Acts 11:27-30, the Antioch Christians had raised some contributions to help the Jewish Christians suffering from the severe famine in Palestine even before the Apostolic Council and the Apostle Paul brought the money to Jerusalem with Barnabas. It was the Apostle Paul's second visit to Jerusalem after his conversion.¹ Unlike J. Knox, who argues that the Apostolic Council was held in A.D. 51 and the Apostle Paul's final visit to Jerusalem was in A.D. 53 or 54,² most scholars believe that the Apostolic Council was held in A.D. 48 or 49³ and the Apostle Paul's last visit was in A.D. 58 or

² (continued from the previous page) werde, zumal da solches z.B. in Antiochia schon geschehen war ...." (His Apg., ss.102f.). Now, here, if we follow Holtzmann's argument (Also cf. Knox, Church of Jerusalem, p.183: "... Their generosity would render it difficult for the Christians of Jerusalem to raise any very effective demand for the circumcision of all Christians, while the latter would benefit by the prayers and piety of those who had made a far greater progress in Christian holiness than the ordinary Gentile convert was normally able to do ..."), the Apostle Paul's attitude toward this matter was from beginning to end something which we could never expect from the very man who had walked so honourably in Christ. What kind of character does Holtzmann (and others) think the Apostle Paul was? In his view, the Apostle was trying to take full advantage of the misery of the poverty-stricken Jerusalem Christians in a most contemptible way. Would it be too much to say that we do really regret all the efforts of Holtzmann (and others) in trying to pull down the Apostle Paul's personality to the very level of his own degenerate one?


respectively.\(^2\) Besides, when the pillars asked the Apostle Paul and Barnabas to remember the poor in Judea, we suppose they did not mean that they were expecting the Gentile Christians' help only in time of great famine. They were in constant need of Gentile Christians' financial support as Calvin indicates:

This extreme poverty may have been caused partly by the various calamities that befell the whole nation and partly by the cruel rage of their own countrymen by whom they were daily stripped of their goods.\(^3\)

But, in regard to the Apostle Paul's collection of the contributions from the Gentile churches to bring to Jerusalem, J. Knox argues that it was "... neither a recognized custom nor an activity with a precedent, but a unique undertaking. Paul nowhere appeals either to a previous practice or to a previous effort ..."\(^4\) Then, if collecting the

\(^1\) A.D. 58 (K. Wieseler, A. Brassac, Th. Zahn, J.B. Lightfoot, H. Daeschel, E. Renan, J.E. Belser, A.A. Steinmann, M. Goguel, B.M. Metzger); A.D. 59 (R. Cornely, H.H. Wendt, C. Clemen, B. Weiss, G. Ogg); A.D. 58/59 (A. Sabatier, A. Jülicher). W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam believe the Apostle Paul wrote the Epistle to the Romans "during the winter 57-58, or early in the spring of the year 58" (Romans, xiii). Also cf. Dodd, Romans, xxvi: "... the most probable date for the Epistle to the Romans is in the first quarter of A.D. 59 ...."


\(^3\) Gal., Eph., Phil. and Col., p.33.

\(^4\) Chapters, p.57.
contributions had been a contractual one, as Dodd and others argue, laid upon the Apostle Paul as an obligation, we cannot help arriving at the very conclusion that the Apostle Paul had been neglecting to perform his solemn contract with the pillars for more than nine years at least. Was it because the Apostle Paul had come to feel no necessity to perform the contract since the incident at Antioch and all the more with the intensified Judaizers' campaign against him? Dodd says "But even so the moral obligation remained". 1 After such a long neglect as nine or ten years? In the view of Dodd and others, what kind of mentality did the Apostle Paul possess?

First, the charity collection was by no means an obligatory contractual one but a voluntary gift of love. 2 Secondly, the Apostle Paul never unnecessarily boasted of what he had done for others and, without doubt, was the last man to be able to look on the miserable condition of his poor fellow countrymen with folded arms because of his aggravated relations with the Jerusalem Judaizers. Even before the time when the pillars asked him to remember the poor in Judea, the Apostle Paul had already been eagerly doing his best to help them. 3 Therefore, even though we cannot find out when and how the Apostle Paul had been delivering the charity collection to the poor in Judea, the Apostle Paul and the Gentile Christians must have delivered the charity

1 Romans, p.232.
2 Cf. Weiss, Urchristentum, s.201.
collections at least several times during the last nine or ten years' time even if the Apostle Paul himself could not bring the money to Judea in person.

2. **DID THE APOSTLE BRING THIS CONTRIBUTION PERSONALLY TO JERUSALEM AIMING AT MAKING THE MOST OF IT FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF HIS AGGRAVATED RELATIONSHIP WITH THE JERUSALEM CHURCH?**

As we have seen already, the irrevocably aggravated relationship between the Apostle Paul and the Jerusalem Church through the incident at Antioch forces us to view this matter in a new light.¹ We suppose, if the Judaizers of the Jerusalem Church had still been expecting such a financial support even after the incident at Antioch, they must have expected it directly from the Gentile churches without intervention of the Apostle Paul or at least only from those Gentile Christians who were willing to follow their Judaizing line. Because,

---

¹ Despite his completely distorted reconstruction of the Lucan context in regard to the Apostle Paul and his consequent failure in understanding the Apostle Paul's lifelong struggle against the Judaizers of the Jerusalem Church [Cf. G. Klein, *Die Zwölf Apostel: Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee* (Göttingen, 1961), ss.38-49, 114-192, and esp. ss.210-216 along with his „Galater 2,6-9 und die Geschichte der Jerusalemer Urgemeinde" in *ZTK*, 57 (1960), ss.275-295 and his „Die Verleugnung des Petrus: eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung" in *ZTK*, 58 (1961), ss.285-328], Klein managed at least to appreciate the significance of the 'Machtverschiebung' from Peter to the Lord's brother and the probable rejection of the contributions by this intransigent leader [See his *Verleugnung*, s.321].
if they came to accept the contributions collected through the Apostle Paul's positive intervention, it would mean that the Jerusalem Church acknowledged his apostleship. Moreover, if the Apostle Paul were to bring the contributions of the Gentile churches to Jerusalem in person and the Jerusalem Church came to accept them from his hands, all the Judaizers' painful campaigns aimed at denying his Gospel and apostleship which the Judaizers had so far waged against the Apostle Paul would immediately come to nothing and the Apostle Paul's position as the apostle for the Gentiles would be consolidated all the more. Such a result must have been what the Jerusalem Judaizers dreaded most even though they were in urgent need of the financial support from the Gentile churches. We cannot say that the Apostle Paul himself could not perceive this dilemma of the Jerusalem Judaizers. Then, did the Apostle Paul plan to visit Jerusalem in person bearing the possibility of the desirable outcome of this visit in mind, as Knox argues,\(^1\) despite all his ominous presentiments?\(^2\) But, more than anyone else, the Apostle Paul himself knew so clearly that the Judaizers would never accept the contributions as a peace offering as Knox conjectures.\(^3\) In

---

\(^1\) See his *Chapters*, p.57: "...Paul felt he must at all costs carry it himself to Jerusalem. He must dramatize and make fully effective its significance as a peace offering on the part of the Gentile churches, of which he was the head and the symbol ...."


\(^3\) See his *Chapters*, p.54: "...he hopes that this offering will have the effect of bringing peace to the church, of healing the terrible schism between Jerusalem and the Gentile churches (at least his churches) which has distressed him and has embarrassed and impeded his work for a long time ...." Also cf. Brandon, *Fall of Jerusalem*, p.150: "...we see Paul himself first hesitating and then deciding to take the alms personally to Jerusalem ... the hostile activity of the emissaries of the Jerusalem Church continued to grow in effectiveness, so that Paul's position in his own churches at last became untenable and he was obliged to decide on a desperate solution. This (cont.)
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1. THE JEWS OF THE CONTEMPORARY JUDAISM OR THE JUDAIZERS OF THE JERUSALEM CHURCH?

In his ignorance of the irreconcilable confrontation between the Jerusalem Judaizers and the Apostle Paul, Haenchen believes that the leaders of the Jerusalem Church really suggested the Apostle purify himself together with the four Nazirites and pay the expenses for their redemption (Acts 21:23f.) in their sincere wish that they might break neither with the Pauline Gentile churches nor with contemporary Judaism in Palestine.¹ To this suggestion the Apostle Paul willingly agreed and thus the unity between the Jerusalem Church and the Gentile churches came to be preserved. Nevertheless, the Apostle had to stay longer at Jerusalem for this purpose (otherwise he could have safely left Jerusalem) and the catastrophe struck him.² Not to mention his

---

¹ See his Apg., s.587.
² See ibid., s.588.
misunderstanding of the situation of the contemporary Judaism in Palestine, even the Apostle Paul's arrest took place much earlier than Haenchen thinks. According to him, the Apostle came to be arrested when the seven days were about to be completed. Then, the whole Lucan chronology in Acts 21:17-24:1 directly contradicts the Apostle Paul's own affirmation in Acts 24:11: "εὐθυγράμμως δὲ εἰπών ἔστω αὐτὸν οἰκείον εἰς τὸ ἡμέραν ἐκείνον ἵνα ἄνευντες προσκυνήσῃ εἰς Ἰεροσολύματα." But, if we translate 'ἐμελλεν ... ἐπιτελεῖτον,' (Acts 21:27a) as 'were going to be completed' and thus assume that

---

1 See idem. Thus also KJV, RSV, NEB. The seven days' period for the vow of a Nazirite (Cf. Num. 6:1-20) reported in our text caused some exegetical difficulties. Loisy suggests that the redactor was badly informed about the conditions of the vow of a Nazirite and supposed the vow needed only seven days instead of thirty (See his Actes, p.805). Loisy, however, assumes the Apostle Paul had already made his vow of a Nazirite on leaving Corinth [Cf. Acts 18:18b] and connects this with the purification ceremonies which he underwent together with the four men at Jerusalem (See ibid., pp.804f. and his Naissance, p.211. Also cf. Goguel, Actes, p.298). We do not know exactly how long those four men had been under the vow by the time of the Apostle Paul's arrival at Jerusalem. It appears those four men, irrespective of the days that they had already spent under the vow, had to consecrate themselves for another seven days entirely for the sake of the Apostle Paul who came to join them on his return from the unclean Gentile world outside the Holy Land (According to Num. 6:9f., if anyone under the vow of a Nazirite happens to defile his consecrated head, he should shave his head on the seventh day and bring two turtledoves or two young pigeons to the priest on the eighth day. Also see Mishnah, Nazir, vi.6). Thus, both the Apostle Paul and those four men whose expenses the Apostle had to pay were going to discharge their vows on the same day. Therefore, we should not read either Luke's ignorance (Cf. Hanson, Acts, p.211) or the unknown redactor's poor knowledge (as Loisy suggests) of the vow into Acts 21:27a.

2 Also cf. Goguel, Actes, pp.308f.

3 Also cf. Arn.-Gingr., p.502; Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p.394: "... 'When the seven days were going to be fulfilled'; the following events took place at the beginning, not at the end, of the seven days ...."
the Apostle was arrested on the very day when he purified himself and went into the temple, the Apostle's own affirmation in Acts 24:11 fits perfectly into the Lucan chronology without any trouble. Was it really by accident that some Jews from Asia recognized the Apostle Paul as soon as he entered the temple? We receive the impression that these Jews from Ephesus\(^1\) had already been waiting in ambush for the Apostle. Was it really a strange coincidence that James' remark on the slanderous rumour about the Apostle Paul spread among the extreme Jewish Christians at Jerusalem (Acts 21:20-22) so resembled the Asian Jews' cry in Acts 21:28a? Besides, the Apostle Paul must have been accompanied by some leaders of the Jerusalem Church at that critical moment. And it is also highly probable that there must have been not a few Jewish Christians at the scene of that tumult. But, none of them tried to check the Asian Jews' behaviour. If the Jewish Christians of the Jerusalem Church had attempted without delay to advocate and defend the Apostle Paul against the slander of some Diaspora Jews,\(^2\) the turmoil would not have developed into such an

---


\(^2\) When Loisy assumes: "... des Juifs d'Asie, qui l'avaient rencontré en ville avec Trophimus d'Ephèse, le voyant dans le saint lieu, crient à la profanation, croyant ou feignant de croire qu'il a introduit un incirconcis dans les parvis réservés ...." (His Naissance, p.212), he seems to reckon that probably those Diaspora Jews really believed that the Apostle Paul had brought an uncircumcised Gentile into the inner court of the temple. It was not, however, on the day chosen for the liberation of the vow, as he supposes (See idem), but was on the second day after the Apostle's arrival at Jerusalem that this tumult occurred. Therefore, it was the first time that the Apostle Paul went into the temple since his arrival at Jerusalem. Then, those Asian Jews should have seized Trophimus as well, so that their accusation brought against the Apostle might be completely justified. If Trophimus had accompanied the Apostle Paul into the temple, how could those Jews have allowed him to go free while they were condemning the Apostle to death because of him? This means those Jews from Asia had never seen the Apostle Paul bringing Trophimus into the temple. If
uncontrollable situation that all the city was aroused (Acts 21:30), moreover, Luke, who emphasizes throughout the Acts the perfect unity which unchangeably existed between the Apostle Paul and the Jerusalem Church despite the transference of her leadership from Peter to James, would never have failed to mention such a favour of the Jerusalem Christians done for the Apostle Paul in his effort to strengthen the unity between the Jerusalem Church and the Gentile churches, especially those founded by the Apostle Paul himself. To our great disappointment, however, the Jewish Christians of the Jerusalem Church seemed to have simply stood by throughout this tumult without lifting even a finger to help the Apostle Paul who was about to be stoned to death before their very eyes. Why?

2. THE PECULIAR SILENCE OF LUKE ON ANY PROBABLE REACTION OF THE JERUSALEM CONGREGATION TO THE APOSTLE'S ARREST AT JERUSALEM

It is equally remarkable to see that Luke is again completely silent about any probable Jerusalem congregation's endeavours to appeal

2 (continued from the previous page) they had been telling the truth, they also should have produced Trophimus himself in support of their accusation. If those Jews had never doubted the truth of their accusation brought against the Apostle, who on earth had made these Diaspora Jews burning with love of the holy temple believe this hideous slander to be true? Above all, those Jewish Christians including the leaders of the Jerusalem Church who were at the scene knew how groundless that accusation was but refused to open their lips. What a treacherous silence!
to the Roman authorities to release the Apostle Paul.¹ Even during his two years' imprisonment at Caesarea, we hear nothing about James' visit to this Apostle in chains or about any Jerusalem Christian's brotherly gesture made to this man who had spared no pains to help his poverty-stricken fellow countrymen. Indeed, since the day of his arrest in the temple court, the Jerusalem Church seemed to have nothing to do with the Apostle Paul. The Jerusalem Church leaders' attitude toward the Apostle Paul in chains is in such a sharp contrast to their warm reception of him on the first day of his arrival at Jerusalem along with the delegates of the Gentile churches on their mission to deliver the contributions that we cannot but seriously question whether there was any sincerity in James' proposal made to the Apostle Paul.²

¹Also cf. Goguel, Naissance p.346; Bruce, The Book of the Acts, p.432; J.D.G. Dunn, Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity (London) 1977), p.256. But, despite their unanimous curiosity about this peculiar silence of Luke, none of them seems to understand its significance. Dunn, for example, asks: "Where were the Jerusalem Christians?" Then, he answers his own question by concluding: "It looks very much as though they had washed their hands of Paul, left him to stew in his own juice. If so it implies a fundamental antipathy on the part of the Jewish Christians to Paul himself and to what he stood for." (See idem). In contrast to such an innocent comment made by Dunn, we are more than perplexed by the devout warning given by Bruce: "We have no evidence that the Jerusalem Christians bestirred themselves in Paul's behalf after his arrest in the temple court or during his subsequent imprisonment; but we must not press such an argument from silence." (See his The Book of the Acts, p.432, n.38). Is he afraid to take the inevitable consequences following the open-minded inquiry into the most treacherous conspiracy in the history of the Christian Church?

²Cf. Goguel, Actes, pp.298: "... Paul est obligé de séjourner à Jérusalem tout le temps que réclame l'exécution de son vœu; pendant tout ce temps il sera en danger. Pour qu'il ait au moins chance de passer inaperçu on lui propose de s'associer à d'autres nazirs pour lesquels il fera les frais du sacrifice. Fondu dans leur groupe il risquera moins d'attirer l'attention. Cette hypothèse laisse subsister dans le récit actuel une incohérence frappante. Les chefs de la communauté jérusalémite signalent à Paul un danger, au du moins une difficulté à laquelle il risque de se heurter du côté des judéochrétiens et, pour parer à ce danger, ils lui proposent une mesure qui se montrera efficace vis-à-vis des Juifs ...."
Was it truly a sincere counsel for the unity of the Jerusalem Church and the Pauline Gentile churches or in fact a cunningly set trap for this Apostle to the Gentiles? The whole development of the affairs at Jerusalem after the Apostle Paul's arrest strongly suggests that the latter was exactly what James had really meant. It also confirms

1 With respect to James' proposal and the subsequent acceptance of it on the part of the Apostle Paul, Brandon gives the following interpretation: "... Paul's move embarrassed the Jerusalem leaders, but their head, James, was more than a match for Paul in astuteness, and he proposed the test which was designed to put Paul in a fatal dilemma. If he refused to give this proof of his orthodoxy, then he was in effect declaring himself an apostate from Judaism and thus would merit excommunication. On the other hand, he had come to Jerusalem, with a delegation of his converts, as the champion of Gentile right to full participation in the new faith; if, therefore, he submitted to the order of James and provided evidence of his orthodoxy, his position in the eyes of his Gentile followers would be gravely compromised, for they would know that he, their champion, recognized his subordination to the Jerusalem authorities and proclaimed his adherence to the doctrine of the essentiality of Judaism by the performance of an obscure Jewish ritual act. For Paul the dilemma was inescapable. For all his gospel of the sufficiency of faith in Christ, he had illogically continued to recognize the claims of Judaism upon a Jew, and now that he was faced with the consequences of this fatal weakness in his logic, he obviously felt that he could not formally repudiate his national faith and accordingly submitted to his opponent's astute demand ...." (Fall of Jerusalem, pp.150f.). But, Brandon's reconstruction of this critical context in the Apostle Paul's relations with the Jerusalem Church goes badly astray both because of his failure in understanding the exact character of James as the arch-enemy of the Apostle Paul and because of his superficial knowledge of the Apostle Paul's missionary principle — not to mention his ludicrous misconception of the Apostle's personality. Was this Apostle to the Gentiles worried about the possible excommunication by the contemporary Judaism? Besides, did the Apostle's acceptance of James' proposal in good faith for the unity of the Gentile churches standing in his Gospel and the Jerusalem Church contradict his everclear principle: "\'Ελεγξας γάρ τιν, οὐκ ἐν πάντας, ἀλλ' ἐν ἑκάστῳ. ἦν τοῦ πολλοῦ κεφάλης καὶ εἰρήκθη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἡ εἰρήκθη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, η εἰρήκθη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, η εἰρήκθη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις. ἦν τοῦ νόμου ὡς ὁ νόμος, η εἰρήκθη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, εἰρήκθη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, εἰρήκθη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ἦν τοῦ νόμου ὡς νόμος, η εἰρήκθη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ἦν τοῦ νόμου ὡς νόμος, ἦν τοῦ νόμου ὡς νόμος, η εἰρήκθη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ἦν τοῦ νόμου ὡς νόμος, η εἰρήκθη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ἦν τοῦ νόμου ὡς νόμος, ἦν τοῦ νόμου ὡς νόμος." (1 Cor. 9: 19-22)? Thus, Brandon is completely missing the heart of James' kind proposal.
that the antipathy of the Judaizers of the Jerusalem Church to the Apostle Paul was far stronger than most modern New Testament students imagine.

As we have already seen in the previous chapter, the Jews of the contemporary Judaism were placed in the situation in which they could never be composed enough to continue making a desperate effort to get rid of the Apostle Paul. Moreover, they were so fully aware of the stern reality that the Roman authorities were never ready to allow any rash and thoughtless action that may be developed into a serious tumult which would aggravate the already utterly unstable contemporary situation all the more. The rapid growth of the Jerusalem Church itself under the direct rule of the Roman procurator in which the Jewish authorities' power was strictly controlled clearly proves that the authorities of contemporary Judaism could no longer threaten the Jerusalem Church by abusing their traditional status in the Jewish society. It is thus natural that in circumstances where the leaders of Judaism could not but stand by helplessly in face of the Christians' proclaiming the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the common Jews of Judaism were by no means ready to dispute about the Gentiles' freedom.

It was the Judaizers in the Jerusalem Church not the Jews of contemporary Judaism that had been making desperate efforts to get rid of the Apostle Paul. They had been already too powerful to be threatened by the helpless contemporary official Judaism which could
not expect any powerful support at all from the majority of the inhabitants in both Jerusalem and Palestine.

After the incident at Antioch, they had come to be firmly convinced that they had to remove the Apostle Paul who was the very obstacle destroying unceasingly and decisively the unity of all churches under the leadership of ONE MOTHER CHURCH at Jerusalem as soon as possible. We do not think that the Apostle Paul was unaware of such a plot of the Judaizers in the Jerusalem Church. The Apostle must have been fully aware that the Jerusalem Judaizers would still try to get rid of him at all costs even though he would bring the contributions for relieving hunger among those poverty-stricken fellow Christians at Jerusalem. From the Judaizers' point of view, Paul should be removed by fair means or foul. Besides, for the achievement of their aim, the first necessity was that Paul should somehow come to Jerusalem in person. To decide whether they must accept the contributions or not and how to dispose of the contributions was a secondary matter of concern. Nevertheless, James and other Jerusalem Judaizers were so clearly aware of the undeniable fact that if they would remove Paul with their own hands, all the Gentile churches would turn their backs on the Jerusalem Church and show an utter antipathy against them. The occurrence of such an unwelcome situation would surely inflict an incomparably fatal loss on the Jerusalem Judaizers in comparison with the benefit which could be got through the removal of the Apostle Paul. Accordingly, if Luke's account in Acts 21:27ff. is correct, the Jerusalem Judaizers
must have cunningly incited the Diaspora Jews from Asia\(^1\) to kill the Apostle Paul by stirring up other radical Jews of Judaism. It is also quite natural that the Jerusalem Judaizers led by James had never made any effort to negotiate for the Apostle Paul's release after his arrest.

Now, it becomes very clear that, when the Apostle Paul says in his Epistle to the Romans: "Παρακαλῶ ἐν ἐμοὶ [ἀδέλφῳ, ...] ... σωματικῶς ἐμὲ ἐν τῷ πρὸς ἔχων ἐκείνῃ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. Ἰησοῦς Παῦλον ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδιστίτων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, ...." (16:30-31a), he is obviously having the Judaizers of the Jerusalem Church on his mind. Then, if the Apostle had been really aware of such an irreparable hostility of the Jerusalem Judaizers, why did he still try to visit Jerusalem in person?

\(^1\) We should give attention to the fact that the Jerusalem Jews of Judaism were neither concerned about the Apostle Paul's visit to Jerusalem nor ready to open hostilities until the Diaspora Jews began to cry out against the Apostle Paul with slanderous false accusations. Luke's account in Acts 21:29 and 24:17f. clearly testifies to the undeniable fact that Jews of Judaism did not show any direct hostility toward the Apostle Paul and his party though they saw him in the city and, later, even in the temple (See *ibid.*, 24:18: "ἐν αἷς ἐκείνης ἢ μὴ ἀδιστίτων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδ., εἰ μὲν ἔχον εἰς τὴν θεράπου"). Mingling with the four men under the vow, the Apostle Paul could easily pass unnoticed by the non-Christian Jews, however, he was constantly watched by the Judaizers of the Jerusalem Church until that fatal moment. Furthermore, the Diaspora Jews' failure to appear in court (See *ibid.*, 24:19) strongly suggests that they had been bribed by the leaders of the Jerusalem Church to stir up other Jews in the temple. Though we admit the serious corruption that had prevailed among the leaders of the contemporary Judaism, if they had happened to know about such a deal made between the Jews of Judaism and the Jerusalem Christians, would even the Diaspora Jews have gone unpunished? If the leaders of the Jerusalem Church had spent part of the contributions of the Gentile Churches to bribe those Diaspora Jews, the Apostle Paul after all had done nothing but made porridge and given it to dogs.
G. Bornkamm argues that it was because the Apostle Paul wished to carry out his future missionary work "nicht als ein Freibeuter, sondern im Einverständnis mit der Urgemeinde". But, the antagonistic relations between the Apostle Paul and the Jerusalem Judaizers were already too much aggravated to hope for such an optimistic result. Considering Luke's accounts in Acts 20:22f. and 21:4, 10-14, the Apostle Paul must have been ready to accept the chain of his unavoidable fate at Jerusalem. What does "καὶ νῦν ἴδε: ἐδεχόμενος ἐμὴν προέλευσιν ἐις Ἰερουσαλήμ,..." (Acts 20:22) mean?

In his constant expectation of the imminent Parousia, the Apostle Paul believed that he did not have enough time. He wished to go on to Spain, the very end of the world, by all means to proclaim the Gospel of Jesus Christ even there before His Advent, the Parousia. At the same time, he saw the unyieldingly towering vigour of the Judaizers' campaign against all the young Gentile churches by unceasingly perverting the Gospel of Jesus Christ after his departure toward Spain. Whether the Judaizers were setting a deadly trap to remove him as he had anticipated or would merely snort at him at the best, the Apostle Paul had to visit Jerusalem Church in any case. No matter what the result would be, he had to appeal with all his might and main once for all to a spark of conscience in the depraved Judaizers.

---

1 His *Paulus*, s.107.
But, why does he mention such a thing, even though he is saying it in a quite roundabout way, in his epistle to the Roman Church which he had neither founded nor visited until now? This question is indeed the very heart of our present study and can be answered finally only after examining the historical background of the Apostle Paul's key messages in the Romans.
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1. PARTICIPATION IN THE LIFE IN JESUS CHRIST

i. Δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ

It is beyond dispute that our faith stands or falls with our understanding of the participation in the life in Jesus Christ as the result of Justification by Δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ through the Christ-Event. In Romans 5:1f., the Apostle Paul says

Δικαίωτες ὅταν ἐκ πίστεως εἰρήνην ἔχομεν
πρὸς τὸν θεὸν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
διὰ τοῦ καὶ τὴν προσφορὰν ἐξήκομεν [τῇ πίστει]
εἰς τὴν χάριν ταῦτα ἐν ἡ ἐστήκαμεν, καὶ καυχόμεθα ἐπὶ ἑλπίδι τῆς ὁμοίως τῷ Θεῷ.

1 Dodd translates v.1 as follows: "As we are justified by faith, then let us enjoy the peace we have with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Romans, p.72). Here, he seems to bear the other possible translation 'ἔχομεν', 'let us have', in mind. Because his adding 'let us enjoy' to 'the peace we have with God through our Lord Jesus Christ' is without doubt a free translation as a possible theological interpretation of the Apostle Paul's thought. But, though 'ἔχομεν' can claim far stronger external textual support (א B C D K L 33 81 it d 8 vg syr, 301 cop ko arm eth al) (cont.)
According to Sanday and Headlam, the verb δικαιοῦν cannot mean 'to make righteous', but 'to declare righteous', 'to treat as righteous' or 'to prove righteous'. They claim that 'whether the person so declared, treated as, or proved to be righteous is really so, the word itself neither affirms nor denies'. In agreement with Sanday and Headlam and Dodd, V. Taylor also argues that 'on lexical grounds, the meaning of δικαιοῦν in the New Testament must be thought among such alternatives as 'to declare righteous', 'to treat as righteous', 'to vindicate'. It cannot mean 'to make righteous'". But Kümmel rejects this kind of lexical approach as being 'müssig' because though, admittedly, through the verb δικαιοῦν the Apostle Paul means 'gerecht erklären', 'gerecht sprechen' in the light of 2 Corinthians 5:17, 21, "ist das gerecht sprechende Handeln Gottes ein schöpferisches Handeln, das den Gottlosen zum Gerechten werden lässt und den Sünder zu einem „neuen Geschöpf” macht". As we can see in Romans 1:17, 3:21-26, 10:3; 2 Corinthians 5:21, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ means nothing but God's saving action through the crucifixion

---

1 (continued from the previous page) than 'ἐξημεν' (א B3 Gτ P 0220; id 88 326 330 629 1241 1739 Byz Lect itει;id? syrh copsa al), the indicative, 'ἐξημεν' is incontrovertibly the correct reading and may be implied even in some of those manuscripts which spell the word 'ἐξημεν'. Since here the Apostle Paul is not exhorting but stating the definite fact that we already obtained the peace through the justification (See Metzger et al., Textual Commentary, p.511 and also Barrett, Romans, p.102).

1 See Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p.30.
3 See Kümmel, Theologie, s.176.
4 See idem.
5 Idem.
and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Consequently, it is the timely eschatological event as the divine grace declaring the ungodly righteous and the very power to create the new cosmic order in this chaotic world under the sway of the demonic powers. Sinners can find no way to escape from the Christ-Event as 'δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ' not because it proclaims sternly the righteous divine judgement on all who are not righteous but because it proclaims the unconditional forgiveness on all unpardonable sinners hostile to God Himself in their wickedness and ignorance. Then, the dispute between Taylor and Kümmel could be solved through the suggestion of E. Best that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ appeared in Jesus Christ:

"God's righteousness", as referred to by Second-Isaiah and the Psalmists, is the phrase rendered God's way of righting wrong in our passage: thus to say 'God is righteous' is almost equivalent to saying 'God saves'. So when Paul in 3:26 speaks of God as 'just' (which is the same word as 'righteous') he does not mean that God judges men by some abstract principle of justice in accordance with their good and evil deeds, but that God is active to right wrong.¹

Therefore, we as the creatures confined within the sphere of time and space could come to be reconciled and have peace with God, the Creator, transcending time and space, because God Himself has

transferred us from 'the impossible relationship to Him' to 'the only possible relationship', in other words, 'a new position' by His initiative and unfathomable ἰάση in His Son Jesus Christ toward the entirely worthless creatures who have no 'creature-consciousness' at all. This new relationship surpasses all human imagination.¹

However, reading Romans 5:1: "Δικαιόωντες ὑμᾶς ἐκ πίστεως ...."² we can not turn away our faces from a delicate question which arises concerning 'justification by faith'. Does the Apostle Paul really mean that faith as our response to Δικαιοσύνη ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ plays the decisive role in achieving our salvation in Christ? Taylor answers definitely 'Yes':

The man has faith, and God is active in the atoning work of Christ; but neither of these in itself secures justification. The ground of the justifying act is God's redemptive work, and the conditioning cause is faith, but it is the interaction of both which brings a man into right relations with God. Unless this is perceived, it is misleading to say that we are justified by faith ... It is equally misleading to say that we are justified by reason of the death of Christ; for whatever that death has achieved stands outside ourselves until there is a believing response which makes the achievement a vital element in our approach to God³ ... even He cannot impart it by gift, by fiat, or by imputation, since righteousness is personal or nothing. We are faced, then, by a double dilemma. The righteousness must be our own, but we cannot create it; it must be of God, but He cannot confer it.⁴

² See also Rom. 1:16f., 3:22, 25, 28, etc.
³ Taylor, Forgiveness, p.48.
⁴ Ibid., p.68.
Nevertheless, Kümmel strongly warns against the possibility of such an interpretation:

so dass der Eindruck entsteht, als spiele der Glaube die Rolle einer Leistung, die Gott anerkennt und belohnt. Es ist aber leicht zu sehen, dass diese missverständliche Ausdrucksweise durch die Aufnahme des Zitates 1.Mos.15,6 („Abraham glaubte an Gott, und es wurde ihm zur Gerechtigkeit angerechnet", s. Röm.4,3. 22f.; Gal.3,6) verursacht ist und im Zusammenhang von Röm.4,3-5 schon dadurch zurechtgerückt wird, dass von einer Zurechnung „aus Gnaden" die Rede ist (vgl. auch Röm.3,24).¹

In his understanding of 'justification by faith', Taylor gives the impression from his overemphasis on our faith as the decisive prerequisite to justification that he failed to notice the more important fact that faith itself is the very irresistible gift of divine grace. But Taylor's attitude can be easily understood when we take the well known fact of his theological background as a Methodist scholar and his faith as a devout Methodist minister.² Actually, we cannot find any fundamental difference between the arguments of Taylor and Kümmel. Because, though Kümmel emphasizes that „... bei allem dankbaren Bekenntnis zur geschehenen Gerechtsprechung bleibt die endgültige Gerechtsprechung die erhoffte Gottesgabe ....",³

¹ Theologie, s.179.
³ Theologie, s.181. Here he quotes Phil. 3:12f. to support his understanding 'faith and justification', but he should notice the plain fact that: "... though St. Paul speaks of himself, his (cont.)
he arrives at the same conclusion as Taylor by admitting the decisively indispensable role of faith as our response to avoid the possibility of falling from grace in the light of Galatians 5:8.¹ Both Taylor and Kümmel have failed to grasp not only the true nature of faith but also the inevitable dialectical character of faith in the Apostle Paul's epistles to the churches.

The key to our understanding of 'justification by faith' in the Epistle to the Romans lies in whether we stand in the place of the Apostle Paul or in that of the Roman Christians to whom the Apostle is preaching and giving admonition, and also whether we can understand the almost inexplicable dilemma of the Apostle Paul. He has to emphasize faith as the decisive condition for justification in Jesus Christ despite his unshakable assurance of his personal justification already granted freely and irresistibly according to the will of God in Jesus Christ when he was still in his mother's womb (Gal. 1:15-16a: ""Οτε δὲ ευδοκήσεν ο ἀγέρισας με εκ νοικίας μητρός μου καὶ καλέβας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλύψει τὸν οἶδαν αὐτὸν ἐν ἑμοί, ... ").

Looking back upon his past life, he himself could not but acknowledge the undeniable fact that his faith as his personal response to the grace of God could never play such a decisive role as would make him

³ (continued from the previous page) language seems really to be directed against the antinomian spirit, which in its rebound from Jewish formalism perverted liberty into license ...." (Lightfoot, Philippians, p.151). Therefore, without understanding the context itself, he cannot but stand in the place of Philippians, not that of Apostle Paul.

¹ Kümmel, Theologie, s.181.
stand in or fall from grace. God justified him first not when he was ready to respond with personal decision but when he was still in his mother's womb, and called him as an apostle for the Gospel in His Son Jesus Christ not when he professed Jesus Christ to be his Saviour but when he was violently persecuting those who believe in His Son to destroy the Church of His Son. Thus, more than anything else, his own experience bears witness so clearly to the fact that his own faith can be by no means the cause of making the righteousness of God his own. For the Apostle Paul, his justification was a completely unconditional and irresistible gift of God in Jesus Christ. His faith is nothing but his humble profession of justification already given to him as a free gift in Jesus Christ while he was an enemy to God. But still he had to proclaim 'justification by faith' throughout his lifelong battle against Jewish legalism not because he could not duly recognize the true nature of justification and faith that he had come to understand to the core through his dramatic life but because he could not find out any other more effectively appropriate way of expression in his proclaiming δικαιοσύνη δωδο to the ignorance and wickedness of man, especially to the Jews who, in their ignorance of the righteousness coming from God, were stubbornly seeking to establish their own righteousness without submitting to God's righteousness (Cf. Rom. 10:3). This is also the very reason why he could not

---

1 See Gal. 1:13-6.
2 Such a delicate paradox as the Apostle Paul was faced with throughout his lifelong mission unceasingly confronts most preachers who sympathize fully with the Apostle Paul even in our own day. Furthermore, the inevitable limit of human cognition itself attests to the irrefutable fact that the solution to such antinomical problems can never be given in the dimension of formal logic but only in that of dialectical dualism.
occasionally avoid giving such a distorted impression as if he himself had left evident room for another 'new legalism' based on the theory of 'cooperative justification' realized through the juxtaposition of faith as human response and God's mercy.

No one can dispute the undeniable fact that when the Christ-Event took place through His incarnation and His proclamation of the Kingdom of God, and even after His crucifixion and resurrection, still there were so many ignorant and wicked minds who did not believe in Him (in other words, in δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ revealed in Him and through Him). Both the evangelists and the Apostle Paul uniformly interpret this phenomenon of unbelief of Jews as the exact fulfilment of prophecy quoting Isaiah and declare unanimously that this unbelief of Jews was caused by the positive will of God. The Apostle Paul firmly believes that the Jews' rejection of the Gospel was inevitable so as to bring salvation to the Gentiles and he can never think of this result as apart from the will of God.³

Then, if God has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, as He has done among the Jews, who can see with their eyes and perceive with their heart δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ? Even though the divine

1 Cf. W. Wrede, Paul, trans. by E. Lummis (London, 1907), p.129: "... He says, man is justified through faith; or, faith is reckoned as righteousness (e.g. Rom. 4:3 sqq). If we take this literally, the Pauline doctrine does not stand above but below the Jewish ...."
3 See Rom. 11:8-11.
grace is freely offered to him, if God gave him a spirit of stupor, eyes that should not see and ears that should not hear, who could make it his own and participate in it by grasping it in time with his responding faith?¹

More than anything else, the sayings of Jesus² themselves unequivocally declare that only those whom God gave to His Son can participate in the true life in His Son. therefore, 'faith' can have meaning only to that chosen remnant which God predestined and called according to His purpose in His eternal Providence.³

After all, faith can never be any conditional cause that makes them able to participate in the life in Jesus Christ, but it is the free addition as a subordinate gift to the eternal life which God had already given them in His divine Providence for His glory.⁴

¹ Cf. Rom. 11:8.
⁴ Cf. Wrede, Paul, p.130: "... Paul's real meaning was something else. What he intends to say is truly this, that our relation to God does not depend on performance and merit, not even on that of faith. God justifies man 'freely', 'of grace' (Rom. 3:24, cf. also 4:4) ...."
That is, those who are not called according to the will of God can neither understand the meaning of faith nor make any confession of faith. Therefore, the Apostle Paul and his fellow workers who were 'Χριστὸς εἰσὶν ἡμῶν τῷ θεῷ'¹ could not help becoming 'ὁμοία ἐκ δικαίου εἰς ἀματοῦ' among those who were perishing, but 'ὁμοία ἐκ σωτηρίου εἰς σωτηρίου' among those who were being saved. Consequently, those whom God did not call can never stand this 'fragrance of Christ to God'.² This was actually the true character of 'participation in the life in Jesus Christ' that the Apostle Paul understood from the teaching of Jesus³ and his own personal experiences.

But, the Apostle Paul, who in Romans 5:8-11, is reminding the Roman Christians (who are called already as blessed participants in

---

¹ See 2 Cor. 2:15.
² See ibid., 2:16.
³ Cf. Metzger, Background, pp.99f.: "... Though Paul probably had never seen Jesus in the flesh, his acquaintance with Peter, James, and other early leaders of the Jerusalem Church provided him with information regarding the life and teaching of Jesus. Here and there in his letters, written in the late fifties and early sixties, he includes more historical data concerning Jesus than is usually realized. Paul's knowledge of Jesus was not limited to the bare fact that Jesus had lived upon the earth; he had a definite idea of the story of his life, and was careful to distinguish between pronouncements made by Jesus on ethical problems and his own pronouncements (1 Cor. 7:10-12). In addition to quoting the eucharistic words of Jesus (1 Cor. 11:23-25), Paul's letters contain a fairly large number of allusions to sayings of Jesus, so many, in fact, that some scholars have thought it likely that Paul may have had in his hands a collection of Jesus' sayings ...."
And with all this in examining the Apostle Paul's knowledge of Jesus' life and teaching we also must take into account the innumerable and still inexplicable 'ἐπιστασις καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις κυρίου' (Cf. 2 Cor. 12:1-4; and also Acts 9:3-7 and 22:6-10, 9:12, 22:17-21, 16:9f., 18:9f., 23:11, 27:23-26, etc.) that the Apostle Paul had incessantly experienced throughout his lifetime as an apostle.
the eternal life in Jesus Christ according to the will of God) of
the truth that, while they were yet unpardonable sinners hostile to
God, they were still justified and reconciled to God by the blood
of His Son; he also declares with confidence the consummation of
their final salvation and emphasizes their present blessing to
rejoice in God through Jesus Christ, through whom they have received
their atonement, and he now begins to contrast Adam and Jesus Christ
as the Second Adam in Romans 5:12ff.

ii. ADAM AND JESUS CHRIST AS THE SECOND ADAM

Why should the Apostle Paul have to introduce the
clear contrast between Adam and Jesus Christ to indicate the plain
fact:

\[\text{ἐἀς ἐὰν ἔνος παραπτώκες εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκρειν, οὕτως καὶ ἐὰν ἔνες δικαιώματε εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαιασίν ἡ ἀνθρωποῦ ἐμεταλδει κατεστάθηκαν οἱ πολλοί, οὕτως καὶ ἐὰν τῆς ἁπασεὶς τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐκάθεσαν κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί.}\]

to the Christians in the Roman Church who are no longer in the reign
of death in Adam but already in the reign of grace in Jesus Christ?
If, as Dodd asserts, the Apostle Paul had based his understanding of
the Fall of Adam on the current rabbinic doctrine of the Fall,² it is
highly probable that the Roman Christians would have already had the

---

¹ Rom. 5:18f.
² See Dodd, Romans, p.79.
opportunity to learn the tragic significance of Adam's Fall especially with the help of the Jewish Christians lately converted from Judaism. And it is also beyond doubt that the Roman Christians were already well aware of the meaning of the life in Jesus Christ through the teaching of the unknown missionaries who had preached the Gospel in the Roman Church long before the Apostle Paul wrote this part of the epistle. Did the Apostle Paul then write this passage only to show the Roman Christians the essence of the Gospel he proclaims with a view to seeking association with the Roman Christians, in the interests of his future missionary task;¹ not to meet a particular emergency, but as a calm exposition?² If not, does this passage imply that a certain confusion belatedly broke out among the Roman Christians in their understanding of the doctrine of salvation that made the Apostle Paul feel the necessity of explaining it clearly to solve that practical problem which the Roman Church was faced with?

For our discussing the Apostle Paul's aim through this passage we need first to pay attention to the argument of Dodd in his interpreting Romans 5:12-21.

He argues

Paul has now to deal with a difficulty which was felt by those to whom he preached, and is still felt by many. You say, 'We are saved by what Christ did. But, granted

¹ Cf. Kümmel, Einleitung, s.273.
² Cf. Metzger, Background, p.229.
that He lived a wonderful life, and died a death of perfect self-sacrifice, we can understand that He has thereby given an inspiring example, yet, after all, He was an individual person in history: how can His conquest over sin and His achievement of the human ideal be effective for other individuals? Paul bases his answer on a current doctrine of Jewish rabbis, that, through the Fall of Adam, all men fell into sin (see 2 Esd. 3.21-22, 4.50, etc.).

To examine the legitimacy of Dodd's argument we have to consider, first of all, the rabbinic interpretation of the meaning of Adam's Fall in the time of the Apostle Paul. We can find a plain indication of the Fall of Adam and its significance in 4 Ezra (or 2 Esdras) especially and in 2 Baruch, and it is true that 4 Ezra much more clearly emphasizes the inevitably fatal consequence brought upon man through the Fall of Adam than 2 Baruch does. However, such an

---

1 His Romans, pp.78f.


3 See 4 Ezra 3:21 in Charles, R.H. (ed.). The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Vol.II. Oxford, 1913: "For the first Adam, clothing himself with the evil heart, transgressed and was overcome; and likewise also all who were born of him" and 7:118: "O thou Adam, what hast thou done! For though it was thou that sinned, the fall was not thine alone, but ours also who are thy descendants!"

4 See 2 Bar. 54:15-19:

For though Adam first sinned
And brought untimely death upon all,
Yet of those who were born from him
Each one of them has prepared for his own soul torment to come,
And again each one of them has chosen for himself glories to come.
Adam is, therefore, not the cause, save only of his own soul,
But each of us has been the Adam of his own soul.
optimistic attitude on the part of the Apostle Paul before his conversion\(^1\) and on the part of the Pharisees of the New Testament period in establishing their own righteousness by fulfilling the demand of the Law (in other words, in solving the problem of Sin), is directly opposed to the totally pessimistic view of 4 Ezra in conquering human sin originated from Adam,\(^2\) and is rather close to the view of 2 Baruch which is remarkably self-complacent about the conquest of sin and the Law.\(^3\) Moreover, in spite of its recognition of the thoroughgoing helplessness against sin and the touching solicitation for divine help,\(^4\) 4 Ezra attributes the ultimate cause of the Fall of Adam to God because God is the very One who has sown a grain of evil in the heart of Adam.\(^5\) This is a very despicable and absurd jump of logic on the part of the unpardonable sinners, who try in vain and impudently to justify their sin in the presence of God. This we can never find in the Old Testament and Pauline thought. Such a self-satisfied view of 2 Baruch about sin and the Law is an impossible base for understanding the Apostle Paul in

\(^1\) See Phil. 3:6b: "... κατὰ δικαιοδότης τὴν ἐν ὑμῖν γενόμενην ἀναστάσιν." Also cf. Gal. 1:14, etc.

\(^2\) 4 Ezra 7:46: "... Or who of the earth-born is there that has not transgressed thy covenant?" See also 3:22, 7:48, 116f.

\(^3\) See 2 Bar. 54:15-19. Also cf. Charles (ed.), Apoc. and Pseud., Vol.II, p.477: "... man according to 2 Baruch preserves his free will, his moral nature remains unimpaired ..." and ibid., p.553: "... The Schools [the school of 4 Ezra and that of 2 Baruch], it would seem, rival schools ... The latter work [2 Baruch] answers the former [4 Ezra]; and, on the whole, it [2 Baruch] gives answers decidedly more in accordance with what later became orthodox Judaism ..."

\(^4\) See 4 Ezra 8:6: "... O Lord above us, if thou wouldst but suffer thy servant to pray before thee; and wouldst give unto us the seed of a new heart ..."

\(^5\) See ibid., 4:30.
Romans 3:9-25. Furthermore, considering the well-known fact that both 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch in their final forms were completed and put forth long after the day of the Apostle Paul\(^1\) and even the original appearance of the Salathiel-apocalypse (S.) is not earlier than A.D. 100\(^2\) together with the fact already pointed out above that 4 Ezra differs a great deal from the Judaism of the New Testament period in which the Apostle Paul lived\(^3\) and 2 Baruch from Pauline thought respectively, Dodd's argument that the Apostle Paul is founding on a current doctrine of the Jewish rabbis (that is to say, 4 Ezra) in his understanding the Fall of Adam is very unconvincing. In fact, the Apostle Paul is not founding on the later developments of Judaism but in the teaching of 'the religion of the Prophets and the Psalms' together with his faith in Jesus Christ.\(^4\)

---

1 Cf. Charles (ed.), *Apoc. and Pseud.*, Vol.II, p.554: "... it seems probable that 2 Baruch in its final form was edited and put forth soon after the appearance of 4 Ezra in its present form; i.e. some time between A.D. 120 and 135, perhaps very soon after A.D. 120 ...."

2 See 4 Ezra 3:1: "In the thirtieth year after the downfall of the City I, Salathiel — (who am also Ezra) — was in Babylon, and as I lay upon my bed I was disquieted", and also 'these thirty years' in 3:29. Cf. Charles (ed.), *Apoc. and Pseud.*, Vol.II, p.552: "Fortunately in the opening verse of the book we have a precise statement which points definitely to an exact date for the original appearance of the Salathiel-apocalypse (S.) ... This date [See 3:29] which probably is intended to refer to the original publication of S. points to the year A.D. 100 (i.e. thirty years after the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70) as the time when S. originally appeared or was completed as an independent work ...."

3 We should keep in mind that the Apostle Paul before his conversion was brought up in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel and educated according to the strict manner of the law (See Acts 22:3) as a Pharisee (See Phil. 3:5: "... κατὰ νόμον Ἠρωδιαῖος") extremely zealous for the traditions of his fathers (See Gal. 1:14).

On the basis of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch W.D. Davies also argues concerning the causal connection between Adam's Fall and the sin of all subsequent generations that though the Apostle Paul goes beyond the teaching of the rabbis in asserting a direct causal relation between the Fall of Adam and the sin of his posterity, still his thought on sin is without doubt governed by essentially rabbinic concepts.¹ To support his argument Davies asserts that in Romans 5:12f. the Apostle Paul was not primarily concerned with precise theological definitions and, consequently, 'a more radical statement of the significance of the first Adam than is found in the Rabbis' was brought about by the sharp contrast that he had drawn between Jesus Christ and the first Adam.² Lastly, Davies attempts a crude interpretation at Romans 7 by saying: "Moreover, the Apostle also, as we say, by implication at least, insists on the responsibility of the individual for his sin in Romans 7."³ The Apostle Paul, on the contrary, with an unshakably fixed purpose, contrasts the first Adam and Jesus Christ, the Second Adam, in Romans 5:12-21 to show the Roman Christians so clearly the significance of the life in Jesus Christ in contrast to the reign of death in the first Adam; and 'a more radical statement, as Davies thinks, of the significance of the first Adam than is found in the Rabbis' is by no means left out of account by the Apostle Paul but the very exact result which the Apostle Paul aimed at from the beginning. It is thus quite natural that the Apostle Paul's statement of the significance of Adam's Fall

¹ See W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London, 1970, 1948¹), p.34.
² See idem.
³ Idem.
in the light of the eternal life in Christ should bear not merely 'a more radical' but, inevitably, 'an incomparably pre-eminent' character in comparison with rabbis' statement that is completely out of focus without Jesus Christ; lastly, Davies would have been better to indicate the examples of the Apostle Paul's insistence on the responsibility of the individual for his sin in the other parts of Romans than in ch.7 in which the Apostle Paul's main emphasis is without doubt laid on the total helplessness of man against the demonic power of immanent sin. But Davies' real attitude is clearly expressed thus:

To infer, however, from the latter ['έν' ὃ

 πάντες ἤμαρτον' (Rom. 5:12)] that Adam's transgression injected a kind of virus into man's system which made him sin inevitably is to read into the text ideas borrowed from later theological speculation. It is best to find in the words ἐν' ὃ πάντες ἤμαρτον the concept of the representative character of Adam's sin. This concept of a solidarity of all mankind in Adam enables Paul to say that in Adam all sinned.¹

And Davies' thought on 'the concept of the representative character of Adam's sin' and 'the concept of a solidarity of all mankind in Adam' are, as he himself acknowledges, based on the argument of Dodd and others.² To understand Davies' fundamental standpoint we need to pay attention to the following remark of Dodd: "... But Adam is a myth (though for Paul he may have been real; ....")³ This is the starting

¹ Ibid., p.32.
² See the footnote in idem and, for more details, see Dodd, Romans, pp.79ff.
³ Romans, p.79.
point of all their arguments. The natural and inevitable result of this development which is without any concrete historical foundation is to attempt to replace the historicity of Adam's Fall and its tragic result brought upon his descendants with 'the conception of solidarity'. Therefore, Dodd and Davies agree with each other in their denial of the direct causal connection between Adam's Fall and the sin of his descendants. The plain fact is that there exists a fundamental difference between the modern scholars and Jewish rabbis. When we consider 2 Baruch, such an argument of Davies as

the Rabbis were always anxious to safeguard human freedom, and so could not regard the relation between Adam's sin and the sinfulness of mankind as directly causal.¹

is somewhat convincing, but Dodd and others deny the direct causal relation between Adam's Fall and the sinfulness of mankind not because they are primarily concerned with the emphasis on human freedom but because they cannot admit the historicity of Genesis 1-3 according to their modern outlook.² It is true that, in their own minds, they can

¹ Paul, p.33. Also cf. 2 Bar. 54:15-19.
² See also K. Barth, The Epistle to the Romans, trans. by E.C. Hoskyns (Oxford, 1968), pp.170-172. But cf. W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. by J.A. Baker, Vol.2 (London, 1967), p.402: "... It is essential to realize that the prophetic interpretation of the world given in the primal history deals not with timeless truths, but with actual events. What has here to be stated by the imperfect means of the myth is a matter of real processes, of happenings by which the present shape of the world has been determined. This results in a second difficulty for our understanding, inasmuch as these processes are related in the language of historical record, while, in fact, any 'record' of the creation, the Fall, and such like, is finally beyond the reach of our historical science. Nevertheless, exactly the same problem arises with regard to the eschatological consummation, which is also concerned with a real
never imagine Adam, the non-historical figure who can exist only in
a myth, and all subsequent generations including themselves united
to him by ties of consanguinity. Consequently, it is a logical
impossibility for them to accept either the Fall of Adam based on a
non-historical myth of Fall or the inheritance of sinful nature from
Adam, the first man. Even Barrett, who does not hesitate to
acknowledge the undeniable fact that "... Paul, a first-century Jew,
accepted Gen. 1-3 as a straightforward narrative of events that
really happened ....",¹ agrees with Dodd and Davies in the denial of
the inheritance of sinful nature from Adam.² The exegetical problem
of 'ἐν' ἡμῖν ἡμῶν' which Barrett indicates as the foundation
of his argument that 'Paul does not say that all sinned in Adam' can-
not be solved simply through grammatical analyses, and the final
decision should be given not according to our smattering of grammatical

² (continued from the previous page) event, though there can never be
any possibility of incorporating this event into a historical survey
..." Also cf. G.L. Archer, Jr., A Survey of Old Testament
Introduction (Chicago, 1970^6, 1964^1), p.190: "... Many prefer to
regard it as a mere myth or fable ('supra-history', to use the Neo-
orthodox term) in which the moral downfall of man is described by a
fictitious episode designed to illustrate it. (Yet insofar 'as man
is a fallen creature, a moral agent with an innate sense of guilt,
the myth reflects a sublime truth, even though no such isolated
episode actually took place.) No decisive objections, however, have
ever been raised against the historicity of Adam and Eve either on
historical scientific or philosophical grounds. The protest has
been based essentially upon subjective concepts of improbability ...."
and Geerhardus Vos, Biblical Theology (Grand Rapids, 1971^7, 1948^1),
pp.43ff.

¹ Barrett, Romans, p.111.

² See Barrett, From First Adam to Last (London, 1962), p.20: "... There
is no positive evidence in favour of a theory of seminal transmission;
Paul does not say that all sinned in Adam (in Rom. 5.12 the Greek is
ἐν ἡμῖν ἡμῶν), though he does say that all die in Adam (1 Cor. 15.22). Such
a theory is not needed. Paul does not think of sin as a thing which,
like an heirloom, may be handed down from father to son ...."
knowledge but according to the context itself in which the Apostle Paul speaks. And Barrett's argument for interpreting 'ἐγ' ῥ πάντες ἡμαρτον' as 'because they all sinned' must be rejected despite its grammatical support, because what Barrett affirms is precisely what the Apostle Paul thoroughly denies. Therefore, as Nygren indicates, 'ἐγ' ῥ πάντες ἡμαρτον' should be interpreted as 'it was under these circumstances, under these auspices, that all sinned'.

The fatal self-contradictoriness of Barrett's argument can be well refuted by such an indication as Nygren gives:

But if Paul had meant that all became subject to death because of the sins which they themselves committed, the conclusion would logically be that all would enter into life by reason of the righteousness which they themselves achieved. That is an idea which is certainly the utter opposite of all that Paul says.

---

1 See Romans, pp.110f. and also J.A. Bengel, Gnomon of the New Testament, trans. by A.R. Fausset, Vol.III (Edinburgh, 1857), p.68: "... ἐγ' ῥ with the verb ἡμαρτεν has the same signification, as διὰ with the genitive, τῆς ἴματος. The meaning is, 'through the fact that', or in other words, 'inasmuch as all have sinned' ...."; Dodd, Romans, pp.78-80; Leenhardt, Romans, pp.83f. And cf. Bl.-Debr., §.235 (Cf. 2 Cor. 5:4; Phil. 3:12); G. Abbott-Smith, A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament (Edinburgh, 1937), pp.166f.

2 Cf. H.A.W. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans, trans. by W.P. Dickson, Vol.I (Edinburgh, 1873), p.248: "... the view, that the death of individuals is the consequence of their own actual sins, would be inappropriate to the entire parallel between Adam and Christ, nay even contradictory to it. For as the sin of Adam brought death to all (consequently not their own self-committed sin), so did the obedience of Christ (not their own virtue) bring life to all ...."

3 See his Romans, p.214.

4 Idem.
The Apostle Paul who held a quite different view of the statements in Genesis 1-3 from Dodd and the others, in other words, took them literally just as Jesus Christ and His apostles did,¹ not only accepted the records of Adam's Fall as a historical event but also firmly believed in the inevitable inheritance of sinful nature. And, though both Davies and Barrett strongly deny the inheritance of sinful nature that surely has brought death to all since Adam's Fall by using such irritating expressions as 'the view that Adam had injected a kind of virus into the human stock which contaminated all men' or 'sin as a thing which, like an heirloom, may be handed down from father to son', the Apostle Paul understands unshakably the relation between Adam and all subsequent generations as an unbreakable lineage united by ties of consanguinity and Adam is incontrovertibly the head as the first man. Then, so long as the human race multiplies through sexual relations, 'a theory of seminal transmission', as Barrett defines it,² can be accepted as a pertinent remark indicating the inheritance of sinful nature from generation to generation through marriage and birth. Therefore, the inheritance of the sinful nature of the fallen Adam, in other words, the inheritance of 'original sin', is by no means an idea borrowed from later theological speculation, but the real self-consciousness of the Apostle Paul who confesses himself to be 'a sinner by nature' before Jesus Christ, the only Solver, and declares that we can do nothing

¹ It is beyond all question that Jesus and the authors of the New Testament accepted the records of the Old Testament as true, irrespective of the incredulous modern minds.
² See his First Adam, p.20.
about our sinfulness because Sin is an integral part of our nature itself from which we can never escape without His intervention.

Even the Fall itself is not so ambiguous as Barrett suggests:

The fall was not uncommonly connected by the Rabbis with sexual desire, and the Jewish suggestion that the serpent actually sought to seduce Eve (sexually) is probably reflected in 2 Cor. 11. Certainly the shame of Adam and Eve with regard to their nakedness, and their making of primitive garments, suggests that there is a strong sexual concern in the story.¹

¹ Ibid., p.17. Many heresies disguising themselves as Christianity are based on a similar misunderstanding or even misuse of this same passage. E.g. The already well known [Cf. Time, September 30, 1974, pp.46f., June 14, 1976, pp.38ff., December 12, 1977, p.45; Newsweek, June 14, 1976, pp.42-48] Korean heretic, Sun-Myung Moon, self-appointed 'Reincarnated Messiah', claims referring to Gen. 3:7 in his book of 'new revelation', what is called, The Divine Principle that, telling the truth, Eve and Adam did not actually eat the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil as it is written in the Bible, but the serpent, i.e. Satan, seduced (had sexual relations with) Eve and later Adam had relations with Eve, and the statement of Gen. 3:7 clearly testifies that they had committed sin with their lower parts of the body. To support his argument he makes very absurd remarks that if Eve and Adam really had eaten the fruit as it is written in Gen. 3:1-6, they should have hidden their mouths in their hands because it is a well known psychological phenomenon of man to hide instinctively the very part of their bodies with which they committed sin just as we can observe so often from the natural behaviour of children. He sternly declares that, therefore, all subsequent generations after the Fall are indeed the seeds of Satan born through the evil relations between Satan and Eve. He argues that, both biblically and logically, the only way of salvation is to receive new blood of the coming Messiah through sexual relations with him to purify man's sinful blood stained by Eve's illicit relations with Satan. But, according to him, Jesus could not accomplish this mission because he was crucified before he could have such relations with women. Consequently, Jesus had to come again to fulfil that unattained mission and he [Moon] is the very second-coming Messiah. Here lies the abominable doctrine of the 'Replacement of Blood' through secret lewd conduct.
Barrett argues that 'the Jewish suggestion that the serpent actually sought to seduce Eve (sexually) is probably reflected in 2 Corinthians 11', but we cannot find any exegetical ground which justifies the argument that the author may have admitted the possibility of the serpent's seduction of Eve in the sense of literal sexual relations either in 4 Maccabees 18:6-9 (where, as Bruce indicates, 'A haggadic version of the fall story which interpreted the serpent's seduction of Eve in a sexual sense is first attested.'1): 

"Ελεγεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῶν ὑπὸ πτέρνων καὶ ταῦτα τὰ δικαίωμα τοῦ τέκνους ... οὐδὲ ἔλεγεν τῷ τῶν ἐγνώμων ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνὴρ." or in 2 Corinthians 11:3: "φασινιμα δὲ μὴ μοι, ὡς δὲ ὁ λόγος ἐξηράνθην, ἑβαν ἐν τῇ παντύρημι αὐτοῦ, φθερῇ τὰ νόμιμα ὑμὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκαθάρτητος [καὶ τῆς ἀνήρ] τῆς εἰς Χριστόν." but only the well known metaphorical expressions throughout the Bible comparing Israel's faith in Yahweh and Christians' faith in Jesus Christ to the wife's chastity and bride's virgin purity.2 Barrett is also wrong in his indicating 'a strong sexual concern' from Genesis 3:7:  "וַיִּקְרָא יְהֹウェָה אֵלָיו בַּנֵאמֶר—אָנֶה בַּנֵא אֱלֹהֵינוּ שָׁם מִן אֻמֶּה הָאָדָם."

Before the Fall, Adam and Eve were not ashamed at all though they were always stark naked. Their simple childlike reliance on their Creator itself was equivalent to clothing. But, no sooner was this simple and innocent trust in the Creator replaced by the uneasy

---

1 Cf. his 1 and 2 Cor., p.235.
and anxious distrust along with the self-awakening of their disobedience than they realized that they were stark naked, and made two awkward aprons with fig leaves together and wore them. Now, that which was not a shame at all in itself became an utter shame and that which could not originally be regarded as clothes at all came to be put on as indispensable coverings for their bodies. Some people may infer from the name of the tree in Genesis 2:17 ('ני האֹל לֹא יָדִיעָה') and the statement that Adam and Eve covered the lower parts of their bodies with aprons made of fig leaves that Genesis 3:7 should be understood as follows: 'The author believed that the serpent actually had sexual relations with Eve, but he described it through metaphorical expression'; however, as L. Köhler firmly claims:

Was ist hier [Gen. 3:1-7] gut und böse? Dass es mit dem Geschlechtsleben zu tun habe, davon steht kein Wort und keine Andeutung da ... Was heisst hier gut und böse? Die Antwort ist einfach. Gut ist, was dem Gehorsam entspricht. Böse ist, was unter Ungehorsam geschieht.¹

any attempt to read into the text a sexual concern is nothing but an irresponsible theological word play. The first couple's unbearable feeling of shame on account of their naked bodies is a natural outward disclosure of their unutterable inner anxiety and perplexity arising from the loss of their true foundation² — through DISOBEDIENCE not

¹ Theologie des Alten Testaments (Tübingen, 1936), s.156. See also TWNT, 1.Bd., s.284: „... Vollends unmöglich kann es gelingen, tob und ra in die sexuelle Sphäre zu ziehen ...."

² Cf. F. Delitzsch, A Commentary on Genesis, trans. by S. Taylor, Vol.I (Edinburgh, 1888), p.156: "... 'Evil is disobedience, and the feeling of shame, now excited by nakedness, was only one of its evil consequences ....'"
as an unconscious mistake prompted by mere curiosity but as the consciousness and positive rebellion against the Creator throwing away the creature-consciousness. They may have started from 'covetousness and mistrust',¹ but their ultimate aim was TO BE LIKE GOD [Gen. 3:5: 'יִשָּׂאֵלָם קָנָה']

Referring to the first couple's ill-fitting aprons made of fig leaves² showing 'die Unbeholfenheit der ersten Menschen',³ H. Holzinger interprets this as

Symbol des Glaubens, dass ohne Gottes Hilfe der Mensch nicht gediehen könne, oder modern ausgedrückt Symbol der Offenbarungs—und Erlösungsbedürftigkeit.⁴

But, God took off these man-made ludicrous aprons and Himself made for them garments of skin.⁵ What does this statement in Genesis 3:21 together with the unmistakably indicated promise of Messiah in v.15⁶ signify at all? As those unknown animals already in the

---

² A. Dillmann guesses the reason why the first couple had chosen 'fig leaves' to be due to the fact that: "... Doch wohl nur, weil unter den paläst. Baumblättern das Feigenlaub das grösste war ...." [Die Genesis (Leipzig, 1886), s.74].
³ See H. Holzinger, Genesis (Leipzig, 1898), s.32.
⁴ Idem.
⁶ Cf. Rom. 16:20: "{ο ἴδε θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης θυμήσει τῶν δακτυλῶν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν ἐν τάξει ...}" and Gen. 3:15: "ὁκερρήσει καὶ ... ..." [LXX: "... αὐτὸς δου τηρήσει (according to other readings, πήγει or τειρήσει) κεφάλην ..."]. Also see Richardson, Theology, p.177: "... (Luke 1:53). The Protevangelium (Gen. 3:15) is fulfilled: the seed of the woman crushes the serpent's head; the Son of Mary delivers from the power of sin the fallen sons of Eve ...."
beginning of history had to suffer to shed blood to provide the first man, Adam, and his wife with their skins, Jesus, the coming Messiah, also had to suffer death by shedding His blood to the last drop to provide the naked Adam's descendants in disobedience with the spiritual clothes prepared in Himself.

Admittedly, the Apostle Paul accepted Genesis 3:1-7 as real history and understood it from a thoroughly Christ-centred angle. It is in this context that the Apostle Paul is contrasting death in Adam's disobedience with life in Jesus' obedience so vividly and dramatically.

As we have seen so far, the basic difference between the Apostle Paul and most modern scholars lies in their understanding of the ultimate origin and nature of Sin itself. Consequently, their concept of 'participation' in the life in Jesus Christ also cannot avoid being twisted into some other meaning which would never have been accepted by the Apostle Paul. The plain fact is that we can by no means expect from these scholars the notice of a human existence which is totally helpless against the deadly power of Sin that forms the immanent human nature itself and such unutterably touching gratitude for δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Jesus Christ that has set man free from the unbreakable chain of Sin such as we can see so distinctly in the Apostle Paul. The life of the Apostle Paul itself shows so clearly

1 Cf. R.M. Grant, A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible (New York, 1972, 1948), p.40: "... Paul believes that unless the Old Testament writer had Christ in mind, his expressions would be meaningless ...."

2 See Rom. 5:18f.
the incomparable qualitative difference in their understanding of all this.

iii. ROMANS 6-7 AND THE PROBLEMS OF THE MIXED CONGREGATION OF THE ROMAN CHURCH

For our further understanding of the conception of 'participation in the life in Jesus Christ' the brief analysis of Romans 6-7 made by Metzger is very helpful:

The apostle next discusses, and refutes, three objections that could be brought against the doctrine that man's salvation rests upon the work of Christ ... To those of evil impulses such a gospel may seem to be an invitation to sin as much as possible, so that God may get more credit for saving them. Such an argument, Paul replies, is unthinkable, because faith in Christ involves vital union with him and sharing in his righteous life (6:1-14). The second objection is that Paul's doctrine of freedom from the Old Testament law releases men from moral obligation; to which he replies no, because the believer accepts a new and higher obligation of loyalty to Christ and therefore devotes himself to do the will of God (6:15-7:6). The third objection is that Paul's teaching makes the law of God an evil thing, because the law not only makes man conscious of sin (compare Gal. 3:19), but also subtly incites man to sin (by suggesting what he must not do). To this Paul replies that the reason that the law cannot save is not that the law is evil but that man is sinful and cannot keep it (7:7-25).¹

But, here a most natural but quite serious question emerges that must inevitably exert a decisive effect upon our understanding the Apostle Paul's aim through this epistle. Metzger argues that

¹ Background, pp.230f.
Unlike most of his other letters, this one was not written to meet a particular emergency, but is rather a calm exposition — as nearly systematic as anything written by Paul could be — of the essentials of the gospel which he preached.1

Then, how can we explain the undoubtedly serious inner struggle between the Jewish Christians and the Gentile Christians that went from bad to worse with the expulsion of Jews (including Jewish Christians) from Rome according to the edict of the Emperor Claudius?2 Throughout the epistle we can easily find these strained antagonistic relationships between Jews and Gentiles. Any noticeably antagonistic relationships between the Jewish Christians and the Gentile Christians cannot be seen in the beginning of the Roman Church when the majority of the congregation consisted of Jews,3 but the gradual increase of the number of the Gentile congregation in the Roman Church came to give rise to the tensions between Jews and Gentiles not only in their understanding of the Gospel but also in their taking on the leadership of the congregation from worldly-minded motives. But no noticeable internal struggle was brought to public notice until the historical turning point caused by the edict of Claudius in A.D. 49 or 50.4

1 Ibid., p.229.
2 Cf. Suetonius, Claudius, XXV.4: "Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit ...."
3 We cannot ascertain whether the unknown missionaries who established the Roman Church were Jews in the Diaspora or Gentiles by nature, however, it is very convincing that they were connected with the synagogue in the Roman society in one way or another and the first Christian society in Rome was constituted among the Jews.
and by the return of Jews to Rome after the death of Claudius (under the rule of Nero) was reached. Marxsen touches the core of the matter when he says:

if the Jews had to leave the city, the Gentile Christian (or proselyte Christian) community would remain behind. However, this community would then almost certainly develop along different lines from what would have been possible within the synagogue ... Rom. was written during the time when the Jews were allowed to return to Rome — but this also meant the Jewish Christians, who now find a Christian community very different from the one they had left.¹

Consequently, the relations between both parties could not avoid running up towards a high state of tension. The strained antagonistic relationships between both parties without doubt clearly went from bad to worse not simply because of the difference in their understanding of the Gospel itself² or of the pattern of Christian living,³ but mainly because of the Jews' strong desire to hold on to the leadership which they had been enjoying in the Roman Church. A further inevitable problem was the reaction of those Gentiles who had already consolidated their footing by taking the initiative while they held an absolute majority in the congregation during the expulsion of Jews.⁴

In fact, the serious dilemma in which the Roman Church was placed was

¹ Marxsen, Introduction, pp.99f.
⁴ Baur argues that the Roman Church was mainly composed of Jewish Christians (See History, Vol.I, p.66), but, as we have seen so far, the majority were definitely Gentiles when the Apostle Paul was writing this epistle (Cf. H.A.W. Meyer, Romans, Vol.I, pp.25f. and also Weiss, Urchristentum, s.650).

243
much more complicated than most interpreters are used to conjecture. Admittedly, though the Gentile Christians could manage to take the leadership through their superiority in numbers among the congregation, so long as they maintained the relationship with the mother church at Jerusalem and admitted her suzerainty over all churches in Palestine and the Diaspora, they could neither disregard the status of the Jewish Christians in the Roman Church nor free themselves completely from the almost absolute authority and traditional priority of the Jewish Christians in interpreting the Gospel itself and the practical patterns of Christian living.¹

Anyway, it would have been almost impossible for the Roman congregation who lacked the power of faith to have any desirable good effect on pagan society in the complicated conditions which arose from the split and hostility between the two parties. The Jews exhibited a wounded superiority complex and the Gentiles an uneasy self-complacency. Then, the Apostle Paul's great exultation and gratitude owing to the fact that "... ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καταδεδεικται ἐν οἷον τῷ Χριστῷ ..." (Rom. 1:8) could be applied only to the Roman Church at latest before the Jews' return to Rome after the death of Emperor Claudius.²

¹ Therefore, Weiss is correct in his indicating the fact that: "... immerhin sind zur Zeit des Römer-Briefes auch die Judenchristen, wenn schon in der Minderheit, doch ein nicht zu übersehender Bestandteil der Gemeinde ...." (Urchristentum, s.650).

² Bruce says: "... Less than three years after the accession of Nero, Paul could describe the Christian community of Rome as renowned for its faith throughout the world. It was no longer confined to Jewish believers; it included a large number of Gentiles ...." (History, p.373). But, he failed to size up the inevitable change of the situation in the Roman Church before and after the Jews' expulsion from Rome caused by the edict of Claudius and to notice the strained (cont.)
Here, the Apostle intentionally mentions the proud figure of the Roman Church in the past to awake them from their foolishness which is ignorant of God's will.

Perceiving these inner problems of the Roman Church awaiting urgent solution, the Apostle Paul, before everything, wishes to get rid of the split and hostility between the Jewish Christians and the Gentile Christians which arose owing to the difference in their understanding the nature of the Gospel itself. Therefore, without understanding the practical problem involved in this context, it is impossible to find out the exact aim of the Apostle Paul in chs.6-7 as well as the other parts of this epistle. In 2:17-29, 3:19-4:25 the Apostle Paul polemizes against the Jewish Christians' hypocrisy and blind adherence to the Law, and in ch.5 he clearly shows how the Roman Christians had come to be saved and now stood in the grace of God through the Christ-Event. After expounding the truth of their participation in the life in Jesus Christ as the result of justification initiated by God's unconditional love and freely given in His righteousness, the Apostle Paul immediately in ch.6 warns the Gentile Christians against their possible misunderstanding of the grace of God in Jesus Christ which abounded all the more where sin increased (Cf. 5:20):

2 (continued from the previous page) antagonistic relationships rapidly developed with the Jews' returning to Rome. His argument is based on his unconvincing denial of the existence of the Roman Church itself as a unified Christian community in Rome owing to his misinterpretation of Rom. 1:7 (See ibid., pp.373f.).
From the very beginning the Apostle Paul leaves no room for the Gentile Christians' reply to his argument by appealing directly to 'baptism' itself. In his article on Romans 6, G. Bornkamm analyses well the meaning of 'Baptism and New Life in Paul', but he fails to note in what context and why the Apostle Paul brought out 'baptism' in ch.6. In other words, he is interpreting the meaning of 'baptism and new life' in his own life context but not in the true historical context in which the Apostle Paul was standing. When the Apostle Paul was writing ch.6, 'baptism' itself was by no means his main matter of concern at all. His ultimate and primary concern was to check the Gentile Christians' anticipated abuse of divine grace, which they already enjoy in Jesus Christ, by reminding them of the significance of baptism through which they were accepted into the Church of Christ. Despite their serious antagonism in their understanding of the Gospel itself and of the pattern of Christian living, neither the Jewish Christians nor the Gentile Christians could deny the solemn significance of baptism as the eschatological sacrament because of their expectation of the imminent Advent of Jesus Christ.

1 Rom. 6:1-3.
His warning admonition irrefutably touches the Gentile Christians on a very sore point when he says: "τίνα ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἶχετε τότε; ἐγ' ὁ ὅσιόν ἐπαισχύνεσθε τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἐκείνον βένατος."  

In ch. 7 the Apostle Paul explains the true nature and ultimate function of the Law which is to indicate clearly the fact that there can be no salvation at all without the Cross of Jesus Christ. He does this through his dramatic confession of his existence as a Christian who still can never overcome the power of Sin which constitutes the very part of his nature itself. Why should the

---

1 Rom. 6:21. Dodd translates v.21 as "Well, what did you gain then by it all? Nothing but what you are now ashamed of! The end of all that is death;" (Romans, p.96). Barrett also translates this as "What fruit did you reap of that? Things of which you now are ashamed, for their end is death." (Romans, p.153) arguing "... The question mark may be placed after 'that', or after 'ashamed'. If the latter alternative is accepted, the answer to the question must be supplied: What fruit did you reap of those things of which you now are ashamed? None; for their end is death. This does not fit the context well and the parallel verse (22) distinguishes between the near and remote consequences of a course of action (the fruit is sanctification, the ultimate result eternal life), thus strongly supporting a similar distinction in v.21, where the translation given here may be confidently accepted ...." (Idem). But, 'τίνα ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἶχετε τότε;' is plainly the emphatic usage of an interrogative sentence brought forward expecting the inevitably negative answer. Both Dodd and Barrett could understand neither the true aim of the Apostle Paul through this sentence nor his grammatical knowledge. Cf. Sanday and Headlam, Romans, pp.169f., and H.A.W. Meyer, Romans, Vol.I, pp.309ff. And also Bengel, Gnomon, Vol.III, p.85.

Paul, trans. by M. Kohl (London, 1971), p.16 and Römer, ss.191-204]. But, unless the Holy Spirit comes upon him, he never feels the necessity to cry out and, even though he tries to do that, he cannot possibly cry out in that way (Cf. Calvin, Rom. and These., p.148: "... it should be noted that this conflict mentioned by the apostle does not exist in man until he has been sanctified by the Spirit of God ...", and Luther, Römer, s.340: "... totus ille textus expresse indicat gemitum et odium contra carnem et dilectionem ad bonum et ad legem. Hoc autem carnali homini nullo modo conuenit, qui potius odit legem et ridet ac sequitur carnem per prona. Spiritualis enim pugnat cum carne et gemit, quod non tantum potest, quantum vult. Carnalis autem non pugnat, Sed cedit atque consentit ...." Also cf. the attitude of the self-complacent Pharisees and scribes in the day of Jesus and the Apostle Paul. See esp. Mt. 23:1-36; Lk. 18:9-14). Then, does the Apostle Paul who has already received the Holy Spirit cry out in the past by transcending time and space? Bornkamm and others are at a loss for words. Had the Apostle Paul ever once realized the true meaning of the Law or confessed his thorough helplessness against Sin before he met the Risen Lord on his way to Damascus? Thus, Bornkamm and his fellow critics' reading 'the unredeemed man's cry' into v.15 ("... εὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω τεῦτον πράσσω, ἄλλον τεῦτον ποιῶ.") clearly shows the true character of their futile piety intoxicated with self-complacency (But, cf. Luther, Römer, ss.341f.: "... Non Est putandum, Quod Apostolus velit intelligi se malum, quod odit, facere et bonum, quod vult, non facere, vt moraliter et metaphysice, quasi nullum bonum, Sed omne malum faciat; sic enim humano sensui verba eius sonant. Sed vult, quod non tot et tantum bonum nec tanta facilitate faciat, quantum et quanta vult. Vult enim purissime, liberrime et lgissime, sine molestiis repugnantis carnis agere, quod non potest, Vt qui castus esse proponit, Vellet nullis titillationibus impugnari, Sed cum omni facilitate castitatem habere. Sed non finitur a carne, quod suis motibus et cogitationibus facit molestissimam castitatem et agit sua immunda desideria, etiam Inuito spiritu. Qui Vigilare, orare, operari proximo proponit, semper Imueniet rebellem carnem et alia machinantem atque cupientem ....") Therefore, Bornkamm and others cannot solve the exegetical problem of v.24 ("Ταλαιπωρεῖς εὐχει ἀνθρώποις τίς μὴ ὑπάρχει έκ τοῦ αὐτοτης τού θανάτου τού τεῦτου;") The only way of solution that they can choose is, as we have seen, inevitably to separate the 'εὖχα of vv.14-25 from the Apostle Paul himself (But, cf. Davies, Paul, p.32: "... Paul's treatment of his experience in Romans 7 ... Paul there pictures his own moral struggle in terms of that of Adam ...."). These critics are, indeed, well aware of the joy of the redeemed man but amazingly forgetful of the plain fact that only a redeemed sinner by the grace of God in Jesus Christ can realize his wretched helplessness against Sin which is the very part of his own nature (See v.17b: "... ἐνεκὶ θεσιν οἱ λόγοι ἔμμαθα εἰς τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ τεῦτον;") so long as he wears this sinful flesh in this passing world (It is very interesting to hear one of them, Käsemann, who argues with regard to 'εὖχα in vv.14-25 that "... εὖχα neint den Menschen im Schatten Adams, umschliesst also nicht die christliche Existenz in ihrer ständigen

(Continued on next page)
(continued from the previous page) Versuchung ... Was hier ausgesagt wird, ist nach c.6 und 8 für den Christen überholt und nicht einmal als Inhalt der Bekehrungserfahrung des Apostels gekennzeichnet ...." (Römer, ss.191f.), yet he declared at his interview given to Der Spiegel on 'der Linksruck in Studentengemeinden' that: "Die Erfahrung hat mich gelehrt, dass Ideale und Ideologien immer umschlagen, sobald sie an die Macht kommen. Auch die westliche Kultur kann sich ja nur sehr bedingt der Humanität rühmen. Auch wir sind in unserem Jahrhundert aus Idealismus in Barbarei gestolpert. Warum sollten Kommunisten den Gesetzen menschlicher Besessenheit nicht unterliegen? Ein Protestant muss lernen, als Sünder unter Sündern zu leben — hüben wie drüben." in answer to the question: „Halten Sie denn Kommunismus für möglich, der in der Praxis nicht umschlägt in die Diktatur einer Partei oder in Staatsmonopolismus und Staatskapitalismus?" presented to him (See the issue of 21. November 1977, s.124). But, honestly, we do not quite understand how he squares this statement: "... A Protestant must learn to live as a sinner ...." with his interpretation of 'ἐγὼ' in Rom. 7:14-25 except that his idea of being a Christian is completely alien from the Apostle Paul's one. Nevertheless, as Nygren indicates, "... in that cry ["Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἀνθρώπος: τίς μὲ μοι ἔχεται ἣν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου;"] there is nothing of doubt or despair." (Romans, p.301) [Cf. also Cranfield, Romans, Vol.I, pp.365f.: "... the truth is, surely, that inability to recognize the distress reflected in this cry as characteristic of Christian existence argues a failure to grasp the full seriousness of the Christian's obligation to express his gratitude to God by obedience of life. The farther men advance in the Christian life, and the more mature their discipleship, the clearer becomes their perception of the heights to which God calls them, and the more painfully sharp their consciousness of the distance between what they ought, and want, to be, and what they are. The assertion that this cry could only come from an unconverted heart, and that the apostle must be expressing not what he feels as he writes but the vividly remembered experience of the unconverted man, is, we believe, totally untrue. To make it is to indicate — with all respect be it said — that one has not yet considered how absolute are the claims of the grace of God in Jesus Christ. The man, whose cry this is, is one who, knowing himself to be righteous by faith, desires from the depths of his being to respond to the claims which the gospel makes upon him (cf. v.22). It is the very clarity of his understanding of the gospel and the very sincerity of his love to God, which make his pain at this continuing sinfulness so sharp. But, be it noted, v.24, while it is a cry of real and deep anguish, is not at all a cry of despair ... and the question τίς μὲ μοι ἔχεται, Χ.Υ.Α. may be understood as expressing the speaker's earnest longing for something which he knows is surely coming (cf. 8.23) ...."

See further Luther, Römer, s.346: "... mirum est potuisse vili in mentem venire Apostolum hgc verba in persona veteris et carnalis hominis loqui, quae tantæ sunt perfectionis verba, quasi Apostolus Velut hipocrissa non nisi bona de seipso sentire et loqui debuerit, hoc est seipsum commendare et peccatorem negare, vt gratiam non
Apostle have to confess such a shameful helplessness of himself against Sin to the Roman Christians whom he has never met so far? Does he confess only to boast of his weakness (Cf. 2 Cor. 11:30, 12:9f.)? If the Apostle Paul were merely intending to introduce himself through his Gospel to the Roman Christians with a view to seeking association with them in the interests of his future missionary work with vague and superficial information about the Roman congregation,¹ it would be much more desirable to conceal such a confession for the sake of his authority as an apostle. But, through this he puts both the mistaken legalism of the Jewish Christians and the distorted anti-nomianism of the Gentile Christians to silence and, at the same time, makes the Jewish Christians in particular, who were much more complacent than the Gentile Christians, see the Cross ² (continued from the previous page) commendaret, Sed negaret ...."

¹ Cf. Kümmel, Einleitung, s.273.

² For the understanding of the background of the Reformers' view on this matter, see esp. Augustinus, Retractationum, I, 23 in PL, XXXII, col.620; his Expositio quarundam propositionum ex Epistola ad Romanos, I. 43 in PL, XXXV, col.2071; his Contra duas Epistolae Pelagianorum, ad Bonifacium, I, x.17 in PL, XLIV, col.559; his Contra Julianum, II, iii.6 (in PL, XLIV, col.677), II, iii.7 (in ibid., col.678), II, iv.8 (in ibid., col.679), II, v.12 (in ibid., col.682), II, v.13 (in ibid., col.683), II, ix.32 (in ibid., col.696), XIII, xxvi.62 (in ibid., cols.733f.), VI, xxiii.70 - xxvi.83 (in ibid., cols.865-874).
and realize humbly once again how God saved them, the sinners who could neither fulfil the demand of the Law nor overcome the power of Sin. It is also highly convincing that, going a step farther, the Apostle Paul wished to make those wrong-headed mystics among the Roman congregation realize their quite mistaken illusion that they had already removed all dirt from their human bodies (Cf. 1 Pet. 3:21). Nevertheless, his main emphasis in ch.7 is without doubt laid on the Jewish Christians.

2. THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN CHRISTIAN LIFE

1. Ἰδα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ εἰς ἡμῖν τοῦ μὴ κατὰ δώρικα περιπατέοντων ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα

From the beginning of Romans 8, contrasting 'ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς' with 'ὁ νόμος τῆς ἐμπειρίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου', the Apostle Paul is unfolding his understanding of the Holy Spirit throughout the whole chapter.

Calvin argues that "Paul improperly calls the Spirit of God the law of the Spirit" and also argues that the Apostle Paul is calling 'the dominion of the flesh and the tyranny of death' 'the law of sin and death'.

---

1 See v.2.
2 Rom. and Thess., p.156.
3 See ibid., p.157.
But what the Apostle means here is that the unconditional and initiative love of God has transferred him from the cursed state in which his sinful flesh had been constantly inhabited and dominated by the rebellious hostility toward God which deserves to die into the blessed state of eternal life in Jesus Christ.

As A. Richardson indicates:

In the OT 'Spirit of God' is one of the ways in which God's action may be mentioned without actually making the anthropomorphic statement that God did this or that.¹

, the Israelite people in the Old Testament period understood the Spirit of God only from His connection with their historical experience.² They had never been so much interested in the nature of God as they had been in the activity of God itself. The Old Testament prophets understood God through His divine activities in their history. For them the Spirit of God was nothing but God's presence itself among them. And God's presence could be perceived only through His concrete activities intervening in human history.

The Apostle Paul is also standing in this tradition of the Old Testament. Therefore, 'ἐν οἷς τε οὐκ ἐπιθυμησα τῆς γῆς ἐν κρίσιν' in v.2 without doubt can be identified with the 'grace of God itself

¹ Theology, p.103.
² Cf. Eichrodt, Theology, Vol.2, pp.50ff. and esp. see p.50: "... The OT conception only attains its proper significance from its connection with historical experience. God's activity in history, aimed at the creation of a consecrated people of God, was discerned not only in isolated marvellous events, but also in the emergence of specially equipped men and women ...."
in Jesus Christ'. And it is the power of God itself that saves man,\(^1\) as it were, makes us abide in the life in His Son.

When he says "... ἵνα τὸ δίκαιωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρώθη ἐν ἡμῖν τοῖς μὴ κατὰ βάρκα περιπατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα" (v.4), does the Apostle Paul indicate any possibility of our fulfilling the Law because we are now in Jesus Christ? The Apostle Paul does not have even the slightest intention to convey such a meaning.\(^2\) What he really wishes to say in v.4 is that God Himself had already fulfilled the requirement of the Law for us through the death of His only Son on the cross and owing to that grace we are now walking under the guidance of the Spirit.\(^3\) Hence, we are the very evidence of God's saving initiative which resulted in the fulfilment of 'τὸ δίκαιωμα τοῦ νόμου'.

Vv.6-8 should be understood in this light. They have nothing to do with the possibility of our fulfilling the Law. God had already fulfilled, and we need only to acknowledge humbly what He had done for us. To set our mind on the Spirit is to acknowledge His fulfilment in our daily life.

---

1 Cf. Rom. 8:3.
2 Cf. 1 Pet. 3:21. And also cf. Calvin, Rom. and Thess., p.160: "... The interpreters who understand that those who have been renewed by the Spirit of Christ fulfil the law, introduce a misrepresentation which is completely foreign to Paul's meaning. As long as believers sojourn in the world, they do not make such progress that the righteousness of the law is full or complete in them ...."
3 When the Apostle Paul says 'περιπατοῦσιν κατὰ πνεῦμα', he means 'being led by the Spirit'.
But, why does the Apostle Paul use an expression which gives us such an impression as if he is saying that we can fulfil the requirements of the Law by living according to the guidance of the Spirit? Even in v.9b the Apostle Paul says "... εἰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ." Does he mean that we have to have the Spirit of Christ in order that we may belong to Him? Can any man have the Spirit of Christ whenever he wants? If he could, the salvation of each man would be in his own power. Clearly, such an idea is completely alien to the Apostle Paul's aim through this passage. The Apostle Paul himself knows more clearly than any one else that only those to whom the Risen Lord gives His Spirit are allowed to belong to Him. The right of choice and decision is always in the hand of the Risen Lord. Why does the Apostle Paul have to use constantly such a perplexing way of expression? What Christian under the sun would say he (or she) does not belong to Jesus Christ? But, how can he prove that he has the Spirit of Christ? What is the yardstick for objective judgement in that case? Is the Apostle Paul concerned about the character of such questions at all? So far as we know, he is not in the least interested in such vacant speculation. What he says in v.9b is "You have the Spirit of Christ. But, if you really know that you have the Spirit of the Risen Lord, you ought to lead a life appropriate to those who are in His Spirit!" Why does he continue to use such an equivocal way of expression?

In v.11, he says

\[ εἰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος τῶν Ἰσραήλ ἐκ νεκρῶν οἶκεῖ ἐν ἱππύν, ο ἐγείρας ἐκ νεκρῶν Χριστοῦ \]
Does he mean that there may be some Roman Christians in whom the Spirit of God who raised Jesus from the dead does not dwell? Moreover, how does he distinguish the Spirit of God from the Spirit of Christ? What is the difference between the Spirit of God who raised Jesus from the dead and the Spirit of the Risen Lord? Where and in what state was the Spirit of Jesus when He was dead and stayed in the tomb for three days?

As Whiteley indicates, the Apostle Paul's statement in Romans 8:11 seems to "suggest that God and His Spirit were active in the resurrection and that Christ Himself was passive". Can we get any satisfactory answer to the questions concerning these puzzling problems? Do we have to be satisfied merely with the superficial conclusion of Whiteley following the argument of A.W. Wainwright that:

 Even Paul, who describes the Spirit as an intercessor to God, does not show any clear awareness of a problem about the relationship of the Spirit either to Father or to Son. The question is clearly present only in the Fourth Gospel, where an attempt is made to show that Father, Son, and Spirit are different from each other.

---

2 The Trinity in the New Testament (London, 1962), p.249. Also see Whiteley, Theology, p.129: "... Wainwright is therefore justified in maintaining that, although God, Christ, and the Spirit were in the forefront of St. Paul's mind he was not aware, like St. John, of a problem of the Trinity ...."
But, we cannot make such a bold assertion without any positive evidence. We think even if the Apostle Paul had been fully aware of the problem of the Trinity, it is quite doubtful whether he would have dared answer such a question concerning the very nature of God.

On the contrary, it is much more probable that from the beginning the Apostle Paul must have been so clearly aware how reckless and preposterous such an attempt was or he did not feel any such necessity in his life-context. Unlike many scholars who made wrong inferences from this passage, the Apostle Paul is only saying "Do you firmly believe that the Spirit of God who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you and that He will also give you eternal life even though you are now wearing mortal flesh?" Why does the Apostle Paul again repeat such a saying: "εἴ ὑὲν κατὰ βάρκα ζήτε, μᾶλλον ἁμαρτήσειν, εἴ δὲ πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ βασιλέως δεινατείτε κοινωθεὶν." (v.13) as if Christians themselves could abolish the effect of divine grace in Jesus Christ according to their own decision? In order to understand his aim through these perplexing

1 Cf. 2 Pet. 3:15b-16.
2 Cf. 1 Cor. 6:14; 2 Cor. 4:14; 1 Thess. 4:14, etc. Calvin argues that: "... By mortal bodies he means all in us that still remains subject to death. Paul's general practice is to apply this name to the grosser part of us. We conclude from this that he is not speaking of the last resurrection, which will take place in a moment, but of the continual operation of the Spirit, by which He gradually mortifies the remains of the flesh and renews in us the heavenly life ...." (Rom. and Thess., p.166). But, here, without doubt, the Apostle Paul has in his mind the imperishably transformed bodies of Christians in the near future at the Parousia (Cf. Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p.198; Dodd, Romans, pp.125f.; Bruce, Romans, p.164). In his expectation of the imminent Parousia, the Apostle Paul believes that not all but many Roman Christians will be able to enter the eternal Heavenly Kingdom of God without experiencing physical death.
questions, first of all, we have to examine whether we are standing in the place of the Apostle who is so fully aware of the unfathomable ignorance and wickedness of human nature in understanding the unconditional grace of God or in that of the Roman Christians, especially the Gentile Christians, whom the apostle is admonishing. We should remember that the Apostle Paul is seriously worried not only about probable Jewish Christian ignorance of the righteousness coming from God but also about the distinct possibility of the Gentile Christians' abuse of divine grace which they had already received free in Jesus Christ. Without understanding this practical situation in which the Apostle Paul is standing we cannot properly understand his message proclaimed to this Gentile church.

In vv.14-16, the Apostle Paul is definitely declaring that the Roman Christians are sons of God led by the Spirit of God and they have already received the spirit of sonship by which they came to cry 'ἀγει α ὑπατὴρ'. ¹ Why does he endeavour specially to emphasize the testimony of the Spirit that they are the children of God? Unlike his former perplexing expressions which cause most people to be tormented by their doubts about individual salvation, the Apostle Paul here carries an unshakable conviction of their salvation to the Roman Christians especially in vv.15f. What is he trying to say to them?

THE CREATION GROANING IN TRAVAIL

In 8:17f., for the first time so far in this epistle, the Apostle Paul is carefully disclosing his aim of developing the discourse on the Holy Spirit in the concrete historical context. In his mentioning 'συμπάθεσιν ἵνα καὶ συμφωνοῦμεν' (v.17b) and 'οὐκ ἐξίσια τὰ παθήματα τῶν νῦν καιρῶν πρὶς τὴν μείλλουσαν δόξαν ἀπεκαλύφθηναι εἰς ἡμᾶς' (v.18), what does he precisely mean by 'συμπάθεσιν' and 'τὰ παθήματα τῶν νῦν καιρῶν'? Is he simply indicating, as most scholars argue, the general suffering of the human being as a whole which are inevitable natural phenomena so long as we are clothed with this perishable flesh in this world?¹

Even in vv.19-22, is the Apostle Paul speaking to the Roman Christians about the biological world of created nature and excepting human beings so as to give them some profound lessons by making them look at the final goal of the creation of God through entirely new philosophical speculation which can hear the creation waiting for the Parousia?²

Interpreting v.23 along with vv.19-22, Dodd indicates the poetic vision of the Apostle Paul viewing the lots of Christians who have to

² Cf. Luther, Römer, ss.371ff. and esp. s.371: "... Aliter Apostolus de rebus philosophatur et sapit quam philosophi et metaphysici. Quia philosophi oculum ita in presentiam rerum immergunt, vt solum quid-ditates et qualitates earum speculentur, Apostolus autem oculos nostros reuocat ab intuitu rerum presentium, ab essentia et accidentibus earum, et dirigit in eas, secundum quod futur& sunt ...."
share not only the common lot of man but also that of all Nature in this passing world.¹ Do we have to understand the Apostle Paul's remark simply as speculative philosophy identifying the pain of animals and plants with our own pain?²

Considering the contemporary historical situation under the rule of the Roman Empire, we cannot be satisfied with such a superficial interpretation. The Apostle Paul was not composed enough for the leisurely development of such a philosophical speculation, as many scholars used to conjecture. Throughout his epistle he never openly mentions the demonic character of this pagan empire utterly hostile to God. And also we can never see him directly criticize even once such abominable evils of the contemporary society of the Roman Empire as emperor worship and inhuman slavery. But, we cannot say that the Apostle approved the legitimacy of the contemporary emperor worship or slavery because he does not directly attack these things in his epistle.³

¹ See his Romans, p.133
² Cf. idem.
³ One may argue it is the modern minds and not the Apostle Paul of the first century that regard emperor worship and slavery in the contemporary Roman society as abominable evils. But such an argument can be made only on the assumption that the Apostle could fully appreciate neither exactly what emperor worship meant to the great majority of the first-century Romans [Cf. S.J. Case, The Social Origins of Christianity (Chicago, 1923), pp.101f.] nor the indescribably inhuman treatment which most contemporary Roman slaves of various origins had to suffer (But, cf. Eph. 6:9. Also cf. Simpson, Ephesians, pp.140f.: "... many a superficial thinker has blamed Christianity for lending any sanction whatsoever to the rank injustice of slavery. But its mission was spiritual in essence and only collaterally social. Had it assailed the established (cont.)
There are few who indicate the agony of the Apostle due to the fact that even though he had been burning with unquenchable hatred toward all the evils of this pagan empire under the sway of the demonic power, he had to refrain utterly from rebuking the Romans for all their evils in the presence of God not because he was worried about his own individual safety but because he was so thoroughly aware of the ruthless brutality of this huge monstrous empire which was ready to crush down without delay all the young churches of God at the very moment when Christians came to show any provocative attitude towards its absolute authority.

The words of S.J. Case:

The cult of both the living and the deceased emperor was well established in the life and thinking of vast numbers of people, particularly in the eastern provinces where gentile Christianity passed through the early stages of its development.1

3 (continued from the previous page) system of serfdom point-blank, it would have ruined that primary object by inflaming political antagonisms to an incandescent furnace-heat. Servile wars had already shaken Roman society to its base and helped to precipitate imperial dictatorship as the sole effectual preservative against social insecurity. The institution of slavery was in fact bound up inextricably with the legislation of the ancient world and could only be dissolved with its dissolution. By attacking that deep-rooted curse directly the new faith would have come into deadly conflict with "the powers that be", and merged itself in a gigantic extrinsic upheaval fatal to its intrinsic purpose. Divine wisdom is not so shortsighted as to be thus side-tracked. In the unsullied cosmos of God's creation slavery could have found no place. That inhuman abuse sprang from the infraction of the moral order. It was one of the outgrowths and evidences of a polity unhinged by sin ....")

indicates an anticipation of tension between the young Gentile churches and the Roman Empire from the beginning of the church history.

Nevertheless, the Apostle Paul never mentions emperor worship in his epistles. That does not necessarily mean that the Gentile Christians living in those provinces where emperor worship, along with other imperial cults, was very prevalent did not experience any direct or indirect oppression from the Roman authorities who could not help suspecting them to be disloyal to the emperor when they firmly refused to attend any imperial cult ceremony. Without doubt, even in the very churches founded by himself the Apostle Paul must have been unceasingly informed of various painful situations of the Gentile Christians produced by their making choices between God and Caesar.¹

¹ Fergus Millar argues with regard to the persecutions in the provinces that "... It was only the men in the middle, the provincial governors, and less often, the magistrates of provincial cities, who, when Christians were brought before them, regularly applied the test of recognition of the Imperial cult, but along with that of the cults of the other gods. The persecutions cannot be explained in political terms, as demands for formal displays of loyalism. They were motivated by feelings which we must call religious; among those religious feelings the worship of the Emperor played a real, but a minor part. The most important conception which lay behind the persecutions was precisely the one which was to be the foundation of the Christian Empire: that the world was sustained, and the earthly government of it granted, by divine favour ...." ["The Imperial Cult and the Persecutions" in Le Cuite des Souverains dans l'Empire Romain: sept exposés suivis de discussions par Elias Bickerman, Christian Habicht, Jean Beaujou, P. Millar, G.W. Bowersock, Salvatore Calderone, Klaus Thraede avec la participation de Denis van Berchem, Adalberto Giovannini, François Faschoud, + Henry Seyrig (EAC, Tome XIX), préparés et présidés par Willem den Boer (Genève, 1973), p.164]. But, we are quite doubtful about the existence of such a deep religious concern on the part of the ordinary Roman authorities in the provinces as is indicated by Millar. Besides,
Christians, especially the Gentile Christians, were placed in very awkward social and political positions not only in the eastern provinces but throughout all the provinces of the Roman empire.

1 (continued from the previous page) he appears to confuse the situation in the frontier provinces with that in the more stable parts of the Empire. Also cf. den Boer's contention in the discussion following the above lecture given by Millar: "... Not all Roman officials displayed the phlegmatic attitude of Gallio in Corinth (Act. 18, 12-17) or evinced the sympathetic interest of Sergius Paulus (Cyprus, Act. 13, 7-12). Perhaps a passage of the Epistle to the Corinthians, dating approximately 25 years after Paul's conversion, is illuminating in this respect. The magistrate asked persons, brought before him as Christians, to curse Christ (ἀντεβημεν Ἰησοῦς [ἐνιοῦν or ἐλών]). If an accused did, he went free (Cf. Plin. Epist. X 96, 5: maledicercer Christo). If he did not, his confession, Ἐκπίπτεις Ἰησοῦς, proved his obstinacy, and he was sentenced to death. One can understand that under this mental pressure "no one can confess 'Jesus is Lord' unless he is guided by the Holy Spirit", as Paul says. Those who did not have the courage to suffer and to die are alluded to in the first part of this passage: "No one who is led by God's spirit can say 'A curse on Jesus'" (1 Cor. 12, 3)." (Ibid., p.170). Apparently, den Boer seems to try unreasonably to read the persecutions in Pliny's time into the Apostle Paul's epistle. It is highly unlikely that the majority of the provincial authorities in the time of the Apostle Paul were ready to pass death sentences on the Christians who refused to join in emperor worship. Nevertheless, we should also admit there is no way to confirm that no Christian of the Apostle Paul's day had suffered death at the hands of the imperial authorities even in those troubled provinces where the loyalties of the inhabitants had been seriously suspected by the Romans. Indeed, it is quite probable that not a few obstinate (?) Christians, especially, in the remote areas near the frontier had been put to the sword on the charge of treason. Anyhow, despite the seeming anachronism on the part of den Boer we cannot totally dismiss the possibility that even in the more stable provinces away from the frontier a small number of Christians scattered among the pagan neighbours had been brought before the authorities and had to undergo an inquisition similar to the one conducted later by Pliny (See esp. his Letters, X, xcv.i.5: "... Qui negabant esse se Christianos aut fuisse, cum praeuentb me deos adpellarent et imaginis tuae, quam propter hoc iussersam cum simulacris nunnun adferri, ture ac vino supplicarent, praeterea male dicentur qui sunt re vera Christiani, dimittendos putavi."). Their faith in Christ may not have brought death sentences but, certainly, severe punishments which may well have led some of them to death eventually and even into shame in the case of Christian women.
Under the rule of Augustus' successors emperor worship as the main imperial cult, inseparably connected with Romans' ardent aspirations for their national security and welfare, came to be accepted by the majority of the Roman public as the most reliable safeguard against any external menace to their peaceful existence.¹

Therefore, though the Roman authorities were not as yet considering any direct persecution toward Christianity, the Roman Christians' unwillingness to support such customary religious activities of their society must have aroused serious hostility of both the authorities of the Empire and their neighbours from the early stage of the Roman Church.²

We should also remember the undeniable fact that even though the Apostle and other church leaders did not attempt to reform the political and social structure of the contemporary Roman Empire including the abolition of slavery, the Christian Gospel itself could never compromise fundamentally with all the political and social injustice in the Empire.

¹ Case, Evolution, pp.215ff.
² Cf. S.J. Case, The Social Triumph of the Ancient Church (London, 1934), pp.145, 168f., and esp. 168f.: "... Christians ... were thought harmful to the state. Their conduct was believed to be subversive of the best interests of the communities in which they dwell. They refused to participate in its customary religious activities, they upset the economic balance by failing to purchase images or victims for sacrifice, they made no contributions to the treasures of the temples, they frowned upon the entertainments, they were clannish and unsocial, and who could say to what lengths their perversities might go when they assembled together in private? These observations would have been sufficient to convince the guardians of the political order that Christians were hateful to the state gods, even if Christian refusal to worship them had not become openly known ...." and also his Social Origins, pp.99ff.
It is true that officially Christianity could still enjoy religious privilege as a mere sect of Judaism in the eyes of the Roman authorities, who as yet did not distinguish Christianity from Judaism. However, so long as the Roman Christians assumed an uncooperative and critical attitude towards all the social and religious phenomena of contemporary Roman society, even if they did not deliberately take any defiant attitude towards this pagan empire, they could not but suffer from the increasing threat and hostility of the Roman authorities together with the unbearable sneers and vicious slanders of their neighbours through daily life.¹

Moreover, the political crisis between the Roman Empire and the Jews in Palestine, which was getting worse and leading irrevocably towards the catastrophe of A.D. 66,² must have not only incited the Roman authorities to cast a more suspicious eye upon the Roman Christians but also must have aggravated the already prevalent anti-Christian feeling of the Roman public all the more.

The Apostle must have been clearly aware of such painful trials of the Roman Christians in their society. At the same time, he was also seriously considering the great likelihood of trials coming upon

¹ Some strong aversion and hostility of the Roman public towards Christians which must have been increased all the more because of their misunderstanding of the ritual of Christianity had already existed even some time before the Neronian persecution. Cf. Tacitus, Annals, XV. xliiv: "... Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subsidit reas et quaesitissimis poenis adfecit, quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat ...."

² Cf. esp. Josephus, Antiquités, XIX, ix; XX, v, vi, vii and War, II, xii, xiii.
Christians as a subsequent side effect of the impending catastrophe in Palestine, because if the Roman authorities came to reconsider their traditionally favourable policy toward Jews and deprive them of all the religious privilege in Judaism, the Roman Christians who could so far share the privilege of Judaism as an inner sect of it would no longer be able to avoid coming into a head-on collision with this invincible pagan empire especially when they refused to adopt the imperial cult.

Therefore, by 'βυθίζωμεν' and 'τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ' the Apostle Paul does not indicate the general sufferings of all the human beings which are the natural consequence of life in the flesh, but the very painful situation of the Roman Christians in contemporary society in which they had to endure all the unbearable trials in utter silence no matter how harsh they were.

The Apostle Paul knows how this unyielding brutality of this invincible demonic power is ruthlessly driving the Roman Christians constantly into a blind alley so as almost to lose their self-restraint. So, pointing to the glory of God which is to be revealed at the imminent Parousia, the Apostle is admonishing the utterly exhausted Roman Christians against any risk of inauspicious activity. So far they have endured all the trials so well in their expectation of the imminent Parousia, they still have to endure the painful tribulations and wait a little longer.
In 8:19-22, at a first glance, the Apostle Paul seems to speak only about the natural world excepting man, but if we closely examine the concrete historical context in which the Roman Christians were standing, we come to realize the stark fact that the Apostle's real aim is to speak about the general situation of the human being suffering from the demonic power of the Roman Empire not from Nature itself. The Apostle Paul says in v.19 that all the creatures eagerly wait for the revealing of the sons of God. But, those who really long for the Parousia are neither creatures which have no reason nor natural men who do not see themselves as being created by the Divine Creator, but, without doubt, only the Roman Christians suffering under the rule of the Roman Empire.

Why does he use such an expression at all? In v.20, the Apostle Paul also says that all the creatures were subjected to futility. Calvin interprets this as follows:

He [Paul] says that they have been subjected to vanity, because they do not remain firm and secure, but, being transitory and inconstant, pass swiftly away. Paul is undoubtedly contrasting vanity with natural perfection.¹

Is this exactly what the Apostle wishes to say? The Apostle Paul continues to indicate that all creatures were subjected to futility by the very will of God who subjected them in hope (v.20b). What creature is more miserably subjected to futility than man? All the creatures in the natural world had been created by God for man but,

¹ Rom. and Thess., p.173.
instead of dominating over these creatures, man came to worship and serve these very creatures rather than God the Creator.\(^1\) All the creatures excepting man are still praising the glory of God even in their cursed plight. Even the inanimate heavenly bodies vividly show the eternal order of God's creation. Therefore, the Apostle Paul could say "**τὰ γὰρ ἄρατα αὐτῶν ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασιν νοοῦμεν καθότατα, ἢ ἡ ἄλλα ἄνδρον ἀνδρός καὶ θείτης, ...**"\(^2\)

Actually, even in their cursed situation, all the creatures are subjected to the very order of God's creation but not to futility as man is. The creatures themselves had never "**ηὗλαβαν τὴν ὅσον τοῖς ἄνθρωποι θέσει ἐν ἐμοίῳματι εἰκόνες φθερτεὶ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ πτεραιώδους καὶ ἑρπετῶν**".\(^3\) All the creatures themselves are by nature good and pure, but they became vain only because man has perverted them through his deceitful lusts.\(^4\) When the Apostle Paul indicates the perverted situation of all the creatures subjected to futility not by their own fault but totally by man's fault, his aim is not merely to make the Roman Christians feel keenly man's irreparable fault but to make them understand clearly the plain truth that among all the creatures man alone is subjected to futility. By declaring that "**... εἰς ἐκεῖνα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ ὑπετάξατα, ἕφ' ἑπτίδι**" (v.20) the Apostle Paul wishes the Roman Christians to realize what a stern judgement had been passed upon all the creatures by God not for their

\(^1\) Cf. Rom. 1:25. \\
\(^2\) *Ibid.*, 1:20. \\
\(^3\) *Ibid.*, 1:23. \\
\(^4\) Cf. Luther, *Römer*, ss.372ff.
own wickedness but solely for man's own wickedness in the presence of God. God had made them patiently wait for the day of salvation when they would regain their blessed original state in the beginning of the Creation. They had been deprived of this as a divine judgement on the wickedness of man for whom they had been created by God in perfect obedience to His sovereign judgement. How much more patiently and humbly does man, the very originator of all these miseries, have to wait for the Parousia in thorough-going obedience to God in whose presence and against whom he had done all this great wickedness and sinned?

But, men became all the more futile in their thinking ("... ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τῶι διάλογῳ αὐτῶι, καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀβύνετος αὐτῶι καρδία.") and, unlike the other creatures, they subjected themselves to futility, exchanging the glory of God for images resembling mortal man through their deceitful lusts which were characteristic of the nature of the Roman imperial cult, especially of emperor worship.

When the Apostle Paul says "... πάση ἡ κτίσις δυστέναξες καὶ ἐποιεῖται ἐξρ. τοῦ νόν", he appears outwardly to contemplate the general phenomenon of the natural world from the angle of a profound

1 Cf. Rom. 8:21.
2 Cf. ibid., 1:21.
3 Cf. further Present Thesis, pp. 290ff.
4 Rom. 8:22.
philosophy of life as a man who speaks with the vision of a poet.¹ Probably, even if the contemporary Roman authorities had happened to read it, they might have also interpreted it in such a sphere of philosophical meditation. But, when the Roman Christians came to read it, they must have realized immediately that it was not the creatures which have no reason, but men that have been really groaning until then and were still groaning in travail. Therefore, 'ἡ κρίσις' should be understood as indicating 'man'.²

Without letting the Roman authorities realize his real aim at all, the Apostle Paul shows his ingenious ability to achieve his aim in his practical life context. The Roman authorities may think that the Apostle Paul is simply developing his philosophical religious idea based on his pessimistic view of life in this world concerning the general sufferings of human life as a part of natural phenomena, but what he is trying to indicate in the context of 8:19-23 is none other than the reality of the Roman Empire in which even the Roman Christians who are being led by the Spirit of God cannot help eagerly waiting for the arrival of the final moment to take off the perishable flesh.

In vv.24f., the Apostle Paul urges the Roman Christians to stand firmly with patience in their hope for the invisible order and sovereignty of the eternal Kingdom of God without wavering in the presence of the visible order and power of the Roman Empire.

¹ Cf. Dodd, Romans, p.133.
² Against Luther. See his Römer, s.372.
After indicating the historical reality in which the Roman Christians are standing, the Apostle Paul begins to convince them in vv.26f. that the work of the Holy Spirit will overcome all the obstacles beyond the control of their strength which are blocking their path to salvation. In the whirlpool of great tribulations, even Christians used to be at a loss to know how to pray as they ought despite their desperate efforts to surmount the unbearable trials. But even at such a critical moment "... αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπερευνάτων στεναχωρέω ἐλαφθοῖς" (v.26). Even though the Roman Christians are living in a society in which they are not allowed at all to express openly what they think, God knows their mind in spite of their utter silence. The Holy Spirit knows the mind of God and intercedes for the Roman Christians according to the will of God. The Roman Christians are within the influence of such works of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, the Roman Christians should be strong and of good courage in their expectation of the imminent Parousia no matter how severe the trials may be.

In vv.28-30, the Apostle Paul mentions the so-called predestination as the eternal Providence of God for our salvation. The Roman Christians are called according to the purpose of God (v.28). God called those whom He had already predestined, and justified and glorified them in His Son (v.30). Such a decision of God has nothing to do with any merits of man. Therefore, the Roman

Christians who have been already predestined in Jesus Christ need only to entrust every thing to divine Providence.

Accordingly, in the full conviction that God who had sacrificed even His only Son for them all is now with them¹ the Apostle Paul declares that nothing, no matter what it is, can separate them from the love of God in Jesus Christ.²

Without understanding the Roman Christians' painful situation in contemporary Roman society we can neither realize the significance of the association of such words as 'Ὀλίγος', 'ὑπόμονη', 'μάχαιρα' (v.35)³ with 'ὕπατι' (v.38) (which without doubt indicates the contemporary Roman authorities), nor can we understand the reason why of all the Old Testament passages the Apostle quotes Psalm 44:22 (Cf. v.36) as especially relevant in his life context.⁴

As we have seen so far in Romans 8, the Apostle Paul's main aim is not to develop the doctrine of the Holy Spirit through a calm

---

¹ Cf. ibid., 8:31f.
² Cf. ibid., 8:38f.
⁴ Cf. idem: "... The sufferings of Christians, like those of Christ, were foretold ...." We have to consider the great probability of serious injustice that may have been done to the Roman Christians unceasingly in the light of the prevalent anti-Christian feeling of both the contemporary Roman authorities and the Roman public. Even though there had been as yet no official persecution, we cannot exclude completely the possibility of ruthless and vicious persecution inflicted on the individual Christians.
exposition\textsuperscript{1} in order that the Roman Christians may understand their salvation in the work of the Holy Spirit but to develop the discourse upon the Holy Spirit in his attempt to solve the urgent practical problem of the Roman Christians.

In his expounding the work of the Holy Spirit to the Roman Christians, the Apostle Paul does not begin from the necessity of the ontological elucidation about the nature of the Holy Spirit for them. In ch.8, the Apostle begins with his soteriological elucidation of the works of the Holy Spirit and ends also with that to the Roman Christians in his attempt to encourage them, as they suffer from the various severe trials under the brutal rule of this pagan empire, not only to overcome all these present ordeals but also to face stoutly the imminently expected persecutions.

Throughout ch.8 the Apostle is eagerly admonishing the Roman Christians in the midst of great tribulations to be patient a little longer in their ardent expectation of the imminent Advent of the Risen Lord in which they have walked so far enduring all kind of unbearable trials under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. This is the historical context in which the Pauline proclamation of the work of the Holy Spirit in Romans 8 should be understood.

\textsuperscript{1} Therefore, the argument on the part of B.M. Metzger that "... Unlike most of his other letters, this one was not written to meet a particular emergency, but is rather a calm exposition ...." (His Background, p.229) is proved once again to be quite foreign to the Apostle Paul's own life context.
3. THE APOSTLE PAUL AND THE SALVATION OF ISRAEL

i. THE APOSTLE PAUL'S CONVICTION OF THE FINAL SALVATION OF ISRAEL

The Apostle Paul's efforts at trying to solve the practical problem that caused the unceasing split and hostility between the Jewish Christians and the Gentile Christians enter a new phase when he begins to make mention of the final salvation of Israel in ch.11.¹ After expounding of God's absolute sovereignty in salvation (9:6-29) and Israel's disobedience before God and the salvation of Gentiles through God's rejection of Israel (9:30-10:21) the Apostle Paul goes on to affirm his firm belief in the final salvation of Israel.

In referring to the Apostle Paul's mention of the future destiny of the Jews, G.H.C. Macgregor and A.C. Purdy claim:

That Paul could not contemplate the final refusal of the Jews to accept the Gospel shows at once how closely his thought of the new faith was connected with the old, and how deeply he was bound by ties of affection to the religion of his fathers.²

When we consider the undeniable fact that the Apostle Paul never mentions his ardent affection for Jews and their salvation in this way in his other epistles, the remark of Macgregor and Purdy does not help us much to understand the Apostle Paul in his context. Is the

¹ See esp. Rom. 11:1-6, 12, 24-32.
² Jew and Greek (Edinburgh, 1959), p.179.
Apostle Paul speaking here, as Marxsen argues, to the Gentile Christians reminding them that "... They have a task to perform for Israel, which they will carry out best by showing to Israel what the church is. God will then put Israel also on the right path ...."? Here, the Apostle Paul is not concerned with this mission of the Gentile Christians. Even though it were true, under the present conditions of the Roman Church, such an attempt on the part of the Apostle Paul as Marxsen conjectures would only make matters worse by hurting the Jewish Christians' sense of self-respect. Indeed, the Apostle Paul who is the very 'living evidence of the faithfulness of God's towards his people' firmly believes in the final salvation of the Jews in his conviction of the fulfilment of the prophets' proclamation in the Old Testament.

ii. FIRST, IN THE ROMAN CHURCH AND, IF POSSIBLE, EVEN IN THE JERUSALEM CHURCH

But, why did the Apostle Paul have to mention such a conviction in this epistle especially? It is highly probable that, just as he wished to check the Jewish Christians' sense of superiority to the Gentile Christians through ch.10 with a view to the effective reconciliation and unity of the Roman congregation, at the same time, the Apostle Paul wished also to check the Gentile Christians from looking down on the Jewish Christians from any worldly motives that might arise from their ignorance of God's absolute sovereignty in salvation. This attitude would surely drive the Roman Church into a

2 See Barth, *A Shorter Commentary on Romans*, p.135.
much more difficult situation in pagan society. Furthermore, when we consider the well known fact that the Judaizers in the Jerusalem Church already led organized campaigns in the Gentile churches founded by the Apostle Paul in Galatia and Corinth\(^1\) and the likely possibility of such a campaign reaching even to the Roman Church with such a slander against the Apostle Paul as we can find in Acts 21:21,\(^2\) these passages in which he expresses his whole-hearted fraternity with Jews\(^3\) have to be viewed from another angle. Our earlier study\(^4\) makes it very clear that not only the Judaizers in the Jerusalem Church but also the extreme Jewish Christians in the Diaspora regarded the Apostle Paul as a renegade and traitor. Then, it also goes without saying that both the Jerusalem Judaizers and the Diaspora Judaizers came seriously to consider the removal of Paul with a view to the unity of the Palestinian churches and the Gentile churches under the mother church at Jerusalem.\(^5\)


\(^2\) "... ἀπεστάλαν διδάσκαλος ἰδίως Μωϋσέως τούς κατὰ τὰ ἡμερήμερα Ἰουδαίους, λέγων μὴ περιτέμνεσθε αὐτῶς τὰ τέκνα μηδὲ τῶν ἔθεσιν περιπατεῖν."

\(^3\) See 9:1-3, 10:1 (Cf. Leenhardt, Romains, p.150: "... Ce que Paul vient d'écrire, nul Juif ne pouvait l'écrire sans que son cœur saignât. La pensée de ce destin brisé — et qui sait pour combien de temps! — inclinait à la prière ....")


\(^5\) Also cf. Metzger, Background, pp.199f.: "... The more the church spread to the Gentile world the looser became its ties with Judaism. Those members of the Palestinian church who lived in accord with the customs of the Pharisees watched this development with profound regret and made a violent attempt to keep the church from breaking with Judaism. The threatened split, they believed, could be prevented or mitigated only when all the churches and all their members agreed to observe the Mosaic law ...."
If the Apostle Paul detected such a trend in the extreme Jewish Christians' conspiracy against his life,¹ we can arrive at a reasonable conclusion such as that the Apostle in writing these passages in the Romans was taking into account the possibility that the Judaizers in the Jerusalem Church might already have succeeded in producing hostility against himself even among the Jews in the Roman Church.² Although the Apostle Paul never opens his heart and lays

---

¹ Cf. Rom. 15:31. Also see Present Thesis, pp.204-213.
² Cf. Rom. 16:17f. Dodd refuses to connect those serving their own belly (κερίτις) (v.18) with the Jewish-Christian extremists, and assumed them to be the people in the Gentile churches 'who practised and defended immoral licence in the name of Christian liberty, and may have been associated with quasi-gnostic speculations' (See his Romans, pp.242f.) (Also cf. Bruce, Romans, p.278). But cf. Phil. 3:19 ['... ἡ ὑπόθεσιν ἡ κερίτις ....'] See Moffatt, Introduction, p.166: "... The letter swerves at this point into a philippic against Jews or Jewish Christian agitators (32-21) ...." Also cf. Luther, Römer, s.151; Hort, Judaistic Christianity (Cambridge and London, 1894), p.126; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p.430; Barrett, Romans, p.285; Brandon, Fall of Jerusalem, pp.147f. Goguel, however, thinks the Judaizers' campaign had not yet arrived in Rome at the time when the Apostle Paul was writing this epistle. He says: "... En l'écritant, l'apôtre a voulu prévenir l'influence que pourraient avoir à Rome, où il leur serait possible d'arriver avant lui, ceux qui l'avaient battu en Grèce et en Galatie ...." (Naissance, p.343) (Cf. also Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p.429: "... It was probably not against teachers actually in Rome, but against such as he knew of as existing in other churches which he had founded, whose advent to Rome he dreads ....") Nevertheless, if the Jerusalem Judaizers also had been aware of the political and geographical importance of the Roman Church as the Apostle Paul did, it is highly improbable that the Judaizers had neglected for so long after their campaigns in Galatia and Corinth to lead a crucial campaign in this capital city of the Roman Empire. Also cf. Moffatt, Introduction, pp.156f.: "... Nor, again, is it likely that the apostle was vaguely warning the Roman Christians againstterrorists who were already troubling other churches and might at some future date make mischief in the capital. The whole point of the counsel is lost if the readers did not know the facts and persons in question. How else could they mark and turn away from them? In short, the tenor of these words marks not an occasion which might possibly arise, but a peril already present ...."
bare all his agony, he must have aimed through these passages to
remove the Jewish Christians' misunderstanding and soothe their
hostility towards him, first in the Roman Church and, if possible,
even in the Jerusalem Church through the intervention of the good
Jewish Christians in the Roman Church. Considering Romans 15:30-32,
it is quite certain that the Apostle Paul is urgently expecting
through chs.9-11, especially through 9:1-3 and 10:1, some immediate
and positive arbitration of the Roman Jews between himself and the
Jerusalem Judaizers if it be possible, at latest, before his arrival
at Jerusalem.1

1 J. Munck could not in the least understand this historical context
of vital importance in the Apostle Paul's life, because he had
failed to realize the exact character of the conflict between the
Apostle Paul and the Judaizers in the Jerusalem Church. Like
others, Munck, despite his own emphasis on the 'awareness of the
history contemporary to Paul' [See author's preface in his Christ
and Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11, trans. from the
Danish by Ingeborg Nixon (Philadelphia, 1967), xi] and Krister
Stendahl's enthusiastic applause of this Danish scholar's under¬
standing of Paul (See his foreword in ibid., vii-ix), managed to
understand neither the change of the power structure in the
Jerusalem Church nor the historical situation of Palestinian Judaism
from the time of Stephen's martyrdom down to the Apostle Paul's
final visit to Jerusalem. By arguing that the Apostle Paul's
opponents were not the Judaizers in the Jerusalem Church but the
circumcised Gentile Christians [See Paul and the Salvation of
Mankind, trans. from the German by F. Clarke (London, 1959),
pp.87-134], Munck, we believe, has eventually distorted the history
of the early Church no less grossly than the Tübingen School had
done previously (Cf. ibid., pp.69-86) [Also cf. W.D. Davies, "A New
View of Paul — J. Munck: 'Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte'" in his
Christian Origins and Judaism (London, 1962), pp.193ff.]. Indeed,
we can hardly appreciate any positive aspect of his scholarship in
understanding the Pauline context of Rom. 9-11, or the Apostle
Paul's relations with the Jerusalem Church (See esp. his introductory
remarks on "Paul's Situation When Composing the Letter to the Romans"
in Israel, pp.8-13).
4. CHRISTIANS AND THE POWERS THAT BE

i. AMONG THE HOSTILE NEIGHBOURS IN PAGAN SOCIETY

In Romans 12:17-21, it is obvious that the Apostle Paul is standing in the tradition of the Old Testament and the teaching of Jesus Christ. And it has been confidently maintained up to now that here the Apostle Paul exhorts the Roman Christians to walk in love which is the loftiest and the most proper principle of Christian life to establish peaceful relations with their pagan neighbours. But if we consider the plain fact that the teaching of Jesus Christ, especially the Sermon on the Mount, probably in oral form must have been circulating already among the Gentile churches even some time before the Apostle Paul wrote this epistle, the exegetical problem of 12:17-21 is not so simple as we should expect. Does he, in his anxiety over the great likelihood of a campaign led by the Judaizers who deny his apostleship, merely repeat this as a part of the Gospel to clarify the content of his Gospel to the Roman Church? If not, does this mean that a series of troubles caused by the pagans hostile to Christianity occurred and almost drove the Christians into a corner to lose their self-restraint in Roman society which made it inevitable for the Apostle Paul to emphasize again the already familiar command to love their enemies?

It is true that anyone who tries to avenge himself seizes unwarrantedly all that belongs to the wrath of God which alone is

\[1\] Cf. Prov. 20:22; Mt. 5:39; Prov. 3:4 (LXX); Mk 9:50; Deut. 32:35; Prov. 25:21f. Also see Mt. 5:44ff. and Lk. 6:27ff.
just and alone deserves to be called 'wrath'.1 And our positive method of dealing with evil should be in accord with Jesus Christ's method by absorbing and neutralizing all that the power of evil can do to us with forgiving love, because any other method of meeting evil means 'being conformed to this present age under the domination of the principalities and powers', 'being severed from Christ', 'a reversion to the weak and beggarly elements from whose bondage Christ has set us free'.2

It has been suggested that by following faithfully the very example of Jesus Christ's love the Roman Christians can make their hostile Gentile neighbours, if they obtain the Divine grace, feel the burning pain of remorse for their act of persecution.3 And the Christians would feel immense delight in the good result brought about through their patience and come to be aware of a new possibility that can be achieved through non-resistance. So, while they have to suffer injury, they would never provoke their pagan neighbours. Even when they are provoked beyond endurance they would face their enemy willingly in the attitude of love and non-resistance leaving the judgement in God's hands whichever way the judgement will be given. They would believe that

3 Cf. H.A.W. Meyer, Romans, Vol.II, pp.271-273. But the writer of Prov. 25:21f. did not write in this sense and also it is not certain whether the Apostle Paul really quotes this Old Testament passage in the sense of 'burning pain of remorse'.
this is the best policy to establish peaceful relations with their pagan neighbours and this is the will of God.

But, this way of logical development may be purely a product of empty speculation of our time. If we consider the indisputable historical truth that Christianity could never avoid producing a series of high states of tension whenever it came into contact with pagan society, it becomes quite clear that the kind of struggle which we can imagine through the daily life among their pagan neighbours must have already existed long before the Apostle Paul wrote this epistle. Then, the emerging questions are whether this command to love was repeated by the Apostle merely to encourage the Roman Christians to maintain more highly elevated moral standards than that of their pagan neighbours and more appropriate to the grace they had already received, or to solve some serious practical problems which had already occurred or were impending between the Roman Church and the Roman Empire; whether the Apostle Paul was considering any possibility of Christianizing the whole Roman Empire through this attitude in dealing with pagan society or whether the Roman Christians themselves in the first century were concerned with social reform.

Therefore, the exegetical problems of Romans 12:17-21 cannot be solved without understanding the Apostle Paul's view of the character of the Roman Empire, the general circumstances of his days, and more than anything else his eschatology. Then, it becomes incontrovertible that Romans 12:17-21 should be interpreted in the light of Romans 13.
In Romans 13:1-7, the Apostle Paul is emphasizing the Christians' obedience to the governing authorities of the Roman Empire. But considering the fact that the Apostle Paul never mentions the relation of the state and Christians like this in his other epistles, there must have been some serious practical problem among the Roman Christians in their relations with the Roman Empire. It thus becomes quite clear that we cannot follow blindly the traditional understanding of this passage as the great Apostle's ideal teaching about the Christians' attitude toward the state that can be applied to every age and place. Of course the Apostle is expounding the ideal relation of the state and Christians. But we think the Apostle Paul wrote this passage to solve some practical local dilemma which the Roman Christians were faced with in deciding their attitude towards the authorities of the Roman Empire. As Case indicates,

The earliest Christians were quite unconcerned with politics. They had no ambition either to reform the Roman Government or to capture positions of influence in the administration. For a long time they were doubtful regarding the propriety of receiving into full church membership persons so closely associated with heathenism as was necessarily the case with those who remained in the employ of the state. It was not easy for an official to follow in daily life the pattern of conduct set up by Christianity.¹

Thus, it is highly improbable that the Roman Christians in the Apostle Paul's day attempted to exert any political influence on the Roman Empire to realize their ideal. On the contrary, they were strongly

¹ Social Triumph, pp.146f.
inclined to avoid taking part in any forms of political activities because they could hardly conceive the possibility of harmony of politics and faith under the pagan rulers. When the Apostle Paul was writing this epistle, the authorities of the Roman Empire had as yet shown no sign of making any distinctions between Jews and Christians, consequently Christianity could still enjoy the privilege of a *religio licita* as a sect of Judaism. Then, what was the urgent necessity that caused the Apostle Paul to give this admonition? For the discussion about this question, we need first to examine the Apostle Paul's view of the Roman Empire.

According to O. Cullmann, we should interpret 'εὐγενήσια in Romans 13:1 as the 'invisible angelic powers that stand behind the State government', and this argument is entirely based on his Christological understanding of the foundation of the state. According to the main point of Cullmann's so-called Christological foundation of the state, the Apostle Paul believed that the invisible angelic powers standing behind the Roman Empire had been exercising their pernicious work only to be subjected to Jesus Christ and despite their original evil nature they had been given their place in the divine order by the victory of Jesus Christ through His resurrection. Therefore, the Roman Empire which had been controlled by those invisible angelic powers came to attain such undeniable dignity under

---
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the kingly rule of Jesus Christ that obedience was due to it. To support this view, Cullmann strongly argues that "... There is not a single other Pauline passage where Paul means anything else than angelic powers by this word in its plural form ...."  

But, this argument of Cullmann has been rejected by many others. E. Käsemann declares that he cannot find any Christological pattern in Romans 13. Criticizing K. Barth and his school's interpretation based on the Christological foundation of the state, he argues in favour of interpreting this passage in the light of the doctrine of creation. 

1 See *Time*, pp.200-210.

2 *State*, p.66. As we can see in the following discussion, this argument of Cullmann is not well founded. Furthermore, his interpreting of 'ἀρχαι' in 1 Cor. 2:9 (In Rom. 13:3, the Apostle Paul uses it in the same meaning with 'ἐξουσία') as both 'invisible, demonic powers' and 'earthly political rulers' (Bruce also supports this argument. See 1 and 2 Cor., pp.38f.) should be rejected in the light of "... εἰ χαὶ ἐργασὶ, οὐκ ἢ τὸν κύριον τῷ καλῷ ἐστελεχθῇν". Because the aim of the invisible demonic powers was from the beginning to make the earthly political rulers crucify the Lord of glory. It was surely the earthly political rulers, not the invisible demonic powers, that crucified the Lord of glory in their ignorance. On the contrary, the invisible demonic powers had constantly pursued their aim according to their already prepared plan. Therefore, 'ἀρχαι' in 1 Cor. 2:8 incontrovertibly indicates 'the earthly political rulers' alone.


5 In his understanding not only of the Christological foundation of the state but also of the theory of the invisible angelic powers, Cullmann is without doubt standing in the teaching of Barth and, fundamentally, he could not suggest anything different from Barth's understanding of Rom. 13:1-7. See esp. Barth, *Church and State*, trans. by G. Ronald Howe (London, 1939), pp.23-36. Cf. also Cullmann, *Time*, xiii.

6 See Käsemann, *Romans 13*, pp.204ff.
Unlike Kasemann who also rejects Cullmann's strong emphasis on the 'invisible angelic powers' in his interpreting of Romans 13:1ff,\(^1\) G.B. Caird admits the probable legitimacy of Cullmann's theory of the angelic powers,\(^2\) but he also rejects Cullmann's Christological interpretation of the state.\(^3\) An interesting thing is that Caird argues the possibility of redeeming the evil powers saying:

This redemption of the powers must not be confused with Cullmann's idea that through the Cross the state has, without knowing it, been brought within the kingdom of Christ. For Paul declares that the powers must confess that Christ is Lord, and that, through the mediation of the church, they must come to understand the wisdom of God's redemptive purpose. There is a helpful parallel here between the individual and the corporate redemption. Men and angels alike have

\(^1\) See \textit{ibid.}, p.205.

\(^2\) See Caird, \textit{Principalities}, pp.22f.: "... Perhaps Cullmann is right in claiming that Paul had both interpretations in mind, and deliberately used terms which could be taken either way [\textit{Time}, pp.195f.]. We have already seen that pagan nations could be represented either by their angelic governors or by their earthly rulers (Dan. 7:27; 10:13, 21; 12:1) ... there was, therefore, no reason why Paul, in urging Christians to obey the Roman state, should not be allowed a certain ambiguity of expression ...."

\(^3\) See \textit{ibid.}, p.25: "... The things which Cullmann denies are precisely the things which Paul affirms. The powers of state are to be obeyed not because they have been made subject to Christ but simply because they exist, and because no authority can exist apart from God's decree. Their authority belongs not to the order of redemption but to the order of creation. Paul achieves the universal centrality of Christ not by making the authority of the powers depend on the cross but by declaring that Christ is God's agent in creation ...." Also cf. Strobel, \textit{Rm 13}, s.91: "... Diese Einordnung des Staates in ein sog. christozentrisches neutestamentliches Welt- und Geschichtsbild ist mit unserer Untersuchung aufs neue fragwürdig geworden. Dagegen besteht über das Verständnis der staatlichen Gewalt als einer interimistischen Anordnung Gottes allseits Übereinstimmung ...."
been reconciled to God through the Cross, but in each case the redemptive act of God must be accepted by faith, worked out in a life of obedience to Christ, and brought to completion at his Parousia.¹

On this foundation Caird develops his theory of the redemption of the state itself as follows:

If the angelic beings who preside over the pagan world order are capable of being reconciled to God, does not this require us to believe that institutions such as the state, in which human sin is organized in what Tillich has called 'a structure of evil', are also capable of redemption? ... Paul seems to me to say that the Christian's loyalty to society and the state, which are derivative authorities, must always be subordinated to his loyalty to the absolute authority of God in Christ; and that by the continued influence of Christ, working through his loyal followers in the church, the state itself may be brought progressively more and more within the Christian dispensation, and the affairs of state directed not merely by the ethics of law but by the ethics of the Gospel.²

Caird's argument for the final redemption of the evil angelic powers is based on Philippians 2:10f. and Colossians 1:16, 20.³ But in the passage of Philippians 2:10f. the Apostle Paul only wished to indicate the entirely new cosmic order which would finally be established through Jesus Christ. He was not concerned at all about the redemption of the evil angelic powers. We should remember the mere fact that the evil spirits' confession of Jesus' Lordship as the Son of God does not necessarily mean their reconciliation to God and redemption.⁴ At the

¹ Principalities, p.29.
² Ibid., pp.29f.
³ See ibid., pp.27f.
same time, through Colossians 1:16, 20, the Apostle also meant only the blessed situation of those redeemed ones alone by the blood of Jesus but never meant any possibility of the so-called 'universal salvation'. Therefore, Caird's argument for the redemption of the evil angelic powers is unfounded. Consequently, his theory of the redemption of the state based on this foundation is also quite unconvincing.\footnote{His conjecture of the probable optimistic attitude of the Apostle Paul toward the state is also nothing but an awkward speculation made by his misunderstanding of the Pauline eschatology.}

Despite some disagreements among these exegetes as indicated above, all of them seem to have no objection to make about bestowing a positive value on the state. It seems to us that they firmly believe that through Romans 13:1-7 the Apostle Paul really gave a positive value to the Roman Empire.

It is noteworthy that 'τὸ κατέξον' of 2 Thessalonians 2:6f. used to be identified with the Roman Empire by many in their support of the positive value of this pagan empire. C.H. Dodd argues:

Paul saw in the empire the providential instrument by which the coming of Anti-Christ was delayed — that which restrains him from being revealed before his appointed time (2 Thess. II.6). That was some seven or eight years ago. By this time he had developed, as we shall see, a clear and definite doctrine of the positive value of the Empire in the World.\footnote{Romans, p.202. Also see his "The Mind of Paul: Change and Development" in BJRL, Vol.18, No.1 (1934), p.32.}
Along with Dodd, C.K. Barrett also firmly believes that in Pauline context 'τὸ κατέξον' indicates the Roman Empire. He assumes that the Roman Empire afforded Christians in its jurisdiction a peaceful existence and the opportunity of preaching the Gospel thus continually restraining the demonic powers from bringing catastrophies upon Roman society until the return of Jesus Christ. On this assumption Barrett refutes Cullmann's theory of the 'invisible angelic powers' in Romans 13:1 as 'almost the exact opposite of truth'. He interprets 'ἐγκουσία' as 'the state appointed by God not as the executive agent but as a bulwark against the demonic powers'. Hence, according to him, the Roman Christians had to recognize in this pagan empire 'God's own appointed means of preserving the stability and moral order of the world, and of putting his wrath into operation before the day of wrath' and maintain 'the machinery of the state' by performing their duties.  

Caird, too, shares this opinion with Dodd and Barrett.

1 See Barrett, Romans, p.245.
2 See Caird, The Apostolic Age (London, 1955), p.173: "... The "restraining power" of which Paul speaks in this passage was Rome in her nobler aspect — the guardian of justice and of world peace. Not long after he wrote this Epistle Paul experienced at the hands of Gallio the benefit of Roman impartiality, and in the years that followed he became more deeply appreciative of Roman rule. When he wrote his Epistle to the Romans he was ready to assert that the state had been instituted by God for the restraint and punishment of wrongdoers and that the magistrate was a man 'ordained to a sacred ministry' ...."

We do really wonder whether such a positive evaluation of the Roman Empire on the part of these British scholars is derived from the thought of the early church fathers (See esp. Tertullian, Apologeticus, XXXII.1: "Est et alia maior necessitas nobis orandi pro imperatoribus, etiam pro omni statu imperii rebusque Romanis, qui vim maximam universo orbi imminentem ipsamque clausulam ipsamque acerbitates horrendas comminantium Romani imperii commenatui scimus retardari ....") or does it arise from the traditional classical educational system which led more directly to their sub-conscious
Did the Apostle Paul really mean 'the Roman Empire' by 'τὸ κατέξων' of 2 Thessalonians 2:6f. as Dodd and others surmise? If their surmise is correct, it is inevitable that Cullmann's theory of 'the invisible angelic powers' should crumble. As regards 'τὸ κατέξων', Cullmann rightly indicates the undeniable fact that:

no other passage can be produced from the New Testament to support the view that the State delays the end and the manifestation of the Antichrist. On the contrary, in Jewish as well as in Primitive Christian apocalyptic, the Antichrist is ordinarily presented in the form of some kind of Satanic empire.1

however, he fails to be persuasive when he regards it as 'a self-designation' of the Apostle Paul.2 It was no doubt the last thing that the Apostle would apply to himself. According to the context of 2 Thessalonians 2:5f., the Apostle Paul had already told

---

1 Cullmann, Time, p.164. Later, Cullmann was followed by Munck (See Salvation, pp.36ff.).

2 See Time, pp.165ff.
the Thessalonians what 'τὸ κατέχων' was. But the only thing we can do is to acknowledge humbly our utter ignorance. Despite his admission of ignorance of the meaning of 'τὸ κατέχων', E. Best still tries unconvincingly to interpret it as 'some hostile force of rebellion at work in the world'. Through the mysterious passage of 2 Thessalonians 2:6ff. we need only to acknowledge God's sovereignty and the fact that even the Antichrist itself can never overstep the very bounds which God had appointed to it. Accordingly, Dodd and others cannot identify 'τὸ κατέχων' with the Roman Empire in any circumstances; and from this we can draw the conclusion that their attitude of putting a positive value on this pagan empire is not proved.

1 F.C. Grant argues with great plausibility that: "... What is restraining him is not necessarily a human person, or the Roman government, but is probably the divine will or the angelic powers, obedient to God ...." [His Romans to Revelation (Vol.7 of Nelson's Bible Commentary, ed. by himself) (New York and Edinburgh, 1962), p.219]. However, the very significant fact that the Apostle Paul never clearly indicates what 'τὸ κατέχων' really is, strongly implies that any such clear indication of 'τὸ κατέχων' (and if, by chance, the Roman authorities happened to gain access to this epistle) would inevitably have aroused serious hostility of the Roman Empire not merely towards the church in Thessalonica but towards all the churches in her dominion. If the conjecture of Dodd and others were correct, the Apostle Paul would have clearly indicated the Roman Empire to be 'τὸ κατέχων'.


4 It is remarkable to see that even Dietrich Bonhoeffer interpreted 'τὸ κατέχων' as 'the power of the state to establish and maintain order' [See Ethics, trans. by N.H. Smith (London, 1970), p.105]. But his interpretation is nothing more than the required one to present his idea of an ideal state in his system of ethics which is quite alien to the Thessalonian context itself.
Some others emphasize the Apostle Paul's favourable experience of well governed rule and justice of the Roman Empire\(^1\) as the direct motive of his giving the very positive value to this empire through Romans 13:1-7.\(^2\) Admittedly the Apostle Paul must have accepted all the justice and order which he had experienced through the local authorities of the Empire as grace ultimately derived from God. However, this does not necessarily prove that the Apostle put a positive value on this pagan empire. It is true, as we have indicated earlier,\(^3\) that in his epistles he never directly criticizes all the political and social evils in the Roman Empire such as the emperor worship and slavery. But this does not lead us to the conclusion that the Apostle Paul was indifferent to all those evils of the Empire. Was it simply because, as F.W. Beare argues, the Apostle Paul 'did not see it as any part of his mission to attack them directly'?\(^4\)

In our examining the Apostle Paul's basic view of the Empire, we have to remember that the bitter shock caused by the Emperor

---


\(^{3}\) See Present Thesis, pp.259f.

\(^{4}\) Cf. his Paul, p.94. But Beare did not realize the significance of Roman emperor worship as the most abominable evil, so he could not indicate it.
Caligula's insane blasphemy against the Jerusalem Temple in A.D. 40 had inflicted a deep and unforgettable wound on both Jews and Christians. It is highly probable that most contemporary Christians must have remembered Jesus' prediction about the Antichrist which was still vivid in their memory and, consequently, their expectation of the imminent Parousia must have been extremely intensified at that time.¹ G.B. Caird, however, argues that 'τὸ κατέξευ' indicates the Roman Empire on the assumption that the very restraining power which had removed Caligula must have been this pagan empire 'fulfilling the divinely appointed office of restraining the evil-doer'.² But, it becomes very clear how inconclusive such an argument is when we observe the historical phenomena of the Roman emperor worship.³ The traditional aspect of the Roman ruler worship characterized by the deification of the ruler after his death by the decree of the senate enters upon a new phase with Augustus who from 27 B.C. throughout his long prosperous reign came to be worshipped as a god with various titles such as 'savior and God', 'son of God, god Augustus, overseer of every land and sea', 'god of Gods', 'father of the gods', etc. even during his lifetime.⁴ This cult of Augustus attained wide vogue throughout the Empire from the eastern regions ('where

---
² See Caird, Principalities, pp.26f.
Christianity first gained a hearing a generation later')\(^1\) as far west as Spain.\(^2\) And such emperor worship became more and more prevalent under the rule of Augustus' successors.\(^3\) The inevitability of a head-on collision between the Roman emperor worship and Christianity is well indicated by S.J. Case:

Had Christians remained socially insignificant, their refusal to worship the Roman deities might easily have passed unnoticed. But when their distinctive manner of life aroused the hostility of their neighbours and made evident their unwillingness to support the customary religious activities of the community, future conflicts with the political guardians of society's welfare were rendered inescapable. In a world where both state and church were believed by their respective sponsors to be divine establishments, the conflict could not remain simply a struggle to preserve the integrity of one or another set of human values. Inevitably it became a battle of the gods to be fought out in a society whose welfare was thought to depend immediately and ultimately upon recognizing the dignity, and thus securing the goodwill, of the tutelary divinities.\(^4\)

---

1 See ibid., p.215. Also cf. Bruce, The Apostolic Defence of the Gospel (London, 1961, 1959\(^1\)), p.57: "... Of all the provinces of the Roman Empire, there was none in which emperor-worship was more thoroughly organized than in Asia. In the Asian city of Pergamum the cult of Rome and Augustus was established as early as 29 B.C. ...."

2 See Tacitus, Annals, I. lxxviii: "Templum ut in colonia Tarraconensi strueretur Augusto petentibus Hispanis permissum, datumque in omnis provincias exemplum ...."


4 Social Triumph, pp.145f. Also cf. Petronius' remarks, as Josephus records, made to persuade the Jews at the crisis of A.D. 40:

"... πάντων Ἰουδαίων ἐναντίων τῆς θείας οὐσίας καὶ τῆς καθαρίας καὶ τῶν Καίσαρεων εἰκόνων, τὰ μένος ἐκείνους ἀντιτάσσεσθαι πρὸς τὸ οὖν ἐξελθεῖν ἀριστερὰς εἶναι καὶ μεθ' θρεψιν. (War, II, x.3)."
In an attempt to justify his argument for the placing of a positive value on the Roman Empire, Barrett asserts that:

It must not be forgotten that Nero, though known to us from such ill-disposed writers as the senatorial historian Tacitus and the Christian Tertullian, was a popular Emperor, especially with the provincials, whose affairs were not badly conducted during his principate. The relief and gratitude which had greeted the re-establishment of a reliable and benevolent state under Augustus had not yet been dissipated.¹

But he failed to look at the growing enthusiasm for emperor worship,² the uncontrollable chaos of religions and thoughts, and the moral decay³ that marked this period. For the Apostle Paul in whose brain the theocracy of ancient Israel had been already stamped, the contemporary Roman Empire itself was nothing more than an existing

¹ Romans, p.248. Also cf. his Reading through Romans (London, 1977, 1963¹), p.69: "... People have often wondered how Paul could write, during the reign of Nero, that the supreme authorities — the Emperor himself — had been appointed by God ... (1) Paul was writing about A.D. 55. Nero reigned from 54 to 68, and it is a well-known fact that the first five years of his reign were years of good government; it was only later that he became a notoriously evil figure. (2) Even in his later years, his cruelty was felt mainly in the city of Rome itself; the provinces (so far the scene of Paul's labours) continued to be well governed ...." This seems to us unfair to Tacitus' deep concern about all the 'political chaos and social corruption' of contemporary Roman society [See E.M. Burns, Western Civilization (New York, 1963, 1941¹), p.228. Also cf. esp. Martial, Epigrams, Vols. I and II] and to fail to appreciate the real situations in the provinces of those days. Cf. Present Thesis, pp.261f.

² Cf. Case, Evolution, pp.216f.: "... one of Nero's first acts was to have Claudius apotheosized. When Tiridates visited Nero, first in Naples and then in Rome, Dion Cassius (lxiii. 1-5) states that this Parthian prince bowed himself before the emperor, saying "O Lord, I ... am thy slave, I am come to thee, my God, worshipping thee even as I worship Mithra." ...."

world order under the sway of demonic powers utterly hostile to God,¹ and the authorities of the Roman Empire were 'primarily servants of Satan and destined to fall more and more under his demonic sway'.²

Then, if, as most scholars argue, 'ἐγκυωσία' of Romans 13:1 indicates 'the human rulers wielding power as the governing authorities of the Roman Empire',³ how could the Apostle Paul urge the Roman Christians so positively to obey these servants of Satan?

According to Romans 13:4, only the ruler who does good is the one ordained by God and such a ruler must not exercise his power in an evil way. Were the supreme authorities and the majority of the local authorities of the contemporary Roman Empire really such good ones? Moreover, in v.5 the Apostle Paul exhorts the Roman Christians: "οὐ μὴν διὰ τὴν ὀργὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν". 'Συνείδησις' is 'the voice of God' (die Stimme Gottes). Therefore, if we look at it from our side, it must be a relative thing. However, from God's side, it is an absolute thing and no relative concept can take its place. Then, Sören Kierkegaard's attitude: "... Jede Sünde geschieht vor Gott ...."⁴ and "... alle Sünde vor Gott geschieht ...."⁵ finally

---

¹ Cf. Beare, Paul, p.94.
² Case, Social Triumph, p.148.
⁴ Die Krankheit zum Tode, in neuer Übertragung und mit Kommentar von Liselotte Richter (Jena, 1924), s.75.
⁵ Ibid., s.77.
reaches such an undeniable conclusion that neither natural men nor Gentiles know what 'sin' is. Consequently, it is only in Judaism and Christianity that we can find an understanding of the idea of knowing 'sin' or 'obeying according to conscience'. The final limit of the obedience of the Christian conscience to any worldly power is always in terms of the words: "... εἰ δίκαιον ἔστιν ἐνόπλων τοῦ θεοῦ, ἕναν ἀκεχείρι μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ, κρίνατε· οὐ δυνάμεθα γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἐν εἰδωλεύσω καὶ ἠκούσωμεν μὴ λαλεῖν." and "... πεθανεῖν δεῖ θεῷ μᾶλλον ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου." which are derived from the teaching of Jesus:

\[\text{μὴ γερηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπεκτενύσεων τῷ ἑαυτῷ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ ἐξέγνων περισσότερον τῇ ποιήσῃς. ὑποδείξω ὡς ἢν τίνα γερηθῇ: γερηθῆτε τῶν μετὰ τὸ ἀπεκτενήσαν ἑκατον ἐξευκάλιν ἐρμακλείν εἰς τὴν γένναν. καὶ λέγω ἢν, τοὐτον γερηθῆτε.}\]

---

1 See ibid., s.84.
2 Cf. Ps. 51.
3 Since Herodotus, the idea of 'sin' in Greek thought was 'intellectual error' (See TWNT, 1.Bd., s.295) and 'ἀμωρτάνω' meant 'to miss a mark'. Therefore, we cannot find the Christian idea of 'sin' from classical Greek thought (See ibid., s.299). The basic idea of 'sin' in Christianity is neither 'ignorance' nor 'mistake', but 'to become hostile to God' (See ibid., ss.315f.: "... die Sünde in ihrem Charakter zu enthüllen, dh sie deutlich werden zu lassen als ἐξβρα. εἰς θεόν R.8, 7, im Bilde gesprochen ..."). It is from the very start a deliberate and positive rebellion against the sovereignty of God.
4 Acts 4:19f.
5 Ibid., 5:29.
6 Lk. 12:4f. Also see Mt. 10:28.
The faith of Christians also must be professed clearly through both words and actions even at the risk of their own lives which is the ultimate limit of the Christian conscience. Therefore, it is inevitable that the Roman Christians' conscience should testify that the Roman Empire itself was filling the cup of the wrath of God with all the abominable evils which would never escape the divine judgement. The problem is that this pagan empire was not in the least ready to accept this bold testimony. And here the Apostle is giving a really perplexing exhortation to the Roman Christians to obey according to their conscience the authorities of the Roman Empire who are primarily servants of Satan. Why did the Apostle Paul write Romans 13:1-7 to the Roman Church if he did not assign any positive value on this pagan empire which was under the sway of demonic powers? To answer this question, first we have to understand his eschatology.

iii. THE EXPECTATION OF THE IMMINENT PAROUSIA

Dodd argues for the development of the Apostle Paul's eschatological thought and as a foundation of his argument he asserts that Philippians 4:5: "οῦντας ἐξίσ" does not mean the imminent Parousia and should be interpreted in the light of Psalm 145:18 as 'The Lord is ready to hear and answer prayer' without any reference to time.¹ But, in the light of Philippians 3:20: "ημεῖς γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοὶ ὑπάρχει, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἡμῖν ἀπεκδεχόμεθα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν", it is quite clear that here Lord's imminent Advent

¹ See his Mind, p.30.
is mentioned for patient forbearance of the Christians in trials.

"ο κόπες ἐγγίζος" is the very watchword of the Apostle Paul expecting the imminent Parousia and what he means by it is incontrovertibly 'The End is at hand'. It is quite obvious that Dodd tackles this particular passage in the Philippians on the very assumption that this epistle was chronologically the last one of all authentic Pauline letters. Though this epistle was neither the last one nor written in Rome, so long as we cannot dismiss the probability that the Apostle Paul sent it to the Philippians during his imprisonment at Caesarea, the Apostle's unabated expectation of the imminent Parousia can be still maintained.

1 Cf. esp. Manson, Studies, pp.164ff: "... So in Philippians, as in 1 Cor., the Parousia is delayed, but not indefinitely. It is expected that it will come in the lifetime of Paul and his correspondents ...." Also cf. Lightfoot, Philippians, p.160; K. Barth, The Epistle to the Philippians, trans. by J.W. Leitch (London, 1962), pp.121ff.; F.W. Beare, The Epistle to the Philippians (London, 1973), p.146; Kümmel, Theologie, s.127.

2 See his Mind, p.26: "... On the whole it seems probable that Philippians followed rather than preceded the others [other captivity epistles], but this view is not altogether without difficulties ...." Dodd, of course, does not admit the authenticity of the Pastorals.


4 Cf. Dodd, Mind, p.6: "... From the fourth century to the nineteenth the prevailing and almost unquestioned view was that they [the captivity epistles] were written during the imprisonment at Rome with which the record in Acts ends. The first departure from this view was the suggestion that one or more of them may have been written from Caesarea during the two years when Paul was awaiting trial there. If this suggestion were accepted, it would not alter the relative chronology of the Pauline Corpus, for the Captivity Epistles would still be later (cont.)
In his interpreting Romans 13:11f., Dodd says,

It is all the more striking that in this epistle there is no mention of the imminence of the Advent, apart from these few verses. The whole argument stands independently of any such expectation. The forecast of history in chap.xi, is hardly framed for a period of a few months or years. There is no suggestion of 'interim ethics' in xii.1-xiii.10. The positive value assigned to political institutions in xiii.1-6 stands in contrast to the depreciation of family life in view of the shortness of the time in 1 Cor. vii. Clearly the urgent sense of the imminence of 'the End' was fading in Paul's mind as the years passed. He dwelt more and more on the thought that Christians were already living in the New Age, and the date at which it should be consummated became a matter of indifference. Only in the present passage the old idea of the nearness of the Day of the Lord survives to give point to his moral exhortations.1

Here he argues that the Apostle Paul is using his old idea of the imminent Parousia merely to give point to his moral exhortations even though he no longer expects the imminent Parousia. The plain fact is that Dodd attempts this interpretation totally according to

" (continued from the previous page) than Romans, and would still represent (if we ignore the Pastoral Epistles) the latest known phase of Paul's literary activity ...." Manson, however, argues for the Ephesian origin of Philippians. According to him, in both Rome and Caesarea the Apostle Paul was a prisoner, but the writer of Philippians was not (See his Studies, pp.154ff.). We do not, however, support the Roman origin of this epistle [against Lightfoot, Philippians, pp.30ff.; A.D. Nock, St. Paul (London, 1938), p.222], and we also find Manson's argument quite unconvincing (Cf. Phil. 1:7b, 13, 14, 17b. Also cf. Kümmel, Einleitung, s.284).

1 Romans, p.209.
his 'realized eschatology' theory. As we have seen, we cannot find any remarkable change in Pauline eschatology. On the contrary, as Case indicates:

The Romans are warned that the night is far spent and the day at hand when all shall stand before God's judgement seat, and the Philippians are encouraged to go on to perfection until the day of Jesus Christ, confident that the Lord is at hand.\(^2\)

---

1 See The Parable of the Kingdom [New York, 1961, (London, 1935\(^1\))], pp.27ff. and esp. pp.29-34. Dodd insists that we should interpret \(\eta \gamma \nu \iota \kappa \varepsilon \nu \) 'has come' (Cf. Mt. 10:7; Mk 1:15; Lk 10:9) as 'has come' (See Kingdom, pp.29f.). But the 'Kingdom of God' mentioned in the Synoptic Gospels without doubt clearly refers to the very eternal one which is to be realized with the Advent of the Risen Lord coming with His power and glory as the cosmic Judge, the Son of Man (Lk. 17:21 also should be understood in the light of the following vv.24-37). Even the statements of Mt. 12:28 and Lk. 11:20 cannot be suggested as decisive textual proofs to support Dodd's theory of the 'realized eschatology' [Cf. Richardson, Theology, p.86: "... Nor must we allow the Hebraic manner of speaking of a future event in the past tense to mislead us into an interpretation of certain texts which would be at variance with the whole NT eschatological programme: \(\epsilon \gamma \beta \alpha \sigma \varepsilon \nu \ \epsilon \gamma^\prime\) \(\eta \nu \iota \kappa \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota \sigma \tau \iota \sigma \iota \nu \iota \sigma \) \(\tau \omicron \omicron \omicron \iota \omicron \sigma \iota \omicron \) \(\pi \omicron \iota \omicron \sigma \nu \iota \sigma \nu \) (Matt. 12.28 = Luke 11.20; cf. Luke 10:18 and 1 Thess. 2.16) must mean in its context that the exorcisms wrought by Jesus are the signs of the coming victory of the Kingdom of God over the counter-kingdom of Satan ..."]. We do not think in the least Dodd believes that the final consummation of the Kingdom of God had been already achieved [Cf. his The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments (London, 1972, 1936\(^1\)), p.117]. Nevertheless, by persisting unreasonably in interpreting \(\eta \gamma \nu \iota \kappa \varepsilon \nu \) 'has come' in Mt. 10:7, etc., Dodd himself shows his failure to grasp the true nature of the Kingdom of God proclaimed by Jesus. There exists an incontrovertible difference in time and quality between the imminent Kingdom of God as the future cosmic consummation in Jesus' proclamation and the already realized Kingdom of God in Dodd's argument. In this case, we consider the 'consistent eschatology' of A. Schweitzer (Cf. Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung. Tübingen, 1911) is a more correct explanation of the very nature of the Kingdom of God proclaimed by Jesus than the 'realized eschatology' of Dodd is. It is no wonder that Dodd, by reason of his wrong interpretation of the imminent Kingdom of God presented in Jesus' message, has been inevitably led into making a decisive mistake in understanding the Apostle Paul's ardent expectation of the imminent Parousia. Also cf. P. Feine, Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Leipzig, 1922), s.80; Caird, Apostolic Age, pp.187-189; R.M. Grant, A Historical Introduction to the New Testament (London and Glasgow, 1971, 1963\(^1\)), pp.286-290.

2 Evolution, p.111.
the Apostle's expectation of the imminent Parousia is consistent through all his epistles and rather becomes more ardent.\textsuperscript{1} And, in Romans 13:11f., the Apostle Paul is without doubt indicating 'the imminent Parousia'. Now, the great importance of this passage in our interpreting of Romans 13:1-7 becomes very clear. In the presence of the pagan empire which would soon be shattered by the Advent and Judgement of Jesus Christ, why did the Apostle, even with such a conviction of the imminence of the Parousia, urge the Roman Christians to obey the pagan authorities hostile to God?

W. Marxsen tries to understand the Apostle Paul's aim in the context of a serious inner struggle between the Jewish Christians and the Gentile Christians in the Roman Church by examining the cause and effect of the edict of Claudius in A.D. 49 or 50.\textsuperscript{2} Particularly, his understanding of the imminent Parousia and the fact that here the Apostle Paul is not concerned about either the doctrine of the state or any social reform is quite correct.\textsuperscript{3} Nevertheless, when he interprets the Apostle Paul's aim throughout Romans 13:1-7 simply as a 'demand for loyal conduct in order to avoid a fresh edict',\textsuperscript{4} he reveals his failure to perceive the very heart of the matter in the

\textsuperscript{1} Also cf. Kümmel, \textit{Theologie}, ss.127f.: "... es lässt sich in der Tat leicht beobachten, dass Paulus in allen seinen Briefen, abgesehen von den kleinen Philemonbrief, auf das nahe Ende oder das kommende Endgeschehen verweist ... darüber kann aber nach all diesen Texten kein Zweifel sein, dass Paulus in seinem Denken grundlegend bestimmt ist durch die Erwartung der nahen Heilsvollendung ...." Cf. also 1 Tim. 6:14; 2 Tim. 4:8b.

\textsuperscript{2} See his \textit{Introduction}, pp.98ff.

\textsuperscript{3} See \textit{ibid.}, p.100.

\textsuperscript{4} See \textit{idem}.
Apostle Paul's life context. A.D. Nock also says "... Perhaps Paul is thinking of the riots which provoked the expulsion of Jews under Claudius ...."\(^1\) Both of them, in our view, have failed to understand the impending catastrophe caused by the culmination of tension between the Palestinian Jews and the Roman Empire.

The reversion to the direct rule of the Roman procurator in Palestine after the death of King Agrippa gave rise to a new political and social situation by provoking Jewish resentment and hostility towards the Roman Empire. The Palestinian Jews' resistance tied in with their mistaken Messianic expectation became more violent and bold. The refusal to pay taxes, frequent assaults on the Romans in Palestine, and especially the armed Sicarii's more intensified direct threat to the Roman rule in Palestine were irrecovably driving the already aggravated Roman-Jewish relations into the catastrophe of A.D. 66.\(^2\) But, why did the Apostle Paul have to choose this time of all occasions to give such perplexing admonitions as we can find in Romans 13:1-7? Has he ever thought about the possible response of the Jewish Christians in the Roman Church in whose mind the very command about which they were in complete agreement with their fellow Jews in Judaism "יִהְיֶה נְפֹלָה לְךָ בְכֵרָה יְבֵנָה הָאָרֶץ יְבֵנָה הָאָרֶץ וְיִהְיֶה נְפֹלָה לְךָ בְכֵרָה יְבֵנָה הָאָרֶץ יְבֵנָה הָאָרֶץ יְבֵנָה הָאָרֶץ יְבֵנָה הָאָרֶץ יְבֵנָה הָאָרֶץ יְבֵנָה H (Deut. 17:15) so clearly lingers? Even the

---

\(^1\) Paul, p.217.

Gentile Christians who were ardently expecting the imminent Parousia never thought of themselves as belonging to this world that would soon be shattered by the Judgement of God even though they had to live in it. The development of such affairs in Palestine must have caused not only the Jewish Christians who had a traditional resentment towards the pagan rulers but also the Gentile Christians in the Roman Church to be extremely agitated.

When G. Bornkamm says:

Doch berechtigt die Tatsache, dass gerade diese Mahnung in keinem anderen Brief eine Parallele hat, zu der Vermutung, dass die Gemeinde in Rom in besonderer Weise in Gefahr stand, wenn auch nicht zu offenen Rebellen zu werden, so doch in anderer Weise sich demonstrativ vom Staat zu distanzieren und ihre bürglerlichen Pflichten zu versäumen.¹

we can easily see that he does not try to understand Romans 13:1-7 in the light of the highly strained political situation in Palestine. Like many others, he also firmly believes that the Apostle Paul, who had never experienced hostile persecution from the Roman Empire, came to give the Roman Christians the admonition to respect it 'als einer gottgesetzten Ordnung in ihren irdisch-zeitlichen Grenzen'.² But, he is quite correct in his indicating the Apostle Paul's highly probable anxiety about the possible danger arising from the Roman Christians' enthusiasm in their expectation of the imminent Parousia.³

¹ Paulus, s.219.
² See ibid., s.220.
³ See ibid., ss.218f.
Küsemann also indicates the fact that the Apostle Paul had to fight a life-long battle not only against Judaism but also against enthusiasm.\(^1\) But, in sharp contrast to Bornkamm and others, he strongly opposes any eschatological approach in the interpretation of Romans 13. In denying the importance of eschatology in interpreting Romans 13 he is clearly mistaken,\(^2\) and with this must also be noted his failure to perceive the significance of the contemporary political and social situation in Palestine.

As we have seen so far, it seems to us that most modern theologians try to understand Romans 13:1-7 not in the actual life context of the Apostle Paul but mainly in the life context of their own present circumstances. This causes them to read in something which the Apostle Paul had never intended by Romans 13:1-7. The Apostle Paul was not so composed as many people conjecture. In looking at the extremely strained relations between the Palestinian Jews and the Roman Empire going from bad to worse, the Apostle Paul could not fail to perceive intuitively that the impending catastrophe in Palestine was likely to cause the Roman Empire to reconsider its traditional exceptionally favourable policy toward Jews and to deprive them of all their privileges including the exemption from the imperial cult. Christians who had so far enjoyed the privilege as an inner sect of Judaism would never be able to avoid coming into a head-on

---

1 See his *Romans 13*, p.206.  
2 See *ibid.*, pp.205f.
collision with this invincible pagan empire when they refused to adopt the imperial cult. The biggest matter of concern for the Apostle Paul was how to protect Christians from this impending disaster.

As the years went by, the Apostle Paul came to be more and more confirmed in his belief that the Advent of Lord was at hand even though it would not happen within a few months or years. And in the situation in which neither the possibility of the Roman Emperor's conversion nor the possibility of revolution could be considered, the best possible way was for the Apostle Paul to avoid arousing any animosity on the part of the pagan rulers and, if possible, by giving a good impression to them, to seek to be allowed the same religious privilege as Judaism had enjoyed.

The 'Apostle Paul was fully aware how such an undesirable 'enthusiasm' on the part of the Roman Christians was liable to bring about an anarchical way of thinking and might give rise to direct action leading to the neglect of their civic obligations in Roman society. He also knew well enough that the Roman Empire would by no means overlook any such treason against the emperor and that the subsequent reaction of the Empire towards the Roman Church would be both ruthless and direct.

Therefore, the language of Dodd in his interpretation of Romans 13:6f.:
He pays them, not because he will be punished for non-payment, but because they help to maintain the moral order in a world which as yet does not know the order of grace. And here we cannot but suspect a reference to the saying of Jesus, *Give Caesar what belongs to Caesar* (Mark xii.17). Paul paraphrases it, and enlarges upon it.¹

is not convincing at all. Dodd connects Romans 13:6f. and Mark 12:17,² but the context of Mark 12:17 may well be completely alien from that of Romans 13:6f. From our investigation it is clear that Romans 13:6f. should be understood in terms of the very life context in which the Apostle Paul was breathing. Under the rule of the Roman Empire, the refusal of tax-payment meant the abandonment of the right to live. Therefore, Romans 13:6f. should be interpreted in the light of the Palestinian Jews' (especially the Zealots') practice of refusing tax-payment,³ and the dangers surrounding the enthusiasm of the Roman Christians in their expectation of the imminent Advent of Jesus Christ.

It is true that throughout Romans 13:1-7 we can find the most ideal mutual relation of the State and Church in the light of God's sovereignty. But, why did the Apostle Paul present such an ideal

¹ Romans, p.205.
³ Cf. Antiquitates, XVIII, i.1: "... 'Ἰεωγας ἐκ Γαλατίας ἀνήρ ἐκ πολέως ὅμοιος Χαμάλων Σεβελίκου Φαρίσαεν προσλάβεις ἕπει ἀποστασθεὶς, τὴν τε ἀπετύμην ὑπὲρ ὅλα ἡ ἀντικρος θεολειαν ἐπιθέρειν λαφοὺς καὶ τὴς δικαίωσις ἐπὶ ἀντιλήψει παρακαλεώτες τὸ ἐθνός'...."
relation of the State and Christians which could never be applied to
the contemporary Roman society in any sense? When the Roman
Christians came to read Romans 13:1ff., they must have realized how
far this pagan empire was away from the ideal example of the state
ordained by God, rather than realize again the civic obligations
already imposed upon them by the Empire as indispensable duties which
could never be avoided without severe punishment so long as they live
in the Roman society.¹ But, if the Roman authorities happened to

¹ Surely the Roman Christians must have been frustrated in unbearable
confusion. But, in the next moment, they must have been able to
courage one another again when they came to 13:1ff. Through
their daily life they knew well enough the brutality of this pagan
empire, and also they experienced too much the undeniable danger of
resisting this authority long before the Apostle Paul wrote this
epistle. They were already identifying this pagan empire with the
evil powers totally hostile to God. This demonic world order was
unavoidably destined to be completely shattered soon by the coming
Lord and replaced by the everlasting Kingdom of God. They saw the
grace they received, and in the same moment they faced up to the
miserable reality of their neighbours entirely helpless without
God under the irresistible demonic sway. Sometimes the stern
Roman authorities throwing their suspecting gaze upon Christianity
happen to be their own kinsmen, and even though they wished to
overlook their own family's and kin's unlawful faith, the evil
powers never allowed it. That is the tragedy of both the Roman
Christians and their kinsfolk in this pagan empire. The Roman
Christians saw the great invisible angelic powers hostile to God
that could be destroyed only by the Advent of Jesus Christ and the
enormous world order under their sway, and recognized both the
divine grace they received and the stern reality that they have to
stay in it. They have to live in it, but they must not conform to
it. They have heard this truth and know it. They learned about
Jesus, who also had to live in the same world under the demonic
sway in which they live now, and His positive way of living through
His inexhaustible love and inexplicable thorough-going non-resistance
even in the presence of His enemy. They were already taught how
Jesus left the judgement in God's hands and how He won His glory
through His resurrection. In their hope in Him they have walked so
far; through their innumerable afflictions they have come to feel
keenly the cost of the grace they received free. Despite their
more intensified conviction of the imminent Parousia, they still
have to wait a little longer and the general circumstances under the
(cont.)
read this passage, without doubt they would interpret it entirely from a self-centred angle. And this is exactly what the Apostle Paul had intended. It is quite plain that the Apostle Paul was aware of the Roman authorities' suspicious gaze upon the Roman Church when he was writing Romans 13:1-10. Consequently, the Apostle Paul, with one eye on the impending catastrophe in Palestine and another on the possibility of the Roman authorities' reading his epistle, aimed to show the latter that Christians never plot a rebellion against the authority of the Roman Emperor and never attempt to disturb the public order of Roman society; on the contrary, they willingly obey the authorities of the Empire, performing their civic obligations faithfully for the welfare of the Empire in accordance with the lofty moral principles of their religion. At the same time, the Apostle

1 (continued from the previous page) invincible demonic sway now begin to assume more and more naked hostility towards Christianity, making the Roman Christians feel anxious to the utmost and driving from moment to moment the Christians into a blind alley so as almost to lose their self-restraint. Under these conditions, the Apostle Paul is writing Rom. 12:17-21 and 13:1-14 follows it immediately. Now, it becomes so plain that the meaning of Rom. 12:17-21 is clearly understood only in the light of 13:1-12, and 12:18 "εἰ δούνατε, τὸ εὖ εἰμι, μετὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων εἰργαζόντες" is not recorded as a mere moral precept but as the only possible way of the Christians' existence in this pagan empire under the wrath of God until the Day of Judgement, more strictly speaking, it is the Apostle Paul's fundamental attitude, namely, the guiding principle of his conduct to avoid arousing the hostility of this pagan empire. And the conviction of the imminent Parousia in 13:11f. is the very mainspring that cheerfully encourages both the Apostle Paul and the Roman Christians to overcome their present afflictions and face even the impending trial without fear however severe it may be. The Roman Christians could see so clearly through 13:11f. the final destiny of both this invincible pagan empire as a visible evil power and the invisible angelic powers of evil standing behind this world order which were to be soon shattered by the Advent and Judgement of Jesus Christ. Therefore, despite their present affliction they could face and deal with this enormous evil power itself and their hostile pagan neighbours through their positive love and utter non-resistance based on the great commandment of Jesus Christ. This is the very result the great Apostle wished from his heart.
Paul had also to check the risk of indiscreet enthusiasm among the Roman Christians in their ardent expectation of the imminent Parousia. He had to do this not because he no longer expected the imminent Parousia nor because he put any positive value on this pagan empire but because he was so fully aware of this empire's demonic character. It was the only solution he could find to keep the Roman Christians safe until the imminent Day of Jesus Christ\(^1\) and to proclaim the Gospel in peace as widely as possible during the limited time remaining. Thus, watching the enormous pagan empire under the wrath of God (Rom. 12:2) in the light of the coming Parousia (Rom. 13:11f.), the Apostle Paul is taking the necessary measures,\(^2\) on the one hand to protect Christians from the impending trial and, on the other hand, to spread the Gospel effectively, until the Day of Jesus Christ when this demonic world order would be completely destroyed and replaced by the everlasting Kingdom of God. But, neither the Roman Christians nor the pagan authorities could understand the careful thoughts underlying aims of the Apostle Paul through Romans 13:1-7.\(^3\)

\(^1\) In his firm belief in the imminence of the Parousia, the Apostle Paul believed that not all but many Christians still alive would be able to enter the Kingdom of God at the Day of Jesus Christ without experiencing physical death.

\(^2\) When Conzelmann says "... Paul does not go into the question of the limits of obedience in Rom. 13, because he has no immediate occasion for doing so ..." [An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament, trans. by J. Bowden (New York, 1969), p.223], he is spinning round in his own sphere of speculation which is quite alien from the Apostle Paul's context.

\(^3\) Not to mention 1 Tim. 2:1f., 1 Pet. 2:13f. and 17b also should be understood basically in the same context. As we know, the authorship of 1 Peter has been disputed by many. It is quite probable that Peter might have employed some interpreter to write down his message in Greek (Cf. Bigg, Peter and Jude, pp.5f.). We can also admit the possibility that some one might have corrected his poor (cont.)
Greek at Peter's request. However, under any circumstances, we can never deny that this epistle is Peter's genuine message (Cf. ibid., p.6: "... there is nothing to prevent us from supposing that the points handled, the manner in which they are developed, the general tone of thought, are those of St. Peter himself ...." Also cf. Hort, 1 Peter, pp.1-7). And it seems to be most likely that Peter wrote it just before the Neronian persecution [Cf. Bigg, Peter and Jude, p.87; Kelly, Peter and Jude, p.30; A.F. Walls and A.M. Stibbs, 1 Peter (London, 1973, 19591), p.67]. When Bigg argues in his interpretation of 1 Pet. 2:13: "... Both in expression and in point of view St. Peter differs very widely here from St. Paul, who speaks of Caesar as holding his authority from God, not from the people (Rom. xiii.1). A doctrine of divine right could be built upon the words of St. Paul, but not upon those of St. Peter ...." (Peter and Jude, p.139), he is misunderstanding both the Apostle Paul and Peter. We believe neither the Apostle Paul nor Peter put any positive value on the Roman Empire. Their concern was how to avoid arousing the direct hostility of pagan rulers to the young churches. And, for this end, both the Apostle Paul and Peter had carefully to check any signs of indiscreet enthusiasm on the part of Christians in their expectation of the imminent Parousia (Cf. 1 Pet. 1:5, 20b, and esp. 4:7a: "Πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἡγεῖτον ...."). Therefore, both Pauline and Petrine epistles should be understood basically in the same historical context.
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With the lapse of time, the Apostle Paul came to be more and more convinced that the Day of the Lord was imminent. It was quite natural that the Apostle Paul, who had already completed his missionary task in the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire, tried to hurry to go to Spain,¹ the very end of the world, that he might successfully proclaim the Gospel of the Risen Lord there also before His imminent return.² He must have firmly believed it to be his last eschatological mission as an apostle to the Gentiles. But, instead of going directly to Spain by way of Rome as he had longed for many years,³ the Apostle Paul had to go to Jerusalem first though he was already well aware of the grim fact that the contemporary Judaizers in the Jerusalem Church were making desperate efforts to seize the opportunity of removing him at all costs and was by no means certain that he would ever return safe from his visit to the holy city.⁴

¹ Cf. Rom. 15:23f.
² Also cf. Deissmann, Paul, p.207: "... His whole being was fired with a world-conquering ethos, and he thirsted with his whole soul for the coming day of God ...."
³ See Rom. 15:23.
⁴ Cf. ibid., 15:30-32.
Surely, the Apostle could not forget even for a moment that he must accomplish his mission of proclaiming the Gospel of the Risen Lord even to those in Spain before His imminent Advent, however, at the same time, he could not but keenly realize the thoroughly helpless situation of the young Gentile churches in the presence of the unyieldingly towering vigour of the Jerusalem Judaizers' campaign that would be, without doubt, intensified all the more after his departure for Spain. In his burning sense of apostolic duty, the Apostle Paul was by no means less concerned about preserving these young and weak Gentile churches securely in the truth of the Gospel until the Day of the Lord than about proclaiming the Gospel of Jesus Christ to those people in the end of the world. Therefore, even at the risk of his own life, he had to make this precarious journey to Jerusalem to appeal with all his might and main once for all to a spark of conscience in the depraved Jerusalem Judaizers.

After having made this grim resolution in his mind, the Apostle Paul, bearing both the possibility of his being killed in Jerusalem and that of safe return from Jerusalem in mind, took two necessary measures. The very heart of the Apostle Paul's message throughout the Epistle to the Romans is inseparably connected with his aim through these two measures. We can say the whole structure of his Epistle to the Romans itself was moulded entirely out of these two measures.

First, keeping the sullen possibility of his death at the hands of the Jerusalem Judaizers, the Apostle Paul, who had already been
fully aware of the importance and the immense potential capabilities of the Roman Church in the light of her political and geographical position, wished that in the event of his death in Jerusalem this sleeping giant would not only securely preserve the very essence of the true Gospel for herself without being disturbed by the Judaizers' deception but also successfully protect all the young Gentile churches from the Judaizers' campaigns until the Day of the Lord. Nevertheless, through his communication with his friends now in Rome,¹ he came to understand the real situation of the Roman Church which had such serious internal and external problems that she would hardly be able to achieve such an important mission for all her potentiality. Unlike the early stage of the Roman Church when the absolute majority of the congregation had consisted of Jews, the relationship between the Jewish and Gentile Christians began to be significantly aggravated with the gradual increase of the Gentile congregation in the church. The antagonistic relationship between the two was aggravated all the more in the Roman Church with the expulsion of the Jews from Rome caused by the edict of Claudius and their subsequent return to Rome in the reign of Nero. It was not merely due to the difference in their understanding of the Gospel itself or the pattern of Christian living but mainly due to the worldly-minded struggles for the leadership of the Roman congregation between the Jews who tried in vain to take back the leadership from the hands of the Gentiles after their return and the Gentiles who had already consolidated their footing by taking the initiative while they held an absolute majority in the congregation

¹ Cf. Rom. 16:3-15.
during the expulsion of the Jews and were not in the least ready to yield to the impertinent demand of the Jews. But, under the circumstances that they could neither consider severing their connections with the Jerusalem Church nor challenge her suzerainty over all churches in both Palestine and the Diaspora, the Gentile Christians could neither disregard the status of the Jewish Christians in the Roman Church nor free themselves completely from the almost absolute authority and traditional priority of the Jewish Christians in interpreting the Gospel itself along with the practical patterns of Christian living. Such a strained relationship between the Jewish and Gentile Christians consequently threw the whole Roman congregation into a great confusion in understanding the true nature of the Gospel and, so far from exerting any desirable good effect on their pagan neighbours with the power of faith in unity, it drove the Roman Church herself into a very difficult situation in the Roman society.

At that time, the political crisis between the Palestinian Jews and the Roman Empire was getting worse and moving irrevocably towards the well-known catastrophe of A.D. 66. The intensified resistance of the Palestinian Jews against the rule of the Roman Empire and the ruthless suppression tactics of the Roman army had caused a great anxiety to the Jewish Christians in the Roman Church, and consequently, stirred them to a more vigorous expectation of the imminent Parousia. Even though the Gentile Christians in the Roman Church were never so deeply agitated by the contemporary Palestinian crisis as the Jewish Christians were, their conviction of the imminent End was also not a
little quickened with the progress of the general circumstances in Palestine.

Furthermore, there was a great risk of indiscreet enthusiasm among the Roman Christians in their expectation of the imminent Advent of Jesus Christ and such an eschatological enthusiasm was heavily based on both the traditional anti-Roman feeling of the Jewish Christians and the utterly negative attitude of the Gentile Christians toward this worldly empire, which, they firmly believed, would soon be replaced by the coming Kingdom of God.

The Apostle Paul was seriously worried about the probable subsequent trial of the Christians as an inevitable side effect of the impending catastrophe in Palestine, because, if the Roman Empire came to reconsider their traditionally favourable policy toward Jews both in Judaism and in Christianity and deprive them of all religious privileges, then the Roman Christians who had so far enjoyed the privilege as an inner sect of Judaism in the presence of the Roman authorities could no longer avoid a head-on collision with this pagan empire especially when they refused to participate in the imperial cult.

He was also clearly aware how the indiscreet enthusiasm of the Roman Christians in their expectation of the imminent Parousia was liable to bring about an anarchical way of thinking and might give rise to direct action leading to the neglect of their civic obligations in their society. He knew well enough what the subsequent
reaction of the Roman authorities toward such a treachery to the
Roman emperor would be.

But both the Jewish and Gentile Christians were drawn into the
vortex of a never-ending split and hostility without being aware of
the significance of the impending catastrophe in Palestine. Moreover,
they were growing more and more restless in their hope of the imminent
End without realizing the real risk of showing any indiscreet enthusiasm
in this pagan society. In their deplorable ignorance of the true
nature of the Gospel, the Roman Christians faced with a hostile pagan
environment were neither ready to welcome the coming Lord nor wise
enough to preserve themselves safe until the Day of the Lord.

In his constant expectation of the imminent Parousia, the Apostle
Paul was unshakably confirmed in his belief that the Advent of Jesus
Christ was at hand even though it might not come within a few months
or a couple of years. It is highly improbable that the Apostle Paul
had attempted to reform the contemporary Roman society by realizing
his Christian ideal. His biggest concern was how to preserve his
fellow Christians safe in the truth of God until the imminent Return
of the Lord without arousing the animosity of the pagan rulers and
how to proclaim the Gospel in time peacefully even to those in the
end of the world. Therefore, the very mission which he expected
the Roman Church to carry out after his death in Jerusalem was also
of this limited character.
Hence, on the one hand, the Apostle Paul had to bind the Jewish and Gentile Christians together in Christ by showing them clearly the true nature of the Gospel which he had received directly from the Risen Lord\(^1\) and, on the other hand, he had to check effectively the indiscreet enthusiasm on the part of both the Jewish and Gentile Christians which would decisively threaten not only the existence of the Roman Church but also that of all the churches in the Roman Empire.\(^2\) It also should be remembered that the Apostle Paul was bearing in mind the possibility of the Roman authorities' reading his epistle especially when he was writing Romans 12:17-13:10. Thus, the Apostle Paul took all these necessary steps very wisely so that the Roman Church might not only securely preserve herself in the truth of God until the Day of the Lord but also successfully accomplish her grand eschatological mission as the sure protector of the true Gospel against the campaign of the Jerusalem Judaizers even after his death in Jerusalem.

Secondly, it is quite plain that, through Romans 9:1-3, 10:1, 11:1-36, and 15:30-32 in particular, the Apostle Paul was taking another crucial measure very carefully to effect his safe return from Jerusalem by any chance for his further missionary work. The Apostle is writing this epistle on the assumption that the Jerusalem Judaizers' campaign must have already reached the Roman Church\(^3\) probably with such a slander as we can read in Acts 21:21 condemning him as a traitor

\(^3\) Cf. \textit{ibid.}, 16:17f.
to his nation and might have produced great hostility against him among the Jews in the church. Accordingly, in this situation, the Apostle Paul must have aimed through chs.9-11, especially through 9:1-3 and 10:1, to make the Jewish Christians in Rome believe that the Judaizers' slander was entirely unjust. It is also clear that the Apostle Paul is expecting through these passages some positive arbitration of the Roman Jews between himself and the Jerusalem Judaizers if it be possible, at latest, before his arrival at Jerusalem. This intention of the Apostle Paul, which has been expressed in a quite roundabout way through those passages in chs.9-11, now becomes very obvious in 15:30-32. Here, the Apostle Paul is humbly but ardently entreating both the Gentile and Jewish Christians in the Roman Church to intervene positively for his safety. Through the solicitation in vv.30-32, he by no means wishes the Roman Christians merely to sit praying without taking necessary steps in their power for his personal safety in Jerusalem. On the contrary, the Apostle Paul is earnestly asking them to take all necessary action in their power along with their constant prayer to God for him. Surely, the Apostle Paul is expecting the Roman Christians to exert some powerful influence upon the Jerusalem Judaizers to back up the support already obtained from the Gentile churches in Asia Minor and Greece. It is highly probable that the Apostle desperately hoped the united support of all the Gentile churches would not only save his life from the evil hands of the Jerusalem Judaizers but also provide him with a decisively advantageous stepping-stone to his victory over the Judaizers in his coming face to face controversy with them for the freedom of the Gentile Christians.
This is the very complicated motive for his writing of the Epistle to the Romans. In a word, here lies the true nature and limit of Christian reconstruction elaborately carried out by the greatest apostle expecting the imminent Parousia in his own life context. For all his desperate efforts he could not after all escape the Jerusalem Judaizers' trap when he arrived at Jerusalem and had to die 'with his eyes fixed on distant Spanish shores he could never reach'.

But, in contrast to the tragic fate of the Jerusalem Judaizers with the Fall of Jerusalem, the Roman Church to which the Apostle Paul entrusted such a great task not merely fulfilled her mission of preserving the truth of the Gospel as the champion of all Gentile churches in the Roman Empire but finally conquered even this invincible pagan empire itself through the continuous blood-bath of martyrdom. How could the Apostle Paul imagine even for a moment in his lifetime the Christianized Roman Empire? In all this, we can see so clearly the fruitful result of the Apostle Paul's lifelong blood and sweat which could be borne only by the everleading hands of the Lord transcending all the physical limits and plans of Paul the Apostle as a man.

Concluding our short study, we would like to emphasize once again the following facts. As we have seen so far, both the Apostle Paul and Luke faithfully and correctly record what they ought to say in their respective life contexts. Nevertheless, we cannot expect them to write down everything that happened in their whole experience.

---

1 See Goodspeed, *Paul*, vii.
They were speaking to their particular audience to solve the practical problems with which they were faced.¹ Not a few troubles have been

¹ For example, it is quite noteworthy that in contrast to the cold attitude of James and other leaders of the Jerusalem Church, Luke emphasizes not only the words of the Roman authorities testifying to the Apostle Paul's innocence in the light of Roman law but also their impartial and more humane attitudes in performing their duties (Cf. Acts 23:29; 25:18ff., 24ff.; 26:30-32, etc.). Why does Luke emphasize constantly such a favourable attitude of the Roman authorities? The other remarkable point in Luke's account in the Acts is that except for the passing fragmentary remark of the Roman tribune in 21:38 he never mentions the serious political and social situation in Palestine under the direct rule of the Roman procurators which we can see so vividly in the writings of Josephus. Even the Apostle Paul never mentions such things throughout his epistles. How can we understand this attitude of Luke? Does he aim at making the Roman authorities recognize Christianity as a sect of Judaism and hence a 'religio licita'? If we suppose that the Acts was written after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 (Cf. esp. Kümmel, Einleitung, ss.153ff. and also ss.119ff.), such an aim on the part of Luke is out of the question. It is true that the Diaspora Jews in the Roman Empire could continue to enjoy their religious privileges even after the fall of Jerusalem; unlike the Palestinian Jews who underwent harsh treatment at the hands of the Romans. But, considering the following indication of G. Le Piana: "... the Roman consciousness of the danger that might arise from the political content of Judaism is revealed by the consistent efforts of the law to restrain the Jewish religion from gaining any ground outside the Jewish race. As a matter of fact the gentiles who were converted to Judaism, the proselytes, were denied by the Roman law the privileges and rights of Jews; and if they refused to perform the acts of worship of the official and imperial cults when it was their duty to do so, they were liable to be punished according to the general law. Even the Jews by race who had foregone their national religion in favor of another were not protected by any national privileges and were bound by the general laws. The special measures taken by various emperors directly or indirectly against Jewish proselytism and the severe penalties imposed betray the same consistent aim of the Roman law to shut up Judaism within racial boundaries and prevent its propagation...." ["Foreign Groups in Rome during the first Centuries of the Empire" in HTR, XX (1927), p.387], the Roman authorities, who had already made a clear distinction between the Jews of Judaism and Christians at the time of the fire in Rome in A.D. 64 (Cf. Goguel, Naisance, p.545), could hardly be induced to adopt such measures extending the same religious privileges to the Christians as a whole at the time when the authorities themselves came to entertain more serious misgivings than ever on account of the Jewish War (A.D. 66-70). Besides, the Gentile Christians had absolute majorities in the churches outside Palestine at this time. (cont.)
(continued from the previous page) Certainly, it was the last thing for the Roman authorities to introduce a policy that would encourage more Gentiles to become spiritual Jews. The present writer, however, assumes that the Acts was written before the martyrdom of the Apostle Paul. Though Kümmel argues: "... Lk 21:20-24 erscheint die apokalyptische Weissagung vom GREUDEL der VERMÜSHUNG Mk 13:14ff umgeformt in eine Drohweissagung über Jerusalem, die ex eventu gestaltet ist ...." (Einleitung, s.119), the origin of Lk. 21 does not necessarily have to be traced back to the fall of Jerusalem. Cf. Dodd, "THE FALL OF JERUSALEM AND THE 'ABOMINATION' OF DESOLATION" in JRS, Vol.XXVII (1947), pp.47-54, and esp. p.52: "... It appears, then, that not only are the two Lucan oracles [19:42-44 and 21:20-24] composed entirely from the language of the Old Testament, but the conception of the coming disaster which the author has in mind is a generalized picture of the fall of Jerusalem as imaginatively presented by the prophets. So far as any historical event has coloured the picture, it is not Titus's capture of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, but Nebuchadrezzar's capture in 586 B.C. There is no single trait of the forecast which cannot be documented directly out of the Old Testament ... Some critics, indeed, believe that Luke sometimes wrote, deliberately, a pastische of Septuagintal Greek. The question would need to be discussed upon a broader basis than these two passages. But there is here a special reason for supposing that at least in XXI,20-4 he is making use of older material: the Marcan language of [XIII,] 21a, 23a, stands out like a patch upon an otherwise homogeneous fabric, which must therefore have existed before our present third Gospel was composed. There seems then to be a high probability that the evangelist is dependent on previously existing sources, whether oral or written. We may describe them as oracles in the manner of the ancient prophets, which circulated in Judaea before Titus's siege of Jerusalem, but at a time when a war with Rome was a menacing possibility — as it must have seemed to far-seeing minds at any date after the rebellion of Judas the Gaulonite in A.D. 6. Whether these oracles were Jewish or Christian in origin, the evidence of these passages does not permit us to say with certainty. In Christian circles they were believed to go back to Jesus ...." Also cf. Williams, Acts, p.15: "... The strength of the case for dating Acts before the Fall of Jerusalem is obvious ...." Therefore, Luke's aim through his constant emphasis on the Roman authorities' testimony to the Apostle Paul's innocence in the light of the Roman law despite the Jews' false accusation is, first of all, to make the Roman authorities distinguish Christianity from nationalistic Judaism with the view to removing the possibility of the Romans' carrying out some uniform policy identifying Christians with other anti-Roman radicals of Judaism and, ultimately, to convince the authorities that Christianity, far from being such a radical Jewish movement as would endanger Roman rule in Palestine, is the successor of genuine Judaism which is not only innocent and harmless but totally loyal to the Roman emperor even though they believe in God. Like the Apostle Paul, Luke also carefully omits many historical facts that might irritate the Roman authorities' nerves. Consequently, we cannot avoid being faced with a lot of difficulties in our reconstructing (cont.)
caused by many exegetes who failed in understanding the Apostle Paul's aim in his Galatian context. Therefore, they could not appreciate the historical reliability of Luke's account that can supplement so crucially the Apostle Paul's accounts in the Galatians in our reconstructing the Apostle's concrete situation in his relations with the Jerusalem Church. Consequently, none of them managed to grasp the fact that the most formidable foe of the Apostle Paul's life-long struggle for the freedom of Gentile Christians was James the Lord's brother and even the Apostle Paul's tragic arrest itself during his last visit to Jerusalem was virtually due to the detestable plot of this arch-Judaizer. Both the Apostle Paul and Luke kept silence. Who could have fathomed the Apostle Paul's agony and sorrow?

1 (continued from the previous page) the historical situation of the early Church. In his firm conviction of the imminent Parousia shared with the Apostle Paul, Luke is taking the most urgent measures to preserve his fellow Christians safely until the Advent of the Risen Lord [As far as Luke-Acts itself is concerned, there is no single text that would justify Conzelmann's attempt to read 'an apologia for the delay of the Parousia' into the Lucan account of the history of the early Church. See his Die Mitte der Zeit. Tübingen, 1943. Also cf. H.J. Cadbury, "Acts and Eschatology" in The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, in Honour of Charles Harold Dodd, ed. by W.D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge, 1964, 19541), pp.300-321].

1 In this situation, it is perfectly natural for all the exegetes of the Romans to have been busy gibbering only about the Apostle Paul's surface aim in this epistle but to have never been able to perceive even vaguely the Apostle's ultimate aim in his life context with the precarious journey to Jerusalem ahead.
SELECT
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