

JESUS, PAUL, AND THE TEMPLE: AN EXPLORATION OF SOME PATTERNS OF CONTINUITY

JAMES SWEENEY*

The relationship between Jesus and Paul has been vigorously debated in critical scholarship for more than two centuries, with the critical consensus generally viewing it in terms of discontinuity rather than continuity. This highly questionable model has unfavorable implications for biblical, NT, and systematic theology. This essay will investigate the Jesus–Paul relationship relative to the apostle’s teaching that believers, both corporately and individually, are the temple of God indwelt by the Spirit (1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19).¹ It will be argued that Paul’s teaching coheres with the implications of prominent strands of Jesus’ teachings preserved in the Gospels. A plausible explanation for this coherence is that there is continuity between Jesus and Paul regarding this theme.

I. THE DEBATED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JESUS AND PAUL

1. *Two distinct approaches to the question.* Questions abound with respect to the relationship between the historical Jesus and the apostle Paul. How much did Paul know about Jesus? How indebted were Paul’s teachings to Jesus? What were the sources of his information?

As mentioned previously, two basic approaches have been discernable from the time of Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792–1860) to the present.² To varying degrees, scholars have either emphasized a basic continuity between Jesus and Paul or they have stressed discontinuity.³ Two prominent scholars

* James Sweeney is on the pastoral staff at Immanuel Church, 301 Boston Road, Chelmsford, MA 01824.

¹ Other relevant passages that could receive focus in a fuller study of this theme include 2 Cor 5:1–10; 6:14–7:1; and Eph 2:11–22.

² On Baur and his followers, see esp. H. Harris, *The Tübingen School: A Historical Investigation of the School of F. C. Baur* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975; reissued with a forward by E. E. Ellis: Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990).

³ For an overview of research on this theme, see V. P. Furnish, “The Jesus Paul Debate: From Baur to Bultmann,” in *Paul and Jesus: Collected Essays* (ed. A. J. M. Wedderburn; JSNTMS 37; Sheffield, JSOT, 1989) 17–50; and S. G. Wilson, “From Jesus to Paul: The Contours and Consequences of a Debate,” in *From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare* (ed. P. Richardson and J. C. Hurd; Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1984) 1–21. For more recent studies of the issue from perspectives that see continuity between Jesus and Paul, though differing as to the nature and degree of continuity involved, see J. M. G. Barclay, “Jesus and Paul,” *DPL* 492–503; D. Wenham, *Paul: Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995); *idem*, *Paul and Jesus: The True Story* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002);

who wrote on Paul in the early twentieth century may be taken as paradigmatic of these two conceptions. William Wrede (1859–1906) stressed discontinuity in his brief but influential history-of-religions approach to Paul.⁴ He contended that Paul was “*the second founder of Christianity*.”⁵ Wrede did not use this description in a particularly favorable sense. For him, “This second founder of Christianity has even, compared with the first, exercised beyond all doubt the stronger—not the better—influence.”⁶ Wrede’s influence on mainstream critical scholarship remains to the present.⁷ Conversely, J. Gresham Machen (1881–1937), in his important work, *The Origin of Paul’s Religion*, exemplified an alternative approach (continuity).⁸ He contended against predominant strands of classical liberalism and the history-of-religions school that the “religion of Paul . . . was founded upon the historical Jesus.”⁹ On analogy to N. T. Wright’s employment of Wrede and Albert Schweitzer typologically as representing, respectively, two *Bahnen*: the pathway of the radical historical skepticism of the *Wredebahn* (resulting in a non-eschatological Jesus) versus the eschatological orientation of the *Schweitzerbahn* (interpreting Jesus against a backdrop of Jewish eschatology),¹⁰ in what follows we shall employ Wrede and Machen paradigmatically

J. D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of the Apostle Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 182–206; and S. Kim, “Jesus, Sayings of,” *DPL* 474–92; *idem*, *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origins of Paul’s Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001) 259–90, 296–97.

⁴ W. Wrede, *Paul* (Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1908). Wrede is perhaps best known for his *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901); ET: *The Messianic Secret* (trans. J. C. G. Greig; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1971); cf. C. M. Tuckett, ed., *The Messianic Secret* (IRT 1; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983); *idem*, “Messianic Secret,” *ABD* 4.797–800. Wrede further influenced Rudolf Bultmann’s conception of NT theology, for Bultmann shared W. Wrede’s view that NT theology is primarily historical in orientation. Compare W. Wrede, “The Task and Methods of ‘New Testament Theology,’” in *The Nature of New Testament Theology* (ed. R. P. Morgan; SBT 2/25; London: SCM, 1973) 68–116, with Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols.; New York: Scribners, 1951, 1955) esp. 2.245–46.

⁵ Wrede, *Paul* 179 (his italics).

⁶ *Ibid.* 180 (my italics).

⁷ Wedderburn credits Wrede with “setting the agenda for the theological discussion this century” (Introduction, *Paul and Jesus* 11). By “this century” Wedderburn was referring to the twentieth century. For a recent twenty-first century presentation of the “Paul as founder of Christianity,” written at a semi-popular level along Wrede-like lines, though in some ways even more radical than Wrede, see G. Lüdemann, *Paul: The Founder of Christianity* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2002).

⁸ On Machen, see N. B. Stonehouse, *J. Gresham Machen: A Biographical Memoir* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954); cf. also D. G. Hart, *Defending the Faith: J. Gresham Machen and the Crisis of Conservative Protestantism in Modern America* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995).

⁹ J. G. Machen, *The Origin of Paul’s Religion* (New York: Macmillan, 1925; reprinted, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 317. By “the historical Jesus” Machen meant something quite different from the way in which the phrase was then (and is still now) customarily employed in critical study of the NT and of Christian origins. As typically used then (as now) it refers to Jesus as he can be reconstructed by way of modern (typically naturalistic) historiographic methods. Machen, by contrast, used the phrase to designate the Jesus who is presented to us in the Gospels—“a supernatural person; a heavenly Redeemer come to earth for the salvation of men” (p. 153; cf. p. 317).

¹⁰ N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, vol. 2: *Christian Origins and the Question of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996) 28–124. Wright maintains that the original quest, R. Bultmann, the

as representing respectively two *Bahnen* of another sort—namely, the models of discontinuity and continuity between Jesus and Paul.

2. *The importance of the question.* In the opening lines of the introduction to a collection of essays on *Paul and Jesus*, editor Alexander J. M. Wedderburn acknowledges that the importance and centrality of the relationship between Jesus and Paul to the study of the NT and early Christianity should be readily apparent. Given the influence that the apostle Paul has exercised on the subsequent history of Christianity and the development of its thought, Wedderburn suggests that their relationship “might reasonably be claimed to be the central question for all Christian theology.”¹¹ Wedderburn cites some practical reasons for this:

If Paul has parted from, and even falsified, the message of Jesus, then the claim of Paul to be a Christian witness who must be listened to today is seriously undermined. And, on the other hand, if Paul and his contemporaries had so lost touch of Jesus and what he proclaimed and stood for, what realistic hope is there that we may be able to remain in any sort of continuity with that message, and thus to claim that our faith and our actions are in any way Christian?¹²

As Wedderburn’s comments correctly imply, the relationship between Jesus and Paul lies at the very heart of the nature of historic Christianity.

II. PAUL AND FIRST CORINTHIANS: THE CORINTHIANS AS THE TEMPLE OF GOD INDWELT BY THE SPIRIT

The temple by all accounts was one of the key pillars of Second Temple Judaism.¹³ Contemporary scholars of widely diverse backgrounds rightly

new quest, and the latter’s renewal movement, the “‘new’ new quest” (including the Jesus Seminar and portrayals of Jesus as an itinerant Cynic Philosopher) belong to the *Wrederbahn*, while the “genuine” third quest, exemplified by scholars like B. F. Meyer, E. P. Sanders, and the like, travels on the *Schweitzerbahn* (see p. 84 for Wright’s list of important works that belong to this latter *Bahn*).

¹¹ Wedderburn, *Paul and Jesus* 11.

¹² *Ibid.* 15. Cf. B. Witherington III, who contends that the historical Jesus and the historical Paul “arguably had more to do with the shape of early Christianity, and indeed with Christianity since the first century, than any other two people” (*The Paul Quest: The Renewed Search for the Jew of Tarsus* [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998] 12). Hence if “we cannot trust Paul’s witness [to Jesus], our prospects of getting at the historical Jesus are considerably dimmed” (p. 13).

¹³ On the place of the temple as a pillar doctrine in Second Temple Judaism, along with monotheism, election, torah, and the like, see J. D. G. Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Trinity, 1991) 18–36; and N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, vol. 1: *Christian Origins and the Question of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 224–32.

On the place of the temple in pre-AD 70 Judaism, see further S. Safrai, “The Temple,” in *The Jewish People in the First Century* (ed. M. de Jorje and S. Safrai; CRINT 1/2; Assen: Van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976) 865–907; E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief* (London: SCM/Philadelphia: Trinity, 1992) 47–76; Dunn, *Partings* 31–35; C. Meyers, “Temple, Jerusalem,” *ABD* 6.364–65; and Wright, *Victory of God* 406–12.

recognize its central role as a political, economic, and religious center in the Judea of the first century AD. Not only was the centrality of the temple deeply imbedded in Israel's scriptural traditions, the Jewish (Maccabean) reaction to pagan threats to the temple in the second century BC and its aftermath were additionally influential in shaping the attitude of subsequent Jewish adherents toward the temple.¹⁴

In light of this, a point that does not often receive the attention it deserves is that the entirety of Paul's ministry, on anyone's reckoning of Pauline chronology, was carried out while the Jerusalem temple was still standing.¹⁵ In this regard it is perhaps not surprising that Paul alludes to the Jerusalem temple at points in his letters, sometimes almost in an incidental fashion.¹⁶ While Paul ministered during a period when the temple was still standing and while he alludes to it occasionally in his letters, however, it is nonetheless somewhat curious from a religio-historical perspective, particularly given Paul's self-professed Jewish pedigree (Gal 1:13–14; 2:15; 2 Cor 11:22; Rom 11:1; Phil 3:5–6), that the temple does not figure more prominently as a religious symbol in his writings.¹⁷ This point again receives only

¹⁴ See esp. W. R. Farmer, *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956) esp. 84–124; and M. Hengel, *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D.* (trans. D. Smith; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989) esp. 146–228.

¹⁵ Despite the widely differing assessments of Pauline chronology, all scholars would acknowledge this point. A wide range of differing proposals regarding Pauline chronology includes R. Jewett, *A Chronology of Paul's Life* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979); G. Lüdemann, *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984); *idem*, *Paul: The Founder* 22–64; C. J. Hemer, "Observations on Pauline Chronology," in *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to Professor F. F. Bruce on his 70th Birthday* (ed. D. A. Hagner and M. J. Harris; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 3–18; *idem*, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (ed. C. H. Gempf; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990) 251–76; K. P. Donfried, "Chronology: New Testament," *ABD* 1.1011–22, esp. 1016–22; L. C. A. Alexander, "Chronology of Paul," *DPL* 115–23; J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul: A Critical Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996) 1–31; Witherington, *Paul Quest* 304–31; and esp. R. Riesner, *Paul's Early Period: Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology* (trans. D. W. Stott; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

¹⁶ To cite two examples: (1) Rom 9:4, where ἡ λατρεία likely refers to "the temple service" (so NASB, NASB update) or "the temple worship" (NEB, NIV), renderings that are preferable to vaguer translation "the worship" of RSV, NAB, and NRSV. See J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16* (WBC 38B; Dallas: Word, 1988) 527–28; and D. J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 564 and n. 1. (2) 1 Cor 9:13, "Do you not know that those who are employed in the temple service [οἱ τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργαζόμενοι] get their food from the temple [ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐσθίουσιν], and those who serve at the altar share in what is sacrificed on the altar?" (NRSV). G. D. Fee suggests the imagery is undoubtedly drawn from Paul's Jewish background, but further concedes that the Corinthians would have surely heard it in terms of their own pagan context (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987] 412, n. 82; *idem*, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* [Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994] 114–15). A. C. Thiselton, however, observes that most commentators "give weight to all three contexts"—i.e. OT background, first-century Temple Judaism, and Greco-Roman (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000] 691–92).

¹⁷ The book of Acts indicates that Paul remained in some measure of contact with the Jerusalem temple at various points in his ministry (see Acts 21:26–30; 22:17; 24:12, 18; 25:8; 26:21). While the relation between the Paul of Acts and the Paul of his letters is beyond the scope of our study, the way in which the two are alleged to be at odds has been greatly exaggerated. P. Vielhauer

infrequent attention. James D. G. Dunn is an exception. He observes: “If there is any pillar of his traditional religion which Paul can be said to have abandoned wholly or almost completely it is this one.”¹⁸ Dunn acknowledges that the traditional categories of temple, priesthood, holiness, and purity have been reworked by Paul but is somewhat vague as to why. His suggested explanation is that the aforementioned cultic categories have been “replaced by the image of the body of Christ.”¹⁹ But why, given Paul’s Jewish frame of reference, as Dunn plausibly views it, has Paul replaced these categories in this way? Let us first turn our attention to one of Paul’s letters to the Corinthians.

1. *First Corinthians 3:16–17*. First Corinthians 1:10–4:21 constitutes Paul’s appeal for unity among the Corinthians against the divisions (σχίσματα, 1:10) and quarrels (ἔριδες, 1:11) that were besetting them.²⁰ In 3:5–17 he draws heavily on agrarian (vv. 6–9), architectural (vv. 10–15), and temple imagery (vv. 16–17) to correct his readers’ faulty view of Christian ministry, specifically concerning the nature and role of its ministers *vis-à-vis* God.²¹ Paul affirms that he and Apollos are “servants” (οἰκονομοί, v. 5), each assigned their specific task in keeping with God’s purposes: “I planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the growth” (v. 6). In contrast to Apollos and himself, God’s co-workers (θεοῦ . . . συνεργοί), Paul states that the Corinthians are God’s field (θεοῦ γεώργιον) and God’s building (θεοῦ οἰκοδομή, v. 9). The mention of “building” at the end of verse 9 marks a transition from an agrarian metaphor to an architectural one in verses 10–15. Paul, as a wise master builder (σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων), laid the foundation (θεμέλιος) of the complex (v. 10)—none other than Christ himself (v. 11).²² Extreme care must be

presented an influential case against the reliability of the Paul portrayed in Acts (“On the ‘Paulinism of Acts,’” in *Studies in Luke-Acts* [ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; Nashville: Abingdon, 1966] 33–50). Yet it would seem that he inadvertently fell prey to what W. W. Gasque characterized as a hyper-Protestant view of Paul: “Only a hyper-Protestant would insist on choosing Paul’s perspective as the only valid one” (*A History of the Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles* [Peabody: Hendrickson, 1989] 359). For a fairer assessment of the question than Vielhauer provided, see F. F. Bruce, “Is the Paul of Acts the Real Paul?,” *BJRL* 58 (1976) 282–302; *idem*, “Paul in Acts and Letters,” *DPL* 679–92; C. J. Hemer, *Book of Acts* 244–76, 418–27; D. Wenham, “Acts and the Pauline Corpus II. Evidence of Parallels,” in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting* (ed. B. W. Winter and A. D. Clarke; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993) 215–58; B. Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 430–38; and, most recently and more fully, S. E. Porter, *Paul in Acts* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2001).

¹⁸ Dunn, *Theology of the Apostle* 721.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* 721–22 (quote p. 721) and 533–64, esp. pp. 543–48 (sec. 20.3: *Community without cult*).

²⁰ Cf. 1 Cor 1:10: “I appeal [Παρακαλῶ] to you, brothers, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you agree with one another [ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες].” What prompted Paul’s appeal was a report about troubles at Corinth that he received from “some from Chloe’s household” (see 1 Cor 1:11).

²¹ For a full bibliography on 1 Cor 3:5–17, see Thiselton, *First Corinthians* 297–99.

²² R. F. Collins calls attention to the specifically Christological orientation of the statement and astutely observes, “No other foundation can be laid because the one foundation has ultimately been laid by God” (*First Corinthians* [SP 7; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999] 149). An allusion to Isa 28:16 is typically and rightly acknowledged. We will treat the Isaianic passage in connection with Rom 9:33 below.

taken, therefore, in building upon this foundation, for the eschatological day (ἡ . . . ἡμέρα [sc. of judgment]) will reveal the quality of one's work (vv. 12–15). Paul next employs another architectural metaphor, one that helps narrow his focus: “Do you not know that²³ you are a temple of God [ναὸς θεοῦ] and that the Spirit of God dwells in you [ἐν ὑμῖν]? If anyone destroys [φθείρει] the temple of God [τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ], God will destroy him [φθειρεῖ], for the temple of God [ὁ . . . ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ] is holy, and that is what you are” (1 Cor 3:16–17; my translation). The use of the second person plural in these sentences (οἴδατε . . . ἐστε . . . ὑμῖν . . . ἐστε ὑμεῖς) indicates that Paul is here speaking of the believing community in Corinth as a corporate dwelling of the Holy Spirit.²⁴ Paul's admonition in verse 17, moreover, is grave.²⁵ Thiselton observes, “Paul warns the addressees that seriously to undo the work of authentic building *thereby* brings destruction upon the person in question, and *thereby also* invites the corroborative verdict of the judgment of God. That person's plight is dreadful indeed.”²⁶ At the same time, however, Paul's apostolic admonition is a pastoral exhortation for the Corinthians to become in practice (*de facto*) what they have been called to be (*de jure*) by God's grace: “God's holy temple in Corinth.”²⁷

2. *First Corinthians 6:19.* In the next major section of the letter (1 Cor 5–6), Paul deals with several concrete ethical challenges that were besetting the believing community. In 1 Cor 6:12–20 he addresses the issue of extra-marital sexual unions.²⁸ A favorite Corinthian slogan, “Everything is permissible for me” (NIV; cf. NJB; πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν, 6:12 [*bis*]; cf. 10:23), it would seem, served as a kind of rationale for dismissing the seriousness of engaging in illicit sexual unions.²⁹ Paul spells out why sexual encounters with illicit part-

²³ Paul uses the rhetorical expression οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι frequently in 1 Corinthians, specifically 5:6; 6:2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 19; 9:13, 24; elsewhere Rom 6:16. He typically employs it to imply that the given point under consideration is something his readers either should or do in fact know. I. H. Marshall tentatively suggests it points to Paul's earlier oral teaching to them (“Church and Temple in the NT,” *TynBul* 40 [1989] 213). If so, 1 Cor 9:13, 24 (also Rom 6:16), introducing more general illustrations, should not be included.

²⁴ Cf. Fee, *First Corinthians* 149; *idem*, *God's Empowering Presence* 115; Collins, *First Corinthians* 161–62; and Thiselton, *First Corinthians* 316.

²⁵ BDAG 1054.3 suggests φθείρω (used twice in 1 Cor 3:17) implies “destroy in the sense ‘punish w[ith] eternal destruction’ (= ‘punish by destroying’ as Jer 13:9)”; cf. 2 Pet 2:12 and Jude 10.

²⁶ Thiselton, *First Corinthians* 318 (his italics).

²⁷ Fee, *First Corinthians* 149, drawing on a comment by E. Käsemann, “Sentences of Holy Law in the NT,” in *New Testament Questions for Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968) 68; repeated in Fee, *God's Empowering Presence* 116. For a brief evaluation of Käsemann's thesis of “Sentences of Holy Law,” see Thiselton, *First Corinthians* 317–18.

²⁸ The bibliography on this section is vast. For a selection, see Thiselton, *First Corinthians* 459–60.

²⁹ A number of English versions—including RSV, NEB, NIV, NAB, NJB, and NRSV (NASB and NASB update, however, are exceptions)—rightly place the twice repeated clause Πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν in quotes, thereby indicating that Paul is employing their own catch phrase (Fee, *First Corinthians* 251–53; Collins, *First Corinthians* 243; and Thiselton, *First Corinthians* 460–63). The same is true of 6:13a, “Food is for the stomach and the stomach is for food” (τὰ βρώματα τῆ κοιλίᾳ καὶ ἡ κοιλία τοῖς βρώμασιν). RSV, NEB, NIV, NAB, and NRSV place it in quotes, while the NASB, NJB and NASB update do

ners have serious consequences.³⁰ Employing the same rhetorical question we noted already in 3:16, Paul asks, “Do you not know that [οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι] your bodies [τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν] are members of Christ himself [μέλη Χριστοῦ]? Shall I then take the members of Christ [τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ] and unite them with a prostitute [ποιήσω πόρνῆς μέλη]? Never! Do you not know that he who unites himself with a prostitute is one with her in body? For it is said,³¹ ‘The two will become one flesh.’ But he who unites himself with the Lord is one with him in spirit” (1 Cor 6:15–17 NIV). Lest they miss his point, Paul presses his argument in verse 18: “Shun immorality [Φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν]. Every other sin which a man commits is outside the body; but the immoral man [ὁ . . . πορνεύων] sins against his own body.” Paul then returns again to the same rhetorical question we noted in both 3:16 and 6:15–16, “Or do you not know that [ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι] your body [τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν] is a temple of the Holy Spirit who is in you [ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματος], whom you have from God, and that you are not your own? For you have been bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body [δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν]” (1 Cor 6:19–20, NASB update).

In contrast to 1 Cor 3:16–17, Paul here applies temple language in this passage in reference to individual believers.³² As Thiselton observes, “The corporate aspect of the community as the Spirit’s temple in 3:16 receives a more individual application here, which arises in the context of the personal lifestyle at issue in this chapter.”³³ Here Paul’s language serves as a basis for the injunction of verse 20, “. . . glorify God in your body.”³⁴ The thrust of

not. Thiselton and Collins further extend the quote to include ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ ταύτην καὶ ταῦτα καταργήσει (“and God will do away with the one and the other”; Thiselton, “Realized Eschatology at Corinth,” *NTS* 24 [1978] 516–17; *idem*, *First Corinthians* 462–63; Collins, *First Corinthians* 239, 244–45). Fee limits it to the first portion of v. 13a (*First Corinthians* 253–55).

³⁰ The logic of Paul’s argument is as follows: 6:15: [a] Your bodies are members of Christ. As a result, [b] do not unite Christ to a prostitute [πόρνῆ], which is what one effectively does, if he does unite himself to one; 6:16: For [c] he who unites himself to a prostitute becomes one flesh (with scriptural substantiation provided from Gen 2:24) while [d] he who unites himself to Christ is one with him in spirit. Consequently, illicit sexual unions are ruled out because of a prior relational commitment to Christ. On the subject of immorality in Corinth, see J. McRay, *Archaeology and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991) 315–17.

³¹ Most English translations supply “it” (sc. ἡ γράφι) as the subject of the verb φησὶν, a verb frequently employed of oral speech in both the LXX and the NT. It is probably for this reason that the NASB and NASB update supply “He,” implying that God (ὁ θεός) is the intended subject. The quotation is taken verbatim from Gen 2:24b LXX (ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν) with Paul’s γάρ, φησὶν supplied between ἔσονται and οἱ. Paul employs φησὶν elsewhere only in 2 Cor 10:10, in a citation of his opponents’ criticism of his weak physical appearance and his being “rhetorically challenged.”

³² In 1 Cor 6:19, the singular of the phrase τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν functions in a distributive fashion. See R. H. Gundry, *Sōma in Biblical Theology* (SNTSMS 29; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976; reprinted, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987) 75–78; Fee, *First Corinthians* 263, n. 65; *idem*, *God’s Empowering Presence* 134, n. 179. Collins argues somewhat differently, but still recognizes that 6:19 is applied to individual believers (*First Corinthians* 160).

³³ Thiselton, *First Corinthians* 474. Cf. Fee: “Paul adopted the imagery that first of all belongs to the church as a whole . . . and applied it to the individual believer” (*God’s Empowering Presence* 135–36). See similarly Collins, *First Corinthians* 249.

³⁴ BDAG 983.2b takes the prepositional phrase in v. 20 in an instrumental sense with ethical implications: “glorify God through your body, i.e. by leading an upright life.”

the argument is clear: illicit sexual unions are prohibited because they belong to Christ and are indwelt by the Spirit.

The question that naturally comes to mind as we examine these passages is how is it that Paul, given his self-professed Jewish pedigree (Gal 1:13–14; 2:15; 2 Cor 11:22; Rom 11:1; Phil 3:5–6), could apply a term (namely, *ναός*) to believers—both corporately and individually—that was used to describe the sanctuary (Holy Place) of the temple in Jerusalem.³⁵ Commentators typically do not seek an answer to this question in connection to Jesus. Fee is a notable exception in suggesting that one of the sources for Paul’s usage is a tradition that goes back to Jesus.³⁶ There are a number of prominent strands of Jesus’ own teachings preserved for us in the Gospels that point plausibly in this direction.

III. JESUS AND THE TEMPLE

Jesus’ attitude toward the Jerusalem temple is variously characterized in contemporary scholarship along a continuum that ranges from that of being overtly hostile (anti-temple) to being highly sympathetic (pro-temple). The reason for such differing characterizations is in part due to a number of complex strands of Jesus tradition preserved in the canonical Gospels that may be interpreted as indicating either a favorable or unfavorable attitude on his part. How one comes to a final estimation of this question, moreover, is largely contingent on one’s overall estimation of Jesus himself and of his intentions in ministry.

On the one hand, there are passages that appear to indicate that Jesus held a favorable view of the temple. This viewpoint is particularly conspicuous in the Gospel of Matthew. In Matt 12:4 Jesus characterizes the pre-Solomonic tabernacle dwelling in Nob that is mentioned in 1 Sam 21:1–6 as “the house of God” (τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦς).³⁷ In Matt 23:17 he states that the temple is what sanctifies the gold, and not *vice versa*.³⁸ This argument im-

³⁵ Paul employs the term *ναός* in the passages surveyed (1 Cor 3:16, 17 [*bis*]; 6:19). Marshall renders *ναός* as “shrine” in his translation of both passages (“Church and Temple” 212–13). *ναός* is typically used of the Sanctuary (Holy Place) in contradistinction to the temple complex (τὸ ἱερόν) in the Gospels. This distinction, noted by D. Juel with respect to Mark, generally holds true in the other Gospels as well (*Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark* [SBLDS 31; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977] 127–28). There are, it would seem, two possible exceptions: Matt 27:5 (of Judas’s actions) and John 2:20 (the Jewish response to Jesus’ statement in 2:17). In both instances *ναός* seems to be used of the larger temple complex (cf. W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974; reprinted, BS 25; Sheffield: JSOT, 1994] 350, n. 46; and O. Michel, *TDNT* 3.884).

³⁶ Fee, *First Corinthians* 147 and n. 10; *idem*, *God’s Empowering Presence* 114 and n. 107. Marshall, by contrast, explains Paul’s usage of this motif in 1 Corinthians on the basis of the OT, specifically Lev 26:11–12 (cited in 2 Cor 6:16); Ps 114:2; and Ezek 37:26–27 (“Church and Temple” 213).

³⁷ Nob (נוב) was a town just to the north of Jerusalem. For an overview of a wide range of suggested identifications, see J. M. Hamilton, “Nob,” *ABD* 4.1133.

³⁸ While Matthew 23 is frequently alleged to reflect “anti-Semitic” or “anti-Jewish” sentiments (generally with minimal, if any, argument), J. Gnilka has recently conceded that it at least contains “trace elements” of Jesus’ teaching (*Jesus of Nazareth: Message and History* [trans. S. S. Schatz-

plies that Jesus viewed the temple as a holy place. Further on in the same context, Jesus states, “whoever swears by the temple, swears both by the temple and by him who dwells within it” (Matt 23:21). This latter argument implies that Jesus viewed the temple as the dwelling place of the living God.³⁹ One of Jesus’ scriptural citations in connection with the temple clearing further indicates a high view of the temple, declaring it to be, in the words of Isa 56:7, “a house of prayer for all nations” (Mark 11:17 parr.).⁴⁰ Jesus’ actions in John 2:12–16 prompted a scriptural reflection by his disciples of his zealotness (ζήλος) for the temple (2:17).⁴¹ The evangelist likely intends his readers to view the disciples’ estimation of Jesus’ zealotness in a favorable light, for in Jesus’ setting such zealotness would surely have been viewed by many Jews as a laudable expression on behalf of the temple, one characteristic of biblical and post-biblical figures that are lauded in the sources for their zealous actions on God’s behalf.⁴²

mann; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997] 268). Such minimalism, however, is predicated on the prior assumption that Matthew 23 is anti-Semitic (surely an anachronistic designation, in any case; cf. J. A. Weatherly, “Anti-Semitism,” *DJG* 13). N. T. Wright considers the charges of anti-Semitism against the Gospels “unproven” and rightly warns that modern interpreters must “guard against attempting to reconstruct history by studying the much later effects of the stories and events” (*Victory of God* 542). On the intramural nature of the debate reflected in Matthew, see S. McKnight, “A Loyal Critic: Matthew’s Polemic with Judaism in Theological Perspective,” in *Anti-Semitism and Early Christianity: Issues of Polemic and Faith* (ed. C. A. Evans and D. A. Hagner; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) 55–79.

³⁹ Compare Pss 43:3; 74:7; 76:2; 132:5; cf. Tob 1:4; Sir 36:18; 1 Esdr 1:50; and Josephus, *J.W.* 5.219.

⁴⁰ Matthew 21:13 and Luke 19:46 employ a shortened form of the Isaianic quotation: “house of prayer.” Of the fuller Markan citation J. H. Charlesworth observes, “Jesus lauded the Temple, and quoting from Isaiah 56:7, he called it ‘a house of prayer for all nations’” (“Hillel and Jesus: Why the Comparisons are Important,” in *Hillel and Jesus: Comparisons of Two Major Religious Leaders Jesus* [ed. J. H. Charlesworth and L. L. Johns; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997] 29). While the authenticity of the scriptural citations on the lips of Jesus has frequently questioned, B. D. Smith has offered persuasive answers to the impediments against their authenticity (“Objections to the Authenticity of Mark 11:17 Reconsidered,” *WTJ* 54 [1992] 255–72).

⁴¹ The scriptural reflection is based on Ps 69:9 (MT: 69:10; LXX: 68:10). The Evangelist does not state explicitly whether this remembrance was a post-resurrection reflection as he does elsewhere (see 2:22; 12:16; cf. too Matt 27:63; Luke 24:8). This may indicate that the initial reflection was contemporaneous with the event. See D. J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond, 1983) 233, n. 2.

⁴² Including, among others, Simeon and Levi (Gen 34, esp. vv. 25–29; cf. Judith’s prayer in *Jdt* 9:1–4; in *Jub.* 30.18–20 the choice of the seed of Levi to serve as priests is tied to Levi’s zealotness in Gen 34); Phinehas (Num 25:1–15, who was divinely rewarded [vv. 11–13] because of his zealous actions [vv. 7–8]; this did not go unnoticed: Ps 106:30–31; Sir 45:24–25; 1 Macc 2:26, 54; 4 Macc 18:12; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 4.152–55, 159); Elijah (1 Kgs 18:16–46; see Sir 48:1–2; 1 Macc 2:58; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 8.335–46); Mattathias (1 Macc 2 esp. vv. 24–27, 50, 54, 58; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 12.265–86). Cf. also Saul (2 Sam 21:2); Jehu (2 Kgs 10:16); and even the LORD himself (2 Kgs 19:31; Isa 9:7; 26:11 [where his zeal is requested; cf. 65:13] and 37:32). Paul characterized his own pre-Christian persecution of the church as a misguided example of religious zealotness (Gal 1:13–14; Phil 3:6; cf. Acts 21:20; 22:3; Rom 10:2–3). On the attitude of religious zealotness reflected in the Qumran writings, see 1QS 4:4; 9:23; 1QH 14:13–15; and esp. 1QM. For more on the theme of zealotness, see W. R. Farmer, *Maccabees* 84–124; *idem*, “Zealots,” *IDB* 4.336–39; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974) 1.303–14; *idem*, *Zealots* 59–73, 146–228; J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16* 586–87; and D. Rhoads, “Zealots,” *ABD* 6.1043–54, esp. pp. 1044–45.

While the foregoing passages indicate that Jesus shared with his contemporaries a favorable estimation of the temple, there are a number of additional examples in the Gospels that indicate that he also viewed the pre-70 Jerusalem temple to be inadequate to meet the new stage of redemptive reality that he was introducing in his own person and ministry.⁴³ Here we will limit ourselves to a sketch of six strands of Jesus tradition that collectively provide a theological background as to why Paul could refer to believers, both corporately and individually, as the temple of God indwelt by the Spirit while the Jerusalem temple was still standing.

1. *Jesus' choice of the twelve.* Contemporary critical scholars increasingly recognize that Jesus chose an inner and identifiable group of twelve disciples (see Mark 3:16–19/Matt 10:1–2/Luke 6:13–16; cf. Acts 1:13, 21–26) in the context of his earthly ministry.⁴⁴ Jesus' naming of them as “apostles” in the context of his ministry (Luke 6:13) is a more controversial point, but a case can be made for this as well.⁴⁵ The Synoptic Gospels are clear that Jesus' choice of the twelve was intentional on his part. The Lukan narrative recounts that Jesus chose the twelve from a wider group of disciples after a night of prayer (Luke 6:13–14), while the Markan account stresses their closeness to Jesus and his purpose in choosing them: “. . . that they might be with him and that he might send them out to preach and to have authority to drive out demons” (Mark 3:14–15).

A broad range of scholars acknowledge that Jesus' choice of a group bearing so strongly a symbolic number was intended to be allusive of the twelve

⁴³ The Qumran community likewise appears to have looked beyond the Jerusalem (Herodian) temple as well. 11Q19 29:8–10 indicates that they looked for a new temple. While it is more debatable, passages like 1QS 8:5 and 4Q174 5–7 (applying 2 Sam 7:11) may further indicate that the covenanters viewed themselves in some sense as a temple (see Juel, *Messiah and Temple* 159–68). M. O. Wise, however, doubts that the covenanters viewed themselves as a temple: “Claims that the so-called Qumran community, for example, had deserted the Temple and that its members considered themselves a new, spiritual Temple, are problematic. These claims mainly depend on certain passages in the *Manual of Discipline* (the view that 4QFlor, with its reference to a *miq-daš 'ādām*, means a spiritual rather than physical Temple must be rejected)” (“Temple,” *DJG* 815). For a balanced discussion on the question of whether the Qumran community viewed itself as a spiritual temple, see Marshall, “Church and Temple” 215–17.

⁴⁴ Scholars supporting the historicity of Jesus' choice of the twelve include J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus* (trans. J. Bowden; New York: Scribners, 1971) 231–34; E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 11, 101–103 (though rather weakly); R. A. Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987) 199–208; B. Witherington III, *The Christology of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 126–29; Wenham, *Paul: Follower* 166–67; J. P. Meier, “The Circle of the Twelve: Did it Exist during Jesus' Public Ministry?,” *JBL* 116 (1997) 635–72; *idem*, *A Marginal Jew*, Vol. 3: *Companion and Competitors* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 2001) esp. 125–97, 248–49, 628–29; and Gnilkka, *Jesus of Nazareth* 182–87.

⁴⁵ Jesus' naming the twelve as “apostles” (ἀπόστολοι) is mentioned only by Luke 6:13 (προσεφώνησεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὀνόμασεν). Some important MSS of Mark 3:14 (κ B Θ f¹³) also contain the clause οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὀνόμασεν (“whom he also named apostles,” a portion retained in the text of NIV, NRSV, NAB), but it may be a secondary expansion on the basis of the Lukan passage (and hence it is omitted in the text of RSV, NJB, NASB update). In support of Jesus' naming the twelve as apostles in the context of his ministry (Luke 6:13), see D. L. Bock, *Luke 1:1–9:50* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994) 538 and 541–42, n. 4.

tribes of Israel.⁴⁶ In this regard it is significant that Jesus did not identify himself as one of the twelve.⁴⁷ The main focus of their mission during Jesus' earthly ministry was to Israel (Mark 3:14b–15; 6:7–13/Matt 10:5–42/Luke 9:1–6), even as Jesus himself had been sent to the “lost sheep” of Israel (cf. Matt 15:24).⁴⁸ It is more debated, however, whether Jesus' choice of the twelve was meant to evoke images of restoration or reconstitution.⁴⁹ Yet Jesus' choice of the twelve, the principal focus of their ministry at this stage on Israel, and particularly given the fact that Jesus did not identify himself as one of the twelve, all imply that Jesus viewed himself at the helm of a new stage in redemptive history.⁵⁰ Such an understanding is further implied in passages such as Matt 19:28 (“Jesus said to them, ‘Truly, I say to you, in the new world, when the Son of Man will sit on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel’” [ESV]) and Luke 22:28–30 (“You are those who have stayed with me in my trials, and I assign to you, as my Father assigned to me, a kingdom, that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel” [ESV]).⁵¹ It is clear from 1 Cor 15:5, moreover, that Paul was familiar with the tradition of this group.⁵²

2. *Jesus as builder of a new community.* What is implicit in Jesus' choice of the twelve and their mission to Israel is made much more explicit in his “re-naming” of Simon in Matt 16:13–18:

⁴⁶ Gnika calls attention to the broad Jewish awareness of the symbolic significance of the number twelve attested in various sources, including Josephus, *Ant.* 11.107; *Ep. Arist.* 47–50; *Test. 12 Patr.*; 1QS 8:1 (cf. 1QM 2:2); and Rev 7:4–8 (*Jesus of Nazareth* 183–84, esp. p. 183). Sanders further observes, “The symbolic meaning of the number would have been obvious to everyone: it represented the twelve tribes of Israel” (*The Historical Figure of Jesus* [New York: Penguin, 1993] 120).

⁴⁷ A point rightly stressed by Witherington (*Christology of Jesus* 129), though we would not support all of the implications he draws from this point.

⁴⁸ On Jesus' (and his disciples') mission to the “lost sheep” of Israel (Matt 10:6; 15:24; cf. Luke 15:1–32; 19:1–10), see G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986) 186–87, 236–37; and Witherington, *Christology of Jesus* 124–26. The “lost” theme appears to be implied in Mark as well, as in Jesus' and his disciples' call for repentance (Mark 1:15; 6:12).

⁴⁹ Sanders proposes that through the choice of the twelve “Jesus intended to show that he had in view the full restoration of the people of Israel” (*Historical Figure* 120), while C. A. Evans suggests that it “in all probability symbolized reconstituted Israel” (“Typology,” *DJG* 865 [§ 4.1]).

⁵⁰ Cf. D. A. Hagner: “The twelve are the core of the new movement representing the new era and the new activity of God” (*Matthew 1–13* [WBC 33A; Dallas: Word, 1991] 267).

⁵¹ On the former (Matthean) passage, see D. A. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28* (WBC 33B; Dallas: Word, 1995) 565; W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988–97) 3.54–58; and C. S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) 479–80. On the latter (Lukan) passage, see I. H. Marshall, *Commentary on Luke* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978] 814–18; and D. L. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996) 1739–40. On both passages together, see Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God*, 273–77 (along with a note on authenticity on p. 277); and Witherington, *Christology of Jesus* 140–42. The considerable differences in language may well suggest that we have two sources here (cf. Marshall, *Luke* 815, with some admitted hesitation; and Bock, *Luke* 1740).

⁵² See further C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (HNTC; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1968) 341–42; Fee, *First Corinthians* 728–29; and Thiselton, *First Corinthians* 1203–5.

Now when Jesus came into the district of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, “Who do people say that the Son of Man is?” And they said, “Some say John the Baptist, but others Elijah, and still others Jeremiah or one of the prophets.” He said to them, “But who do you say that I am?” Simon Peter answered, “You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God.” And Jesus answered him, “Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah! For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father in heaven. And I tell you, you are Peter [Πέτρος], and on this rock I will build my church [καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν], and the gates of Hades will not prevail against it. (NRSV)

The authenticity of Jesus’ promise to build his church (ἐκκλησία) has frequently been viewed with considerable suspicion, particularly given its non-Markan parallel (cf. Mark 8:27–30).⁵³ Yet its authenticity is not as easy to dismiss as some critical scholars allege.⁵⁴ A related debate concerns the grammatical referent of the prepositional phrase ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ (“on this rock”). Some scholars argue that πέτρα (“rock”) refers to Peter’s confession rather than Peter himself.⁵⁵ Yet it is grammatically unlikely that ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ refers to anything other than the nearer *ad sensum* antecedent Peter (Πέτρος = Aram. ܦܬܪܝܘܨ; cf. John 1:42).⁵⁶ Here Peter is the recipient of divine revelation and speaks, as elsewhere (Matt 15:15), representatively for the disciples.

Those who favor the historicity not only of the declaration but also of its setting (that is, a *Sitz-im-Leben Jesu*) nonetheless debate the semantic force that should be given to ἐκκλησία. K. L. Schmidt suggested that the Aramaic term behind ἐκκλησία in Matthew was the late Aramaic term ܥܘܢܝܫܘܬܐ (“community”).⁵⁷ Jeremias, conversely, purposed that ܥܘܢܝܫܘܬܐ (Heb.; Aram. ܥܘܢܝܫܘܬܐ = “congregation”) lay behind ἐκκλησία here, on the analogy to the Teacher of Righteousness at Qumran (see 4QpPs37 3:16) whom God established in order to build for himself a congregation.⁵⁸ While these explanations are not impossible, OT usage renders it unlikely that anything other than ܥܘܢܝܫܘܬܐ (Heb.

⁵³ Jesus’ promise to Peter concerning the “church” (ἐκκλησία) is commonly regarded as secondary (e.g. F. W. Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1981/San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1982; reprinted, Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987] 350–56) and the “naming” event associated with it is not infrequently attributed to a post-Easter experience (e.g. R. E. Brown et al., *Peter in the New Testament* [Minneapolis: Augsburg/New York: Paulist, 1973] 85). Yet such explanations are far from persuasive.

⁵⁴ For a persuasive argument on behalf of authenticity, see B. F. Meyer, *The Aims of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1979) 185–97, 303–5; *idem*, *Christus Faber: The Master-BUILDER and the House of God* (PTMS 20; Allison Park: Pickwick, 1992) 259–60, 277. On the suppositional nature of the denial of the authenticity of this passage, see G. Maier, “The Church in the Gospel of Matthew: Hermeneutical Analysis of the Current Debate,” in *Biblical Interpretation and the Church: The Problem of Contextualization* (ed. D. A. Carson; Nashville: Nelson, 1984) 45–63.

⁵⁵ For a learned defense of this position, see C. C. Caragounis, *Peter and the Rock* (BZNW 58; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990).

⁵⁶ See D. A. Carson, “Matthew” 369–70; R. T. France, *Matthew* (TCNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985) 255; Davies and Allison, *Matthew* 2.625–28, esp. p. 627; Hagner, *Matthew 14–28* 471–72; and Keener, *Matthew* 427–29.

⁵⁷ Schmidt, “ἐκκλησία,” *TDNT* 3.524–26.

⁵⁸ Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* 168.

= Aram. ܠܗܩ) was the intended meaning behind Jesus' words, for ܠܗܩ is commonly rendered as ἐκκλησία in the LXX.⁵⁹

Such a promise, moreover, indicates something about Jesus that some scholars too often are unwilling to seriously contemplate: namely, that the Jesus who is here confessed as Messiah also intended to found a church that would continue on after the earthly dimension of his ministry.⁶⁰ Against this church, no opponent, however fierce, would ultimately prevail.⁶¹ Hence, not only is Peter's confession an affirmation of Jesus' messiahship (v. 16, "You are the Messiah [σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός], the Son of the Living God" [ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος]), Jesus' response is also an affirmation of his messianic status as well (v. 18, "I will build my church" [οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν]).⁶²

Paul himself was likely familiar with some form of this "naming" tradition, for he typically refers to Peter not by his Greek name Πέτρος (which he used only in Gal 2:7–8), as one would expect from someone writing in Greek, but by his Aramaic name "Cephas" (Aram. ܩܦܫܐ; in Greek transliteration: Κηφᾶς).⁶³ This assumes a "naming" event of the type Matthew 16 preserves (cf. John 1:42).⁶⁴ Additionally, Peter's leadership role, so prominent in the Gospels and early in Acts, is confirmed in Paul's comments in Gal 2:7,

⁵⁹ According to L. Coenen, ἐκκλησία appears about 100 times in the LXX, 22 times in the Apocrypha, and 3 times with no Hebrew equivalent ("Church," *NIDNTT* 1.292; a computer search discovered only slightly different numbers: 103 times total; 26 times in the Apocrypha). In cases where ἐκκλησία translates a Hebrew equivalent, it is *always* used to render ܠܗܩ. The Greek term συναγωγή, is also utilized as a rendering for ܠܗܩ in nearly 40 passages, including 26 examples in Genesis, Leviticus, and Numbers (Coenen claims 21 examples in Gen, Lev, and Num ["Church"], but a computer search uncovered 26 examples in these books and 30 in the Pentateuch as a whole), but in most instances συναγωγή, is more commonly reserved for ܩܦܫܐ (congregation).

⁶⁰ One here recalls the wry and frequently quoted comment of W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, "A Messiah without a Messianic Community would have been unthinkable to any Jew" (with a supporting mention of Qumran; *Matthew* [AB 26; Garden City: Doubleday, 1971] 195). For a recent account of Christian origins that persuasively argues that Jesus is the "driving force" within the NT, see P. Barnett, *Jesus and the Rise of Christianity: A History of New Testament Times* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999).

⁶¹ For OT background on the phrase, "the gates of Hades" (πύλας ᾗδου), see Isa 38:10–20, esp. v. 17 [ܠܢܝܫ ܝܓܘܫܩ; LXX: ἐν πύλαις ᾗδου]; similar expressions are used in Job 38:17; Pss 9:13 and 107:18 (all [αἱ] πύλαι [τοῦ] θανάτου); Wis 16:13 (πύλας ᾗδου); 3 Macc 5:51 (πύλαις ᾗδου); and *PssSol* 16:2 (πύλων ᾗδου). Here Jesus, who is confessed as "Messiah and Son of the living God" (ὁ χριστός ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος; on the phrase "living God," see Deut 5:26; Josh 3:10; 1 Sam 17:26, 36; 2 Kgs 19:4, 16; Pss 42:2; 84:2; Isa 37:4, 17; Jer 23:36; Dan 6:20, 26; and Hos 1:10), promises Simon (Peter) that these dreaded gates of Hades *will not conquer* (οὐ κατισχύσουσιν) the church (in this context κατισχύω bears the sense of "win a victory over" [BDAG 534.2]). This suggests that the church, which Jesus announces he will build, will face opposition, but that the opposition it will face will not ultimately gain victory over it (cf. Marshall, "Church and Temple" 222, though his reference should be to Matt 16:18, rather than 18:18). As Messiah and Son of the living God, Jesus has both the authority to offer such a promise and the power to deliver on it.

⁶² Carson observes, "Implicitly . . . the verse . . . embraces a claim to messiahship. The 'people of Yahweh' become the people of the Messiah (cf. also 13:41)" ("Matthew" 369). Cf. G. E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (ed. D. A. Hagner; rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993) 108.

⁶³ Paul's references to "Cephas" include 1 Cor 1:12; 3:22; 9:5; 15:5; Gal 1:18; 2:9, 11, 14. He employs the Greek equivalent "Peter" only in Gal 2:7–8.

⁶⁴ For a discussion of the semantic range of ܩܦܫܐ and a reconstruction of the Aramaic substratum of the declaration recorded in Matt 16:18, see esp. J. A. Fitzmyer, *To Advance the Gospel* (New York: Crossway, 1981) 112–24.

where he acknowledges that he has been “entrusted with the gospel [πεπίστειμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον] to the uncircumcised [τῆς ἀκροβυστίας] even as Peter [had been entrusted with the gospel to] the circumcised [καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς].”⁶⁵ It finds further confirmation in Gal 2:9, where Paul refers to Cephas (Peter), James, and John as “pillars” (στῦλοι) of the Jerusalem church. Ulrich Wilckens rightly recognized a connection between Matt 16:18 and Gal 2:9, stating, “The rock on which the Church is to be built holds up the house or temple of the ἐκκλησία and thus has the same function as is denoted by στῦλος in G[a]l. 2.”⁶⁶

3. *Jesus is superior to the temple.* Matthew 12:6 is part of a larger controversy pericope involving Jesus, his disciples, and the Pharisees dealing with the question of whether or not Jesus’ disciples had transgressed the Sabbath by picking grain (12:1–8).⁶⁷ Jesus responds to the charge that his disciples were “doing what is unlawful [οὐκ ἔξεστιν] on the Sabbath” as follows:

Have you not read what David did when he became hungry, he and his companions, how he entered the house of God, and they ate the consecrated bread, which was not lawful for him to eat nor for those with him, but for the priests alone? Or have you not read in the Law, that on the Sabbath the priests in the temple break the Sabbath and are innocent? But I say to you that something greater than the temple is here [λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μεῖζόν ἐστιν ὃδε] (Matt 12:3–6, NASB update)

The nature of Jesus’ response is clearly *qal wahomer* ([קל וחומר])—that is, *a fortiori*) and leads to his authoritative pronouncement in verse 8: “the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath.” For our purposes, however, it is verse 6 that is intriguing: “But I say to you that something greater than the temple is here” (λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μεῖζόν ἐστιν ὃδε). The debated issue concerns whether the neuter comparative adjective μεῖζον is intended as an oblique self-reference on the part of Jesus to himself or more generally to the kingdom message he is proclaiming and demonstrating in his actions.⁶⁸ While

⁶⁵ On this see Wenham, *Paul: Follower* 202–3. This makes the Jewish leadership’s recognition of the legitimacy of Paul’s own gospel on equal footing with Peter’s (Gal 2:2–7) all the more significant (Gal 2:9).

⁶⁶ U. Wilckens, “στῦλος,” *TDNT* 7.735. Wilckens further acknowledged that Paul’s use of στῦλοι is “more than simple metaphorical usage” (p. 734) though his unqualified correlation of Galatians 2 with the Jerusalem council is perhaps a debatable point. See also Wenham, *Paul: Follower* 203. See also the ensuing discussion of Eph 2:19–22 in section III.5, which also has relevance given the building metaphor of “foundation” (θεμέλιος) that Paul applies to “apostles and prophets.”

⁶⁷ On the historicity of the incident, see Davies and Allison, though they place vv. 5–7 in the category of Matthean redaction on the basis of the parallel in Mark 2:25–28 (*Matthew* 2.304–5, esp. pp. 312–13).

⁶⁸ C L Δ 0233 f¹³ et al. leave no room for doubt, for these witnesses supply the masculine comparative μεῖζων, which is clearly an interpretive, secondary variant. On Jesus’ inauguration of kingdom in his own person and ministry, see the use of ἐφθασεν in Matt 12:28/Luke 11:20, along with Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* 75–80. C. C. Caragounis, by contrast, prefers to limit ἐφθασεν to being “so imminent that the kingdom of God may be considered as being virtually here” (“Kingdom of God/Heaven,” *DJG* 423). Yet one must question whether this explanation does

notable scholars may be found on both sides of this interpretation, it is important to note that the two notions should not be too sharply separated.⁶⁹ D. A. Carson plausibly suggests that the two notions “merge into one,” though he considers a reference to Jesus “marginally more plausible.”⁷⁰ For this reason Eduard Schweizer’s suggestion that 12:6 might be an isolated saying “especially because this obscure statement does not refer directly to Jesus as that which is greater but rather to the Kingdom of God that comes through him” is unhelpful, for he bases his literary decision on a debatable interpretation.⁷¹

It is evident from Rom 9:4–5 that Paul views Jesus the Messiah as the culmination of Israel’s rich spiritual prerogatives, a heritage that included the adoption as sons, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law (or legislation), the temple service, the promises, and the fathers (9:4). Hence for Paul, Jesus the Messiah is qualitatively superior to all of Israel’s other prerogatives, including the temple worship (ἡ λατρεία).⁷² In keeping with this, Paul can fittingly call him God (θεός).⁷³ Given this exalted language applied directly to Israel’s Messiah, there can be little doubt that Paul considered Jesus the Messiah to be superior to the temple.

4. *Jesus’ temple clearing and predictions of the temple’s destruction.* Jesus’ temple action (or actions; Mark 11:15–18 parr.; John 2:13–22) and his predictions of the temple’s destruction also have relevance for the present discussion. The former is conveyed in two versions: Johannine (located early in Jesus’ ministry) and Synoptic (located during the passion week).⁷⁴

adequate justice to the contexts of Matt 12:28/Luke 11:20. On the broader twentieth-century debate over the meaning of the kingdom, see the collection of essays in W. Willis, ed., *The Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987).

⁶⁹ Beasley-Murray considers Matt 12:6 an oblique reference to Jesus’ role in the coming of the kingdom (*Jesus and the Kingdom* 271). Hagner, conversely, takes it in the more general sense of “the phenomenon of the ministry of Jesus and the disciples and the reality of the dawning kingdom altogether” (*Matthew 1–13* 330).

⁷⁰ Carson, “Matthew” 282; cf. Keener, *Matthew* 356–57.

⁷¹ Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew* (trans. D. E. Green; Atlanta: John Knox, 1975) 278. It is better here to speak objectively of Matthew’s special material in vv. 5–7 (cf. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13* 327) rather than assuming that we are dealing with an isolated logion in 12:6.

⁷² On the cultic meaning of λατρεία in Rom 9:4, see n. 16 above.

⁷³ While J. D. G. Dunn has issued repeated arguments to the contrary (e.g. *Christology in the Making* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980] 45; *Romans 9–16* 528–29; and *Theology of the Apostle* 255–57), ὁ ὄν ἐπι πάντων θεός εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας of Rom 9:5 in all probability refers to ὁ Χριστός as its grammatical antecedent (so NASB, NIV, NRSV, NJB, NASB update, ESV) rather than introducing an asyndetic (i.e. independent) doxology (as RSV, NAB). See esp. the compelling discussion of M. J. Harris, *Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992) 143–72, as well as the persuasive treatments in the recent commentaries of J. A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993) 548–49; Moo, *Romans* 565–67; and T. R. Schreiner, *Romans* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998) 485–90.

⁷⁴ M. A. Matson argues persuasively for the literary independence of the Johannine and Synoptic accounts, regardless of whether one agrees with his reason as to why they are independent (“The Contribution to the Temple Cleansing by the Fourth Gospel,” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1992 Seminar Papers* [ed. E. H. Lovering, Jr.; Vol. 31; Atlanta: Scholar’s Press, 1992] 489–506). For recent examinations of Jesus’ temple action, see C. A. Evans, “From ‘House of Prayer’

Jesus' prediction of the temple's destruction, moreover, is conveyed to the surprised disciples in Mark 13:2 (par. Matt 24:2).⁷⁵ More difficult to assess are the charges brought against Jesus by adversaries claiming that he predicted the destruction and rebuilding of the temple: Mark 14:57–58 par. ("false" witnesses at his hearing before the council) and 15:29–30 par. (mocking passersby at the cross). A prediction attributed to Jesus concerning the destruction and rebuilding of the temple is found in *Gos. Thom.* 71 ("Jesus said: 'I will destroy [this] house, and no one will be able to [re]build it'"), but nowhere in the canonical Gospels do we find Jesus explicitly stating this in the fashion alleged by his accusers (Mark 14:58 par. Matt 26:61) and mockers (Mark 15:29 par. Matt 27:40).⁷⁶ A probable source of this charge is a garbled remembrance on the part of Jesus' antagonists of his earlier response preserved in John 2:19: "Jesus answered them, 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up'" (λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν).⁷⁷ Here the aorist imperative λύσατε ("Destroy") in John 2:19 may function conditionally: "If you destroy . . . [then] I will raise . . ."⁷⁸ More likely, however, it is a prophetic challenge.⁷⁹ Few critical scholars today doubt that Jesus cleared the temple. Many, too, acknowledge that he predicted the

to 'Cave of Robbers': Jesus' Prophetic Criticism of the Temple Establishment," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (ed. C. A. Evans and S. Talmon; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 417–42; *idem*, *Mark 8:27–16:20* (WBC 34B; Nashville: Nelson, 2001) 161–82; J. Ádna, *Jesu Stellung zum Tempel. Die Tempelaktion und das Tempelwort als Ausdruck seiner messianischen Sendung* (WUNT 2/119; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2000); and R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) 443–47. My own work on this subject, *Jesus' Temple Action (Mark 11:15–18) in Recent Discussion: An Examination of Its Character, Meaning, and Role in Jesus' Death*, is presently in preparation for publication.

⁷⁵ See the recent discussions of this passage in Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20* 293–300; and France, *Mark* 494–96.

⁷⁶ Mark 14:58 ("We heard him say, 'I will destroy this temple made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands'") is sometimes explained as either a pre-Markan or Markan interpretive addition (e.g. E. E. Ellis, *The Making of the New Testament Documents* [Leiden: Brill, 1999] 76). Others contend that Mark 14:58 represents something that (or something close to what) Jesus said (e.g. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20* 445). We prefer the explanation of Blomberg and Köstenberger; see the next note.

⁷⁷ Cf. C. L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1987) 170–73; *idem*, *The Historical Reliability of John* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001) 89; and A. Köstenberger, *Encountering John: The Gospel in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective* (EBS; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999) 76–78.

⁷⁸ So C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955) 302, n. 1; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (2d ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978) 199; and R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John* (3 vols.; New York: Crossroad, 1968–1987) 1.350; cf. BDF § 387 (1).

⁷⁹ D. B. Wallace observes, "Such a prophetic statement is reminiscent of the 'ironic commands' of the Jewish prophets (cf. Isa 8:9; Amos 4:4). It thus functions as a taunt or a dare, akin to 'Go ahead! Destroy this temple, if you dare! I will still raise it up!'" (*Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996] 490–91). Jesus' hearers understood him to refer to the temple itself (as 2:20 indicates), while the evangelist interprets Jesus' saying as referring to his body (2:21). For differing estimates of the relation of this statement to the Jerusalem temple, see L. Morris, *The Gospel According to John* (rev. ed.; NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 177–79; and A. R. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSS 220; London/New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) 67–101.

temple's destruction. Moreover, a broad cross-section of scholars from widely diverse backgrounds view the combination of Jesus' temple clearing and/or his words against the temple to be a main cause(s), if not *the* cause(s), that led to Jesus' death.⁸⁰

The question that comes to mind is whether Paul was familiar with either or both of these traditions. There are several linguistic features in his letters that may imply that he was familiar with some form of the tradition concerning Jesus' prediction of the temple's destruction. In 1 Cor 3:10–17 we find a complex of motifs that are connected with Jesus' prediction of the temple's destruction and with the cornerstone image (see III.5 below): temple (ναός), destruction (φθείρει), and building (ἐποικοδομήσεν). In 2 Cor 5:1, moreover, Paul employs similar imagery: "For we know that if the earthly tent which is our house (ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκηνῶν; lit. 'our earthly house of the tent') is torn down (καταλυθῆ), we have a building from God (οἰκοδομῆν ἐκ θεοῦ), a house not made with hands (οἰκίαν ἀχειροποίητον), eternal in the heavens." Once again we find a reference to temple (here ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκηνῶν [lit. "our earthly house of the tent"]), destruction (καταλυθῆ), and building (οἰκίαν ἀχειροποίητον). These points of correspondence may simply be coincidental uses of common stock metaphors. It has also been plausibly suggested, however, that Paul is drawing upon Jesus tradition allusively.⁸¹

⁸⁰ On Jesus' temple clearing as *the* factor that led to Jesus' death, see E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress) 305; *idem*, *Historical Figure* 265, "The Temple action sealed his fate." While not stated as strongly as Sanders, nor always reached by way of the same line of argumentation, other proponents who view the temple clearing as a principal cause in Jesus' crucifixion include: C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963) 158; S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967) 333, n. 3 ("the logic of events points to the Cleansing of the Temple as constituting the decisive event which precipitated the final tragedy in Jerusalem"); Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* 279–80 and n. 3; J. H. Charlesworth, *Jesus within Judaism* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1988) 118; R. Bauckham, "Jesus' Demonstration in the Temple," in *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of Law in Israel and Early Christianity* (ed. B. Lindars; Cambridge: James Clarke, 1988) 86–89; B. F. Meyer, "Jesus Christ," *ABD* 3.791; C. A. Evans, "Jesus and the 'Cave of Robbers': Toward a Jewish Context for the Temple Action," *BBR* 3 (1993) 92–110; R. E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels* (2 vols.; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1994) 1.460; and N. T. Wright, *Victory of God* 405. Yet appropriate attention also needs to be given to the charge of blasphemy against Jesus (Mark 14:53–65). See esp. D. L. Bock, *Blasphemy and Exaltation in Judaism and the Final Examination of Jesus* (WUNT 2/106; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1998); and Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20* 430–59.

⁸¹ See further Wenham, *Paul: Follower* 206–7. On 2 Cor 5:1, see also P. Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 257–58, n. 14; and Ellis, *Making* 77. Wenham further notes the related imagery of building and destroying is found also in Gal 2:18; 2 Cor 13:10; and Rom 14:18–20. In Gal 2:18, recounting an argument with Cephas in Antioch, whether by relating the actual content of the scene or elaborating for his readers on the content quoted in v. 14, Paul says, "if I *build up* again the very things that I *destroyed*, then I demonstrate that I am a transgressor" (εἰ . . . ἂ κατέλυσά ταυτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἐμαντὸν συνιστάνω). In 2 Cor 13:10 he refers to "the authority that the Lord has given me for *building up* and not for *tearing down*" (τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἣν ὁ κύριος ἔδωκέν μοι εἰς οἰκοδομῆν καὶ οὐκ εἰς καθαίρεισιν). In Rom 14:19–20a Paul exhorts, "Let us then pursue what makes for peace and for mutual *upbuilding* (τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς). Do not, for the sake of food, *destroy* (κατάλυε) the work of God."

5. *Jesus as the rejected stone and cornerstone.* Two related building metaphors that Jesus employed in reference to himself were simultaneously “the stone that the builders rejected” (λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες) and the “cornerstone” (κεφαλὴ γωνίας; lit. “head of the corner”; Mark 12:10 parr.). The Synoptic Gospels all recount a controversy episode in which the religious leaders challenged Jesus’ authority following his dramatic entry into Jerusalem and the temple clearing that followed. To this challenge Jesus responded with the parable of the tenants (Mark 12:1–12).⁸² In this parable we find a theme of replacement. The parable introduces a landowner (cf. v. 9, ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος) who had planted the vineyard and leased it to tenant-farmers (v. 1).⁸³ At the time of harvest the owner looked for fruit through numerous emissaries who were met only with violence (vv. 3–5).⁸⁴ Last of all, he sent his beloved son (υἱὸς ἀγαπητός) in the hopeful expectation that the tenants would treat him differently (v. 6). The tenants, however, recognizing in the son the heir of the estate, saw an opportunity to grasp the inheritance for themselves (v. 7), and hence “they took him and killed him, and cast him out of the vineyard” (v. 8). This leads to Jesus’ rhetorical query: “What will the owner of the vineyard do?” (v. 9a), to which he gives an immediate answer, “He will come and destroy the tenants and give the vineyard to others. Have you not read this scripture: ‘The stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone [λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας]; this was the Lord’s doing, and it is amazing in our eyes?’” (vv. 10–11, NRSV).⁸⁵

⁸² The Markan narrative contains the following pericopae: Jesus’ dramatic entry (11:1–11); the cursing of the fig tree (11:12–14); the temple clearing (11:15–19); the discovery of the withered fig tree and accompanying teaching (11:20–25); the questioning of Jesus’ authority (11:27–33); and the parable of the tenants (12:1–12). In the Matthean narrative we find: Jesus’ dramatic entry (21:1–11); the temple clearing (21:12–17); the cursing of the fig tree and lesson (21:18–22); the questioning of Jesus’ authority (21:23–27); the parable of the two sons (21:28–32) [uniquely Matthean]; and the parable of the tenants (21:33–46). In the Lukan narrative we find: Jesus’ dramatic entry (19:28–40); Jesus’ lament over Jerusalem (19:41–44) [uniquely Lukan]; the temple clearing (19:45–48); the questioning of Jesus’ authority (20:1–8); and the parable of the tenants (20:9–19). Hence, the four common elements among the Synoptic accounts are as follows: 1. Jesus’ dramatic entry (Mark 11:1–11; parr. Matt 21:1–11; Luke 19:28–40); 2. the temple clearing (Mark 11:15–19; parr. Matt 21:12–17; Luke 19:45–48); 3. Jesus’ authority questioned (Mark 21:23–27; parr. Matt 21:23–27; Luke 20:1–8); and 4. the parable of the tenants (Mark 12:1–12; parr. Matt 21:33–46; Luke 20:9–19).

⁸³ Given the context, the points of correspondence are as follows: the vineyard is a reference to Israel (an evident allusion to Isa 5:1–7), while the tenants represent the religious leaders, as Mark 12:12 indicates, “And they [sc. the religious leaders; cf. Mark 11:27] tried to arrest him, but feared the multitude, for they perceived that he had told the parable against them . . .” Cf. Juell: “It is at least clear . . . that the tenants referred to in the parable are, in Mark, the leaders of the temple establishment” (*Messiah and Temple* 136).

⁸⁴ The imagery recalls a similar charge through the prophet Jeremiah (see Jer 7:25–26, albeit without the explicit mention of violence).

⁸⁵ Scholars debate whether κεφαλὴ γωνίας (lit. “head of the corner”: KJV, RSV) implies a “cornerstone” or “capstone” (cf. BDAG 542.2.b). Standard translations more frequently render the phrase as “cornerstone” (NRSV, NAB, NJB, NET Bible, ESV; cf. NKJV, NASB update: “chief cornerstone”; NEB: “main corner-stone”), though the NIV is an exception in translating it as “capstone.” Evans suggests that κεφαλὴ γωνίας “probably refers to either a capstone that completes an arch or a capital

The scriptural quotation that Jesus employs to substantiate the replacement theme suggested in this parable comes from Ps 118:22–23, and while its original connection with the parable has at times been questioned, more convincing discussion has rightly seen that the Psalm quotation is an authentic part of the parable, particularly given the Semitic play on words between son (בן) and stone (אבן) that is so integral to the parable.⁸⁶ Moreover, while Klyne Snodgrass doubts a reference to the temple in the building imagery in his prominent study of this parable,⁸⁷ recent scholars have maintained a plausible allusion to temple replacement in the Ps 118:22–23 reference of the parable. David Wenham writes in this regard:

The picture here is of Jesus, the rejected son of the parable, being the foundation of God's new building, and it is quite clear from the context of the story in the synoptic Gospels (following the cleansing of the temple and the cursing of the fig tree) that the building concerned is the temple. . . . If it is such, then it is a significant clue suggesting that the supernatural temple that Jesus anticipated was not a building of bricks and mortar but something intimately connected with himself.⁸⁸

N. T. Wright further suggests that the linking of the stone of Psalm 118 with the new eschatological temple is original to Jesus himself:

[T]he idea of the 'stone' is closely linked with the idea of the new eschatological Temple. I am not aware that Psalm 118.22–3 was interpreted in this way by any of the varieties of the Judaism of Jesus' day, but Jesus' own varied use of scriptural rock/stone imagery in relation to the building of a new Temple, interpreted apparently as the new community of the people of YHWH, makes it quite likely that this was his intention here as well, even if the linking of this passage into this (widely attested) theme was original to him.⁸⁹

that sits atop a column or pinnacle of the building" (*Mark 8:27–16:20* 238). More plausible, however, is H. Krämer: "The terms that κεφαλὴ γωνίας and ἀκρογωνιαίος both designate the *foundation stone at its farthest (foremost) corner*, with which the building is begun—it firmly fixes its site and determines its direction" ("γωνία," *EDNT* 1.268).

⁸⁶ For a recent scholar who questions the original connection of this Psalm with the parable, see A. J. Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary* (The Bible in Its World; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 363–64, 366. In defense of the original connection between the quotation and the parable, see esp. K. Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants* (WUNT 27; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1983) 63–63; cf. also J. Jeremias, "λίθος," *TDNT* 4.274; R. H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993) 663; and Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20* 228–30. Snodgrass further notes the formative nature of Psalm 118 for Jesus (*Wicked Tenants* 112). On the play on Semitic words between "stone" and "son," see esp. Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants* 80–87, 95–106, and 113–18 (Appendix, "The Wordplay between בן and אבן").

⁸⁷ Snodgrass, with reference to Juel, *Messiah and Temple* 136 (*Wicked Tenants* 73). While it is true, as Snodgrass notes, that Juel prefaced his comments on the connection of this parable with the temple as "not obvious," Juel went on to trace several themes that were coherent with such an interpretation (see *Messiah and Temple* 136–37).

⁸⁸ Wenham, *Paul: Follower* 175. See also the earlier argument of J. Jeremias, "λίθος," *TDNT* 4.274–75.

⁸⁹ Wright, *Victory of God* 499. It should be observed also that Jeremias had earlier suggested, on the basis of Mark 12:10 and Luke 20:18, that "Jesus Himself was the first to apply the metaphor of the stone to Himself" ("λίθος," *TDNT* 4.274).

While not referring explicitly to Psalm 118, Paul employs strikingly similar metaphors (cornerstone and rock of offense/stumbling stone) in references to Jesus. The former metaphor is grouped with a series of other building metaphors in Eph 2:20.⁹⁰ As part of a summary of an argument in which Paul contends that Gentiles in Christ are with believing Jews now part of God's household (οἰκεῖται τοῦ θεοῦ = the church; cf. 1:22), Paul describes this household as

built upon the foundation [ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ] of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone [ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ], in whom the whole structure [πᾶσα οἰκοδομή] is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord [εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν κυρίῳ]; in whom you also are built into it for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit [ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι] (Eph 2:19–22, RSV).

As with κεφαλὴ γωνίας (“head of the corner”) in Mark 12:10 (parr.), it is debated whether ἀκρογωνιαῖος in Ephesians means either “cornerstone” or “capstone.”⁹¹ While the former seems more likely for both, however, important for our purposes is that κεφαλὴ γωνίας and ἀκρογωνιαῖος overlap semantically.⁹² Here we find a shift in the referents of the metaphor of the “foundation” (θεμέλιος). In 1 Cor 3:11 this image is applied to Christ himself. Here it is used in reference to the apostles and prophets,⁹³ with Christ himself as its cornerstone (ἀκρογωνιαῖος). The Pauline portrait of the edifice culminates in the crowning image of growth (αὐξάνω) into a “holy temple” (ναὸς ἅγιος, 2:21b). In application Paul notes that his predominantly Gentile readers are collectively being built (συνοικοδομέω) into a habitation of God (εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ) in which he lives by the Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι, 2:22).⁹⁴ Paul thus again applies

⁹⁰ While a number of scholars consider Ephesians to be post-Pauline (e.g. Lincoln, *Ephesians* [WBC; Waco: Word, 1990] lix–lxxiii), a strong case can be made for Pauline authorship (cf. P. T. O'Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians* [PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999] 4–47; and H. W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* [Grand Rapids: Baker 2002] 6–20).

⁹¹ Translations of ἀκρογωνιαῖος as “cornerstone” include KJV, RSV, NRSV, NIV, NJB, NASB update, NET Bible, and ESV (cf. NEB: “foundation-stone”). NAB prefers “capstone.” Lincoln also favors the “keystone” (*Ephesians* 123, 154–56; cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984] 306 and n. 154), while other scholars more plausibly contend for “cornerstone” (Krämer, “γωνία,” *EDNT* 1.268–69; O'Brien, *Ephesians* 216–18; and Hoehner, *Ephesians* 397, 404–7). Much of the debate turns on whether Isa 28:16 is part of the allusion, which seems highly likely.

⁹² Krämer notes that Symmachus uses ἀκρογωνιαῖος in its rendering of Ps 117:22 LXX instead of the κεφαλὴ γωνίας of the LXX (“γωνία,” *EDNT* 1.268).

⁹³ It is at times debated whether one group (apostle-prophets) or two (apostles and prophets) are in view in Eph 2:20. W. Grudem argues for one (“apostle-prophets”—i.e. apostles who are prophets; *The Gift of Prophecy in the New Testament and Today* [Westchester: Crossway, 1988] 45–63), while O'Brien and Hoehner contend that two groups are in view (O'Brien, *Ephesians* 214–16; Hoehner, *Ephesians* 401–3). The parallel language of 1 Cor 12:28 (“God has appointed in the church, first apostles, second prophets . . .”) and Eph 4:11 (“he gave some as apostles, others as prophets, others as evangelists . . .”) makes it far more likely that two groups, not one, are in view, though Eph 2:20 and 3:5 indicate that there is a close connection between the two ministries.

⁹⁴ On the coherency of the Spirit language here (ἐν πνεύματι) with Paul's other writings and the trinitarian nature of the language of 2:21–22, see Fee, *God's Empowering Presence* 689, n. 106 and 690 respectively.

to his recipients language and imagery he elsewhere (in 1 Cor 3:16; 6:19) applies, both corporately and individually, to the local church.⁹⁵

The second image—stone of stumbling—is used in reference to Jesus as the Messiah in Rom 9:32–33. In drawing out the implications of his argument in 9:1–29, Paul states:

What shall we say, then? That Gentiles who did not pursue righteousness have attained it, that is, a righteousness that is by faith; but that Israel who pursued a law that would lead to righteousness did not succeed in reaching that law. Why? Because they did not pursue it by faith, but as if it were based on works. They have stumbled over the stumbling stone [προσέκοψαν τῷ λίθῳ τοῦ προσκόμματος], as it is written, “Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone of stumbling [λίθῳ προσκόμματος], and a rock of offense; and whoever believes in him will not be put to shame.” (Rom 9:30–33, *ESV*)

To substantiate the observation that Israelites unresponsive to the gospel have “stumbled against the stumbling stone,” Paul quotes a mixture of Isa 8:14 and 28:16 in Rom 9:33, introduced with a customary introductory formula (καθὼς γέγραπται).⁹⁶ The beginning and end of his quotation reflects Isa 28:16, while the reference to “a stone of stumbling” reflects Isa 8:14, with the common metaphor in both passages being the reference to the “stone” (אבן/λίθος).⁹⁷ The Isaiah 8 passage is part of an oracle delivered in the midst of the troublesome political context of the Syro-Ephraimite war (late 730s BC), when the LORD presents himself to the prophet as “a sanctuary” (שֹׁמֵרָה; LXX: ἀγίασμα) to those who will hallow and fear him. For those unresponsive to his gracious offer, however, rather than being a source of refuge, he will be “a stone that causes men to stumble and a rock that makes them fall.”⁹⁸

⁹⁵ Commentators frequently differ as to whether Paul has in mind here in Eph 2:20–22 the universal church (e.g. Bruce, *Ephesians* 307), “a heavenly entity” (O’Brien, *Ephesians* 219–20), or even some combination of the two (as e.g. Lincoln seems to favor, with the Spirit providing the link between the heavenly and earthly dwelling places of God; *Ephesians* 158). It is important, in any case, to recognize that the application is to Paul’s recipients as God’s people “especially as they are gathered to worship him and instruct one another (as 5:18–20 indicates)” (Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence* 689).

⁹⁶ Elsewhere: Rom 1:17; 2:24; 3:4, 10; 4:17; 8:36; 9:13; (here in 9:33); 10:15; 11:8, 26; 15:3, 9, 21; 1 Cor 1:31; 2:9; 2 Cor 8:15; 9:9.

⁹⁷ This is the Jewish interpretive technique known as *gezera šawa* (גזרה שוה) in which different scriptural passages are tied together by means of a repetition of a key word or phrase. “According to this rule one passage may be explained by another, if similar words or phrases are present” (B. Chilton and C. A. Evans, “Jesus and Israel’s Scriptures,” in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research* [ed. B. Chilton and C. A. Evans; Leiden: Brill, 1994] 288–89, quote p. 288).

⁹⁸ The LXX recasts the sense of this passage substantially (8:13–14): “Sanctify the Lord himself and let he himself be your fear. And if you trust in him, he shall be to you a sanctuary (εἰς ἀγίασμα) and you shall not meet him as a stone for stumbling or as a rock for falling (οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματος συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι). But the house of Jacob is in a trap and those dwelling in Jerusalem are in a snare” (κουλάσματι for שֶׁמֶרֶת). Paul’s phraseology appears to be independent of the text form preserved in the LXX at this point and follows the text form attested by MT quite literally.

On the metaphorical use of אבן (“stone”) as a source of refuge in reference to the LORD see e.g. Deut 32:4; Pss 18:2; 31:2–3.

The other segments of Paul's quotation, both the beginning and ending, are derived from verse 16 of Isaiah's woe oracle against Ephraim and Judah (28:1–29). Ephraim is first addressed as proud drunkards primed for divine judgment (vv. 1–4). Despite this bleak prospect, an eschatological promise to the remnant follows, introduced with a common Isaianic phrase “in that day” (בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא) employed some 40 times between 2:11–31:7). After further warnings of future judgment (vv. 7–13), Isaiah directs his comments, by way of application, to his more immediate audience (the Southern Kingdom) in verses 14–15. His language is highly figurative and ironic, representing the Southern Kingdom's looking for help from foreign power (probably Egypt, cf. 30:2–3) in the face of Assyrian advancement (pictured as an “overwhelming scourge”) as “a covenant with death” (בְּרִית אֶת-מָוֶת) and an agreement with “the grave” (שָׂאֵל).⁹⁹ Isaiah then announces (v. 16): “So this is what the Sovereign LORD says: ‘See, I lay a stone [אֶבֶן] in Zion, a tested stone [בֶּחֶן בֶּחֶן], a precious cornerstone [פִּנֵּת יִקְרָת] for a sure foundation [מוֹסָד מוֹסָד]; the one who trusts will never be dismayed’” (NIV).¹⁰⁰ It is interesting to note that the LXX apparently understood this passage messianically, for the translators supplied an object of faith (ἐπ’ αὐτῷ) where the Hebrew has no explicit object.¹⁰¹ It is clear from the context of his argument in Romans 9, in any case, that Paul saw in this prepositional phrase a reference to Jesus the Messiah.¹⁰²

An explicit connection between the words of Psalm 118 (LXX: 117) that Jesus applied to himself in the parable of the tenants and the references to Isa 8:14 and 28:16 that Paul applies to Jesus to Rom 9:33 is found in 1 Pet 2:6–8. Kim further suggests that Paul may have had a similar connection in view in 1 Cor 3:11, 16.¹⁰³

⁹⁹ Cf. R. E. Clements, *Isaiah 1–39* (NCB; London: Morgan, Marshall & Scott/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980; reprinted 1982) 229–31.

¹⁰⁰ The LXX runs as follows: “Therefore thus says the Lord, ‘Behold, I lay for the foundations of Zion [τὰ θεμέλια Σιών] a precious stone [λίθον πολυτελεῆ], a choice and precious cornerstone [ἐκλεκτόν ἀκρογωνίατον ἐντιμον] for its foundations [εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς]; and the one who believes in him shall by no means be ashamed.’” Exactly what Isaiah meant by אֶבֶן (LXX: λίθος) here is a constant topic of debate. Suggestions include, among others, the law, the temple, Zion itself, the Messiah, the remnant, Yahweh's promise, and faith (see O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39* [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974] 253; J. N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1–39* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986] 518; and J. A. Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah* [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993] 233). In view of the wide range of possibilities, Oswalt proposes that the cornerstone may reflect “a whole complex of ideas relating to the Lord's revelation of his faithfulness and the call to reciprocate with the same kind of faithfulness toward him” (*Isaiah* 518).

¹⁰¹ LXX: καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ κατασχυνθῆ (MT: שִׁחֵן לֹא יִשְׁחָצֵן). The prepositional phrase is omitted in codex Vaticanus (B). On the messianic nature of the LXX addition, see Jeremias, “λίθος,” *TDNT* 4.272; and O. Cullmann, “πέτρα,” *TDNT* 6.98.

¹⁰² *Contra* the occasional suggestion that Paul has in view a reference to the Torah in Rom 9:33 (e.g. C. K. Barrett, *Essays on Paul* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982] 144; and L. Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* [Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987] 129).

¹⁰³ Kim asks, “May it not be that in 1 Corinthians 3:11, 16 Paul reflects Jesus' teaching on the Temple and, in echoing Isaiah 28:16 (cf. Rom 9:33) he has also Psalm 117 (118):22 in mind?” (“Jesus, Sayings of” 482). The close connection of language of “foundation” (θεμέλιος; 1 Cor 3:11 = θεμέλιον in Isa 28:16), “stone” (λίθος; Rom 9:33 = in reference both to Isa 8:14 and 28:16), and the rare word for “cornerstone” (ἀκρογωνίατος; Eph 2:20 = Isa 28:16; elsewhere only in Isa 28:16 and 1 Pet 2:6, which also cites Psalm 118 [LXX 117]:22), all in reference to Jesus as Messiah, renders such a

6. *Jesus' promise of divine indwelling.* A final theme we shall examine briefly and one that receives little attention relative to Paul's application of the temple to believers in 1 Corinthians is the promise of divine indwelling that Jesus issues to his disciples in the various places in the Gospels. In Matt 18:15–20, a context related to the procedure of correcting a sinful brother in the church, Jesus closes his directives with a promise: "For where two or three are gathered in my name, I am there among them" (v. 20).¹⁰⁴ Marshall observes, "This is a functional statement which identifies the church as the temple and which identifies the presence of Jesus as equivalent to the presence of God."¹⁰⁵

The Matthew 18 passage anticipates Jesus' Galilean post-resurrection appearance recorded in Matt 28:16–20.¹⁰⁶ In this dramatic encounter the resurrected Jesus issues his disciples the promise of his living presence to be with them to the end of the age in connection with the upcoming and ongoing challenges of mission. As Davies and Allison observe, "The Jesus who commands difficult obedience is at the same time the ever-graceful divine presence."¹⁰⁷

In the Johannine upper room discourse (John 13–17), moreover, Jesus explicitly promises his disciples the personal presence of the coming Spirit (14:17)¹⁰⁸ and the personal abiding presence of the Father and himself (14:23). The relationship between these two promises has been the subject of much discussion.¹⁰⁹ D. Bruce Woll suggested that Jesus' promise of "another

connection linguistically plausible. Note also the verb *τίθημι* used in 1 Cor 3:11; Rom 9:33; and 1 Pet 2:6, all in reference to Isa 28:16 (Isa 28:16 LXX, by contrast, employs *ἐμβαλῶ*; MT: *יָסַד*).

¹⁰⁴ For a juridical understanding of the language of this passage, see J. D. M. Derrett, "Where two or three are convened in my name . . . : a sad misunderstanding," *ExpTim* 91 (1979–80) 83–86. His interpretation, however, is not without problems (on which, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew* 2.788). An ecclesiastical setting is clearly presupposed. Carson notes: "Jesus thereby implicitly points forward to a time when, as 'God with us' (1:23) he will be spiritually present with the 'two or three' and with all his followers; and he presupposes that this time will be of considerable duration" ("Matthew" 404).

¹⁰⁵ Marshall, "Church and Temple" 211.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Hagner: "This presence of Jesus [sc. promised in 18:20] should not be understood as a metaphor . . . but is in keeping with the promise to be articulated in 28:20 (cf. 1:23). The community founded by Jesus (16:18) is assured that he will be present in that community until the close of the age" (*Matthew 14–28* 533).

¹⁰⁷ Davies and Allison, *Matthew* 3.676–89 (quote 689). For further attention to this promise, see Carson, "Matthew" 598–99; C. A. Perry, *The Resurrection Promise: An Interpretation of the Easter Narratives* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986) 44–47; Hagner, *Matthew 14–28* 888–89; and Keener, *Matthew* 718–21.

¹⁰⁸ There is a textual question concerning the tenses of *μένω* and *εἰμί*, in the last *ὅτι* clause of 14:17. Most English versions, based on *P⁷⁵vid* κ A Θ Ψ *f*¹³ 28 33^{vid} 157 180 205 579 700 et al., follow the present of *μένω* (*μένει* rather than *μενεῖ*) and future of *εἰμί* (*ἔσται* rather than *ἔστιν*). The NJB is an exception, rendering both verbs as present: "because he is with you, he is in you." The USB committee of the fourth edition provided the present-future variants a "C" rating (i.e. the committee had difficulty deciding between variants). Cf. B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2d ed; Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994) 208.

¹⁰⁹ Against the tendency of scholars to see in John 14:23 the climax of the reinterpretation of the Parousia hope in terms of the indwelling of the believer by the Father and the Son (through the Spirit) see G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC 36; Waco: Word, 1987) 259–60.

Paraclete” (ἄλλος παράκλητος, 14:16) is fulfilled in his promised return as his own successor.¹¹⁰ This is a doubtful interpretation.¹¹¹ Rather, as Alan R. Kerr notes, “It is better to see the Paraclete as a functional equivalent to Jesus. The Paraclete serves as the presence of Jesus while Jesus is away. To have the Spirit is to have Jesus (and the Father) dwelling within (14.23; cf. 1 Jn 4.12–16).”¹¹² What should be observed, moreover, is the heavily trinitarian language of these passages.¹¹³ Augustine (AD 354–430) earlier recognized a close connection between 14:17 and 14:23 and observed temple imagery in the trinitarian language of these passages. We will take the liberty here to quote his comments on John 14:23 at length:

But further, lest any should imagine that the Father and Son only, without the Holy Spirit, make their abode with those that love Them, let him recall what was said above of the Holy Spirit, “Whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye shall know Him; for He shall dwell with you, and shall be in you” ([John 14] ver. 17). Here you see that, along with the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit also taketh up His abode in the saints; that is to say, within them, *as God in His temple*. The triune God, Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, come to us while we are coming to Them: They come with help, we come with obedience; They come to enlighten, we to behold; They come to fill, we to contain: that our vision of Them may not be external, but inward; and Their abiding in us may not be transitory, but eternal.¹¹⁴

The aforementioned promises of divine presence in various strands of the Gospels (Matt 18:15–20; 28:16–20; and John 14:17, 23), the latter two of which (John 14:17, 23) bear distinctly trinitarian implications, further cohere remarkably well with the whole rationale reflected behind Paul’s language in 1 Cor 3:16–17 (believers collectively as the temple of God indwelt by the Spirit) and 1 Cor 6:19 (believers’ individual bodies as a temple of the Spirit). It is further interesting to find that Paul’s final recorded words to the Corinthians also bear a distinctively trinitarian stamp (2 Cor 13:13[14]).¹¹⁵

¹¹⁰ Woll maintains: “In vss. 12–17 the idea of succession predominates. In vss. 18–24 the idea of the Son’s return predominates. Or, to put it in another way, in vss. 12–17 the Paraclete and the disciples succeed Jesus. In vss. 18–24 Jesus becomes his own successor” (*Johannine Christianity in Conflict: Authority, Rank, and Succession in the First Farewell Discourse* [SBLDS 60; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981] 80).

¹¹¹ A. R. Kerr persuasively responds to Woll’s argument: “The Paraclete/Spirit and Jesus are to be distinguished. Jesus speaks of giving ‘another Paraclete’, that is, one who is other than himself (16.14). Moreover, this new Paraclete glorifies Jesus, implying that Jesus is separate from the Paraclete” (*Temple of Jesus’ Body* 312).

¹¹² Kerr, *Temple of Jesus’ Body* 312.

¹¹³ On the trinitarian nature of this language, see the following quote by Augustine; cf. also R. G. Gruenler, *Trinity in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986) 101, 103; and M. J. Erickson, *God in Three Persons: A Contemporary Interpretation of the Trinity* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995) 201–2, 207.

¹¹⁴ *Tract. Ev. Jo.* 76:4 (NPNF¹ 7.338), with my italics and bracketed reference.

¹¹⁵ Barnett observes that the language is personal, not merely functional (*Second Corinthians* 618–20, esp. p. 619); cf. Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence* 362–65; and Erickson, *God in Three Persons* 185, 301, cf. p. 85.

IV. SUMMARY REFLECTIONS ON THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN JESUS AND PAUL

It is now time to summarize briefly our findings. While much of what we have looked at in the preceding study is admittedly indirect in nature, it is nonetheless interesting to see how complementary Jesus and Paul are in their basic patterns of thinking regarding the temple. It is also interesting to note that the Gospels and Paul's letters provide us with an accurate presentation of the given stages of salvation history from which these patterns of thinking emerge.

The passages in the Gospels that we have examined portray the period of Jesus' earthly ministry prior to, but leading up to his death and resurrection (with the exception of Matt 28, which is clearly post-resurrection). Here we find a Jesus who has a favorable view of the temple, on the one hand, and yet also predicts its physical destruction (Mark 13:2), on the other, a destruction precipitated by his own ministry (cf. Luke 19:42–44). In this respect, Jesus not only predicts the temple's destruction, he also makes provision for its *functional* replacement—a provision reflected in his choice of the twelve, his consciousness of the superior nature of his person and ministry *vis-à-vis* the physical temple (Matt 12:6), the building of the church (Matt 16:18), his conception of himself as the chief cornerstone of God's new building (Mark 12:1–10 parr.), his promises of his presence with the church and his disciples (Matt 18:15–20 and 28:16–20 respectively), and his promise of divine indwelling (John 14:17, 23).

Paul appears to be familiar with many, if not all, of these strands of Jesus' teaching in some form. In contrast to the context of Jesus' earthly ministry, however, Paul views matters in the light of Jesus' death and resurrection. As a result, he sees the true locus of God's presence in the presence of the risen Christ in believers, both corporately and individually (1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19). The various themes examined in the foregoing study provide us with a fuller picture as to why Paul was able to refer to believers in the 50s AD,¹¹⁶ *while the Jerusalem temple was still standing*, as the temple of God indwelt by the Spirit.

¹¹⁶ The dating of 1 Corinthians in the fifth decade of the first century is not greatly debated. Fee provides the typical parameters: in the spring of "ca. 53–55" (*First Corinthians* 15). M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer date it in 54 (*Paul Between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years* [trans. J. Bowden; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997] xiv), while Riesner places opts for "54/55" (*Paul's Early Period* 322; cf. Thiselton, *First Corinthians* 32). Hemer suggested "no later than early 55" (*Book of Acts* 271; similarly was F. F. Bruce: "Spring 55": *The Acts of the Apostles: Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* [3d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990] 93). There is little justification for Lüdemann's earlier dating of 51, based in part on his AD 41 dating of the Claudian expulsion of Jews from Rome (Acts 18:2; Suetonius, *Claud. 25.4*; *Paul: The Founder* 62). In his earlier work, Lüdemann offered alternative dates for 1 Corinthians of "49 (52)" (*Apostle to the Gentiles* 172). For a welcome critique of an AD 41 date for the Claudian expulsion, see Witherington, *Paul Quest* 310–14.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The preceding study suggests that the course of continuity is a fruitful pathway to pursue in seeking to understand the relationship between Jesus and Paul. Hence, in choosing between the two major paradigmatic pathways noted earlier—the *Wredebahn*, in which Paul is viewed as “the second founder of Christianity” (thereby stressing discontinuity), and the *Machenbahn*, in which Paul’s religion is viewed to be founded upon Jesus (thereby stressing continuity)—the latter pathway is surely to be preferred to the former, not only theoretically, but also methodologically. In following the latter *Bahn*, moreover, a fruitful pathway for biblical theology lies open—one that scholars committed to the authority and coherency of Scripture can pursue with both vigor and considerable reward.

VI. A BRIEF AFTERWORD ON THREE IMPORTANT PROPOSALS REGARDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JESUS AND PAUL

It should be noted that three prominent studies on Paul, ranging in date from 1995 to late 2001, have set forth important findings on the question of the relationship between Jesus and Paul. David Wenham concluded his thorough study on the question of whether Paul was a follower of Jesus or the founder of Christianity by suggesting that “Paul would have been horrified at the suggestion that he was the founder of Christianity. For him the fountain of theology was Jesus: first, the Jesus whom he met on the Damascus road; second, the Jesus of the Christian tradition. He of course identified the two. Paul saw himself as the slave of Jesus Christ, not the founder of Christianity. He was right to see himself in that way.”¹¹⁷

In seeming contrast, Hengel and Schwemer, in their detailed study of Paul’s early years (i.e. AD 33–49), employ the language of the history-of-religions school to describe Paul as “the second founder of Christianity” because as “a theologian and missionary he put it [sc. Christianity] on the way by which it became a world religion—the first.”¹¹⁸ It must be observed in this instance, however, that these two propositions are much closer than they might at first appear. Wenham’s focus is on the *origin* of Paul’s *message*, while Hengel and Schwemer’s focus is on the *effect* of Pauline *mission*. Hence Hengel and Schwemer’s view of the relationship between Jesus and Paul is based on very different assumptions than those of the history-of-religions school, for Hengel and Schwemer, like Wenham, acknowledge the formative influence of the Jesus tradition on Paul, but find it difficult to trace it in his letters. They observe, “At the precise point where we necessarily accept the strongest outside influence, in the Jesus tradition, which he [Paul] needed for the preaching with which he founded communities, he unfortunately re-

¹¹⁷ Wenham, *Paul: Follower* 409–10.

¹¹⁸ Hengel and Schwemer, *Between Damascus and Antioch* 309 and 310 (respectively).

mains very taciturn in the letters.”¹¹⁹ Taciturn, however, even “very taciturn,” does not mean non-existent, as our study has attempted to show.

Another important recent study that should be mentioned is Seyoon Kim’s *Paul and the New Perspective*, a sequel of sorts to his earlier study, *The Origin of Paul’s Gospel*.¹²⁰ On the basis of his examination of the Jesus tradition in chap. 8 of his most recent study, Kim modifies the fundamental thesis for which he had argued in his earlier study.¹²¹ In his *Origin* he had argued that “the Christophany on the Damascus road constituted both his gospel . . . and his apostolic commission” and that “at the Christophany on the Damascus road Paul received his call to the Gentile mission as well as his gospel.”¹²² In his more recent study he proposes that “Paul’s gospel originated from both the Damascus revelation and the Jesus tradition.”¹²³ Kim goes on to illustrate the double origin of Paul’s gospel by employing the metaphor of a child of two parents: “the Damascus revelation being the father and the Jesus tradition being the mother.”¹²⁴ He additionally acknowledges that further, more comprehensive study is needed to determine more precisely how the Damascus revelation, the Jesus tradition, the Scriptures, and the early church kerygma “were brought into an interplay to produce various Pauline theological conceptions.”¹²⁵

What these three studies indicate is that scholarly interest in the relationship between Jesus and Paul remains a fruitful area of historical and theological investigation, one that is at the very heart of the gospel and of the Christian faith.

¹¹⁹ Ibid. 309.

¹²⁰ Kim, *The Origin of Paul’s Gospel* (WUNT 2/4; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1981; American edition: Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982). This book was widely reviewed in English and non-English language journals: S. Barton, *King’s Theological Review* 7 (1984) 25–26; F. R. Howe, *BSac* 141 (1984) 178–79; L. W. Hurtado, *JBL* 103 (1984) 122–23; I. H. Marshall, *EvQ* 54 (1982) 181–82; D. M. Stanley, *CBQ* 45 (1983) 140–41; R. L. Thomas, *JETS* 26 (1983) 502–4; M. E. Thrall, *ExpTim* 93 (Oct. 1981) 25–26; M. Turner, *Them* 9 (Jan. 1984) 31–32; non-English language journals: J. N. Aletti, *RSR* 73 (1985) 290–91; R. Lehman, *RHPR* 64 (1984) 193–94; H. Moxnes, *NorTT* 84 (1983) 122–24; P. Nautin, *RHR* 201 (1984) 210–11; and C. Wolff, *TLZ* 108 (1983) 595–97.

¹²¹ Kim, *New Perspective* 259–90. It should be noted, however, that the content of chap. 8 appeared initially as “Jesus, Sayings of,” *DPL* 474–92.

¹²² Kim, *Origin* 57, 65 (respectively).

¹²³ Kim, *New Perspective* 296 (my italics).

¹²⁴ Kim continues: “Just as a child resembles both parents, so that from one perspective it looks much like the father while from another perspective very much like the mother, Paul’s gospel appears stamped with the Damascus revelation, while it appears as a reinterpretation and reapplication of Jesus’ gospel in the new salvation-historical and missiological context when viewed from the perspective of the Jesus tradition. To continue the metaphor, we may see the Old Testament as the grandparent of Paul’s theology and the pre-Pauline Christian kerygma as an older sibling” (ibid. 297).

¹²⁵ Ibid. 296.