Hunter S. Rhodes will graduate from the University of Memphis in the spring of 2016. He is a part of the English and Philosophy Departments' respective honors programs and will graduate *summa cum laude* with University Honors with Thesis, including a thesis project in both the English and the Philosophy Departments. Beyond academia, Hunter is heavily involved in his church as an Elder and a Sunday school teacher, and he has tentative plans to attend Vanderbilt Divinity School in the future in pursuit of a master's of divinity degree. For now, though, he will take at least a year off from school to focus on woodworking, his job as a personal trainer, his cats, and most importantly, his wife after his wedding in June 2016. He is also the recipient of a *Quaesitum* outstanding paper award.

# Hunter S. Rhodes

The Apostle, the Rock, and the Resurrection

**Faculty Sponsor**
Dr. Brad McAdon

## Abstract

One of the traditions in Christianity is the idea that the early followers of Jesus were united in their ideology and mission; since the nineteenth century, however, scholars have studied the New Testament texts while considering what appears to be opposition between two of the most well-known early leaders of Christianity: Paul and Peter. This opposition, known as the Pauline-Petrine Controversy, is evident from both Paul's letters and the Synoptic Gospels. By combining evidence of the controversy from Paul's letters alongside various conceptions of resurrection, I conduct a rhetorical analysis of the Synoptic Gospel's resurrection accounts to determine how the authors interpret the Pauline-Petrine Controversy and apply this interpretation alongside their own ideology in their unique resurrection narratives. From this, I argue that Mark follows the Pauline tradition, Matthew the Petrine, and Luke uses his narrative to blend elements from the two sects in order to whitewash the controversy altogether.

## Introduction[1]

The subject of this project is the Pauline-Petrine Controversy—that the early followers of Jesus were not as united as many believe; instead, there were two main fronts leading the early-followers-of-Jesus movement: the Paulines (various churches under Paul) and the Petrines (Jerusalem center under Peter and James).[2] I aim to look at the distinctions between the two factions and how they are present in the New Testament, specifically looking at the resurrection accounts in the three Synoptic Gospels.

The Pauline-Petrine Controversy is an understanding in New Testament studies that dates back to the nineteenth century with Ferdinand Christian Baur, a German theologian who first posited that the early followers of Jesus were in fact not united, but rather that there were opposing sects. There appears to be evidence of this opposition in both the letters of Paul as well as the three Synoptic Gospels. While this understanding of such a controversy was popular in the mid to late 1800's, it is still mostly rejected by fundamentalists and evangelicals who still hold to the idea of ideological unity within the earliest groups of followers of Jesus through notions of the historical accuracy of the New Testament texts, mainly the book of Acts, or by documents such as the hypothetical Q source.[4] The "unified-early-followers" understanding often arises from a traditional view that insists that the biblical texts are inerrant or that the Christian texts should be read differently than other historical documents; on the other hand, even when scholars do recognize a controversy within the texts, many believe that the opposition comes not from Peter and James, but from other sources.[5] That said, this recognition of this controversy has been re-emphasized recently by many, including Michael Goulder and Gerd Luedemann, both of whom argue that there never was a single, united church as far as we can trace back (which is to the 1940's), and in fact there has been a controversy between the Pauline and Petrine sects of followers of Jesus from the beginning of early church history. I am going to argue two main points: I will demonstrate the problems with the aforementioned claims that argue for the unity of the early followers of Christ, and I will demonstrate that there are sharp differences between the Pauline and Petrine sects, even within the texts comprising the New Testament. I will argue the shortcomings of holding to the united church position and instead turn to the more historically and biblically accurate (from a literal and literary standpoint) view of the early church.

My method is rhetorical analysis. I am not looking at the Bible as a sacred or holy text; rather, I am analyzing it as a collection of rhetorical and polemical works of literature—texts that demonstrate the various authors' interests in presenting and defending a particular stance, either Pauline or Petrine. The authors of the these texts employ various rhetorical techniques that I analyze more thoroughly in subsequent sections, including Paul's use of comparison (σύγκρισις) and his rhetorical questions in his letters as well as Matthew's and Luke's alteration of their sources (perhaps examples of Greco-Roman *mimesis*) in the forming of their own resurrection accounts. I am focusing specifically on those letters thought to be genuinely written by Paul[6] and the three Synoptic Gospels.[7] This will involve not simply looking at the historical context and dating of the texts, but particularly reading Paul's letters against the Synoptic Gospels, conducting verse-by-verse analysis, and cross-referencing the epistles and gospels to themselves and each other. My reasons for doing so are to demonstrate the differences between the two sects and to reveal ultimately that the early followers of Jesus were not as united as many believe.

The following discussion will include five sections. The first introduces the Pauline-Petrine Controversy and will include further discussion of how the opposition between the two factions becomes apparent within the biblical texts, particularly within Paul's letters. The second introduces ideas regarding the resurrection, including Jewish and Christian conceptions of the resurrection within the Old and New Testaments, Jewish and Christian apocryphal and pseudepigraphical texts, and Paul's conception of resurrection evidenced within those epistles thought to be genuinely written by Paul. The third, fourth, and fifth sections will cover the resurrection accounts within Mark, Matthew, and Luke, respectively.[8] Each of these three sections will analyze the ideas of the controversy, looking at the different stances of Peter and Paul, alongside conceptions of resurrection, especially Paul's ideas, to determine how the details of the individual resurrection accounts align with a Petrine or Pauline stance and to note how the accounts align with and differ from one another. In so doing, I will demonstrate that Mark seems to align with a Pauline stance, Matthew seems to align with a Petrine stance, and Luke seems to be a middle-ground, merging ideas from both Pauline and Petrine stances, and I will argue that these alignments are evident within the resurrection accounts of the Synoptic Gospels themselves.

## Developing the Pauline-Petrine Controversy

Nearly every letter thought to be genuinely written by Paul has evidence of a controversy between him and at least one person in opposition to him.[9] In particular, the letter to the Galatians as well as both letters to the Corinthians provide evidence that Paul faces strong opposition. Much of this controversy surrounds the issue of Paul's (alleged) apostleship and authority.

### Signs of the Controversy in Galatians

Paul begins his letter to the Galatians by calling himself an apostle, and he further says that he was neither sent nor commissioned by humans "but through Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him from the dead." Further, Paul claims that his teaching is not "from a human source, nor was [he] taught it, but [he] received it through a revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. 1.1, 12). As Gerd Luedemann states, "The emphatic declaration of (the independence of) the Pauline apostleship can…be best understood if its validity had been challenged from the opponents' side" (98). Paul faces strong opposition from someone or some group, and it is immediately apparent in the first few lines of Galatians, and, as the letter progresses, he intensifies his defense of his own apostleship and authority.

He begins to show how angry he is beginning at verse six, noting that not only is he surprised that the group is so "quickly deserting the one who called" them, but he also argues that there are false brothers who are attempting to confuse them and "pervert the gospel of Christ" (Gal. 1.6-7). It is not clear this early in the letter who these people are whom Paul so adamantly opposes, and he does not "explicitly say that the opponents had attacked him directly" (Luedemann 97), but he offers a hint at who these opponents may be through the slightly-autobiographical passage beginning at verse thirteen.

Although it still is not entirely clear at this point in the letter, it appears as though his opposition originates from the leaders in Jerusalem. Whereas Paul mentions in general that he did not confer with any human being before his departure for Syria and Cilicia (Gal. 1.16), he brings up specifically that he did not see the leaders in Jerusalem. He goes out as soon as he received his calling, and after seeing Peter in Jerusalem three years later, did not go back to Jerusalem for fourteen years,. Even then, he went only "in response to a revelation" (Gal. 2.2). The Jerusalem leaders

are recognized as apostles, even by Paul, but mentioning them specifically and noting that he consciously does not visit them in the beginning of his ministry suggests that there must be, at the very least, tension between them.

Paul then begins to employ stronger language in his description of his later meeting with the leaders in Jerusalem. He notes that he "laid before them…the gospel that [he] proclaim[s] among the Gentiles" and that even though false believers came in to undermine him, he "did not submit to them even for a moment" and that those supposedly acknowledged leaders "contributed nothing to [him]" (Gal. 2.2-6). Paul aims to undermine the Jerusalem leaders' authority in this short passage. First, he does not ask for their permission to spread his message to the Gentiles; instead, he meets with them after fourteen years to tell them what his message is and simply that he spreads it. Second, he uses comparison,[10] a rhetorical technique common to Pauline writing and one that "involves the presentation of a parallel case / item which may be compared in some detail with the subject in hand in order to show how the one is better, worse, or equal to the other" (Anderson 110). Paul's comparison here contrasts the freedom inherent in his message with the submission required in the message of the false believers. Third, Paul notes that these people were "supposed to be acknowledged leaders" and that what they actually are does not matter because "God shows no partiality" (Gal. 2.6). To Paul, even though many consider them to be leaders within the body of Jesus followers, they may or may not actually be leaders, and in the end it is not important whether they are leaders because they are, in Paul's view, misleading people.[11] Ultimately, their leadership status also made no difference to Paul because they "contributed nothing" to Paul or his mission.[12]

Paul next offers a description of a face-to-face interaction with Peter,[13] whom he "opposed…to his face, because he stood self-condemned" (Gal. 2.11). Paul sees Peter as a hypocrite, living like a Gentile when not watched, but then living as a Jew when watched by the "circumcision faction" (Gal. 2.12). When Paul does not see him as living according to Paul's conception of the truth, he angrily questions Peter on his hypocrisy of living like a Gentile as a Jew while simultaneously attempting to convince Gentiles to live like Jews. It is clear now who the opposition against Paul is: the Jerusalem followers of Jesus under Peter and James,[14] the latter of whom sent emissaries to Antioch, henceforth referred to as Petrines.

Paul has moved from the generality of the earlier parts of the letter to a specific confrontation against Peter, instigated by James and the Jerusalem leaders, thus revealing the source of his opposition and the other side of this controversy.

**Signs of the Controversy in 1 Corinthians**

Transitioning to evidence of the controversy in 1 Corinthians, Paul immediately expresses more details within the opening lines of the letter. Instead of remaining vague by saying that there is "someone" or "some people" who are causing the people in Corinth to stray from his teachings, Paul specifically mentions that there are people within the group who pledge allegiance to certain factions, including one under Peter and another under Apollos (1 Cor. 1.12). Goulder argues that this faction is best understood as "a group of emissaries from Jerusalem, like the 'false brethren of Gal. 2.4 or 'those from James' of Gal. 2.12…[who] might then appeal to [Peter's] authority and cause divisions in the church" (*Competing Mission* 19). It is not until a third group comes, the Petrines (those under Peter), that there begins to be evidence of controversy between the factions. By way of a metaphor, Paul says that he himself "like a skilled master builder…laid a foundation, and someone else is building on it" (1 Cor. 3.10).[15] As opposed to building a true foundation, this person is simply reappropriating what Paul started, using it in their own ways, perhaps to spread their own message. All of the factions have Jesus involved in some manner, but Paul writes as though the Corinthians are not merely following the ideologies of the different factions, but are in fact worshipping the persons under whom the factions exist., This is evidenced by his continual embedding of faction leaders' names within the text, saying, "So let no one boast about human leaders…whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas" (1 Cor. 3.21-22).

Paul again mentions Peter specifically in chapter nine when asking rhetorical questions about his apostleship, an issue of utmost importance here as it is in Galatians. He questions the Corinthian group on his apostleship. Luedemann suggests that the context surrounding these circumstances is that Paul has not taken advantage of his rights as an apostle to be supported by the Corinthian group, and thus the opponents argue that this proves he is not an apostle. However, Paul argues that this does not make his status inferior to the other apostles, as he has good reasons for not taking advantage of the support, and the mere fact that he does not take

the support does not negate his right and authority to have it (Luedemann 66). Instead of arguing for his need to take advantage of his rights, Paul offers a simpler defense for his own apostleship, a defense he must offer because it seems clear that he knows the Corinthians do not consider him an apostle when he says to them, "Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord? Are you not my work in the Lord? Since I am not an apostle to others, at least I am to you; for you are the seal of my apostleship in the Lord" (1 Cor. 9.1-2). Indeed, as Luedemann notes, "Paul's apostleship follows…from the existence of the Corinthian church, of which he is the founder" (67). While the opponents under Peter want to reject Paul's apostleship, Paul defends it vehemently here and in the following verses.

Paul compares Barnabas and himself with the other apostles and Peter in verse five. He rhetorically asks, "Do we not have the right to our food and drink? Do we not have the right to be accompanied by a believing wife, as do the other apostles and the brothers of the Lord and [Peter]?" (1 Cor. 9.4-5). Paul, if he is a true apostle, can expect to be answered in the affirmative to these two questions. As Goulder argues, "Of course, Paul has the right to live at the charge of the local Christian community and, for that matter, the right to take a Christian wife around with him at church expense…Paul has sown spiritual seed at Corinth, and it is a small return to ask for his physical needs free" (*Competing Mission* 29). These two rhetorical questions follow the comparison Paul often depicts between himself, Peter, and the Jerusalem leaders. As Luedemann argues, "The chiastic structure indicates that Paul wants to compare the groups…with each other" (66). In this comparison, Paul elevates himself up to those who are clearly acknowledged to be apostles. He seems to be asking, "Why do the other apostles besides Barnabas and me have these rights?" The question of Paul's apostleship arises in 1 Corinthians as it does in Galatians, and Paul has to strongly defend his apostleship against both his opponents and the group to whom he writes.

#### Signs of the Conflict in 2 Corinthians

Regarding 2 Corinthians, Paul does not mention Peter specifically, but given the context of Galatians and 1 Corinthians, it is reasonable to believe that the opposition to which he refers in 2 Cor. 10-13 is from the same group. As Goulder argues, "It may not be important that [Peter's] name does not occur in 2 Corinthians…The two Corinthian letters are

written to the same community at not much more than a year's interval, and it is more plausible that the same problems underlie both than that an entirely new group of troublemakers has arrived *(Competing Mission* 17). Beyond this, evidence from chapter 11 of 2 Corinthians strongly suggests that Paul's opposition is from Peter and the Petrine group. Paul says, "Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they descendants of Abraham? So am I." (2 Cor. 11.22). Speaking historically, Paul most likely was actually Jewish and possibly a Pharisee,[16] and here he is characterizing his opponents as Jewish also. As Goulder argues, "'Hebrews,' 'Israelites,' and 'the seed of Abraham' are all laudatory versions of the term *Jews*, the first stressing racial purity, the other two stressing theological significance" (*Competing Mission* 39). Moreover, the addition of "Are they ministers of Christ…I am a better one" (2 Cor. 11.23) adds to "the fact that they belong to the Christian movement" (Luedemann 86). Paul then adds that he is also these, suggesting further that these opponents are not merely Jewish, but Jewish Christians. The opponents in 2 Corinthians are the same opponents, or at least are members of the Petrine party, as the opponents in Galatians and 1 Corinthians. Although the dates of composition for Galatians, 1 Corinthians, and 2 Corinthians 10-13 are still debated, an order of 1 Corinthians, then Galatians, then 2 Corinthians 10-13 appears to explain Paul's anger toward the super-apostles, particularly if Paul's account of the event in Galatians 2 occurred prior to the composition of 2 Corinthians 10-13. At any rate, drawing upon the end of the letter, it is evident that Paul is facing a similar type of opposition from the Petrines as he was at the time of the composition of 1 Corinthians. His opponents and the Corinth group are once again questioning his apostleship as the relationship between Paul and the Corinthians has deteriorated between the time of 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians, possibly due to the effects of the events described in Galatians 2.

In chapter 11, Paul invokes again the idea that the group is turning away from the gospel they received from him in favor of a different gospel, the same concern that Paul expressed in Galatians 1.7. He states that he is "not in the least inferior to these super-apostles" and he "may be untrained in speech, but not in knowledge; certainly in every way and in all things we have made this evident to you" (2 Cor. 11.5-6). It is clear that the opponents speak of themselves as apostles and with authority. While this group of super-apostles may not include Peter himself, it is evident that that the super-apostles are supported by the Jerusalem leaders, and

they are in clear opposition to Paul, questioning his claims of apostleship.

Later in the same chapter, Paul aims to seriously challenge the super-apostles. He states that he will continue to do what he has done "in order to deny an opportunity to those who want an opportunity to be recognized as [his equal] in what they boast about." To Paul, these opponents are "false apostles, deceitful workers, disguising themselves as apostles of Christ," and he then compares them to Satan disguising himself as an angel of light, noting that "it is not strange if [Satan's] ministers also disguise themselves as ministers of righteousness" (2 Cor. 11.12-15). This point cannot be stressed enough: Paul must always make "for the high ground because he cannot compete on the low ground" (*Competing Mission* 39). Paul must argue based on the grounds of his apostleship under God, the high ground, because he cannot argue by way of authority under the Mosaic Law, the low ground. The Petrines, coming from Jerusalem, have authority, and they exercise this authority when opposing Paul, particularly in ways to undercut Paul's apostleship. Thus, Paul must always make claims to and in defense of his apostleship in order to actually stand a chance against these opponents. Further, as Luedemann argues, "Paul cannot concede the legitimacy of the opponents' claims to apostleship" (Luedemann 87), for to do so would undercut his own argument, and he must show himself as an apostle and an authority in light of the claims against him.

In chapter 12, Paul draws one last comparison between himself and the Petrines. He says that the Corinth group should be "commending [him], for [he] is not at all inferior to these super-apostles," and that "the signs of a true apostle were performed among you with the utmost patience, signs and wonders and mighty works" (2 Cor. 12.11-12). Further, there is a parallel between 2 Corinthians 12.13 and 1 Corinthians 9.4. In both instances, Paul's claims to his apostleship are countered by the idea that a true apostle takes financial support from the groups he is over, as mentioned previously. If this is a point of contention for Paul's apostleship, then it is clear that his opponents, if they want to be perceived as true apostles, must be taking financial support from the Corinthian group. Luedemann draws the same conclusion, noting, "If Paul was thus attacked… on account of his renunciation of support by the congregation, then it is clear at the same time that his opponents themselves in fact were supported by the church" (89). This attack consists of an adamant denial of Paul's apostleship; if Paul were indeed a true apostle, he would, theoretically,

accept support from the group in Corinth. Moreover, "if the anti-Paulinists of 1 and 2 Corinthians are the same group, the point discussed here would cast light on…those missionaries whose arrival in Corinth would have led to the formation of the [Peter] party" (*Ibid*., 90). In order to combat this attack from the Petrines, Paul consistently refers to himself as an apostle against those who are generally acknowledged as such. Moreover, he wants to show that his apostleship is genuine, and thus he defends it with appeals to God's calling (Gal. 1.1), his claim of revelation (Gal. 1.16), and good deeds that have been performed among the groups (1 Cor. 9.1-2). He compares (σύγκρισις) himself with the "super-apostles" who are from Jerusalem and who, instead of building up a new foundation with true teachings, build upon Paul's foundation and pervert Paul's proclamation of Jesus (1 Cor. 3.10, Gal. 1.7). This Petrine group, led by Peter, is a constant source of opposition for Paul, be it in the group at Galatia or the group in Corinth. Paul perceives their intrusion into his groups as a threat, and thus he tries to undermine them in various ways, while simultaneously elevating himself to the office of apostleship, and thus a controversy is born.

## Conceptions of Resurrection from Judaism through Paul

### Pre-New Testament Conceptions of Resurrection

To put it simply, there is no conception of life after death in the Hebrew Bible that involves eternal life or eternal torment until Daniel was composed around 167-165 BCE.[17] The Israelites did not have dreams or visions of an afterlife that consisted in perfection and unity with God. This does not mean, however, that the Israelites did not think people simply died and decomposed. Rather, they believed the dead went to a place called Sheol, mentioned sixty-six times in the Hebrew Bible. Sheol is described as an underground place that is dusty and dark (Gen. 3.19; Psalms 90.3, 104.29). The dead who are in Sheol are considered forgotten (Psalms 88.13; Ecc. 3.19-21, 9.5-10), and they do not have contact with anyone living, and even less contact with God (Psalms 88.6-12). Moreover, the dead who go to Sheol do not have the ability or the opportunity to come back to the land of the living (Job 7.9-10, 21).

However, under the possible influence of the Persians and Zoroastrianism during the Babylonian captivity (ca. 586-538 BCE),[18] the Jewish conceptions of resurrection begin to change. Instead of having one God

who is responsible for every aspect of life, both good and bad (Isa. 45.7), now there are conceptions of a God who is all good and all powerful. Other conceptions also arise that were never before seen in Judaism, such as angels and an eternal, good afterlife for those who are righteous. This becomes evident in the Hebrew Bible in Daniel (ca. 165 BCE), which states:

> At that time Michael, the great prince, the protector of your people, shall arise. There shall be a time of anguish, such as has never occurred since nations first came into existence. But at that time your people shall be delivered, everyone who is found written in the book. Many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. Those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the sky, and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars forever and ever. (Dan. 12.1-3)

This cannot be overstated: this is the first and only reference in the Hebrew Bible to a concept of eternal life after death. The idea is simply not a conception in Judaism until about the third century BCE.

The conceptions of resurrection in Judaism that align with Daniel are much more evident in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical texts, dated to around the same time as Daniel and even closer to the turn of the eras. In fact, many of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical texts include numerous references to these conceptions of resurrection, from the third century BCE to around the second century CE. For example, the *Book of Enoch* (ca. 3rd century BCE) states that the righteous will enter the holy place and there will be no more sorrow or calamity for them while the wicked will be gathered in place of judgement (24-27). *Jubilees* (ca. 2nd century BCE) states that the dead's "bones shall rest in the earth, and their spirits shall have much joy, and…it is the Lord who executes judgement, and shows mercy…to all that love Him (23.31). *2 Maccabees* (2nd century BCE) states that "the King of the world shall raise us up, who have died for his laws, and revive us to life everlasting," and for the righteous narrator later in the same chapter, "Tis meet for those who perish at men's hands to cherish hope divine that they shall be raised up by God again; but thou—thou shalt have no resurrection to life" (7.9, 14). *4 Maccabees* (1st century CE) speaks perhaps more frequently than any other apocryphal or pseudepigraphical Old Testament text regarding the themes of immortality and eternal life that begins as soon as a person dies.[19] *Psalms of Solomon* (ca. 1st century BCE) notes that "[It is He] who setteth me up in glory, and

bringeth down the proud to eternal destruction in dishonor, because they knew Him not" (2.35). *2 Baruch* (ca. 100 CE) mentions that:

> the glory of those who have now been justified in My law, who have had understanding in their life, and who have planted in their heart the root of wisdom, then their splendour shall be glorified in changes, and the form of their face shall be turned into the light of their beauty, that they may be able to acquire and receive the world which does not die, which is then promised to them. (51.3)

As demonstrated by these texts, after around the time of the third century BCE, after the return of the Israelites from Babylonian exile, ideas of resurrection and afterlife begin to appear in Jewish texts. Perhaps with the influence of the Persians, Judaism was fundamentally changed, and the ideas of resurrection and afterlife continued to be a part of the religion, and these conceptions influenced Paul and other early followers of Jesus.

#### Paul's Conception of Resurrection

As Paul writes to his churches, the views of resurrection continue to reflect an eternal good afterlife for the righteous in communion with God. Paul takes this a step further, arguing not simply that people will be in communion with God, but with Jesus himself, and those who follow Jesus will experience this afterlife. Indeed, within about twenty years following Jesus's purported death (ca. 30 CE), claims of his resurrection were arising. Paul in his letters (ca. early 50s) and the authors of the Synoptic Gospels (ca.70-110) write about the resurrection in different ways, but all were in support or defense of the truth of the resurrection. The New Testament offers two types of evidence for this defense: visual evidence, in that people claimed to see Jesus after he was allegedly resurrected, and physical evidence, in that people claimed to touch and spend time with Jesus after he was allegedly resurrected. An important point to keep in mind, though, is the difference in the dates of these two types of evidence. As Goulder states, "The bulk of the visual evidence, the reports of *appearances*, are so early that it would be absurd to question them" (*St. Paul*, 173). That is, it can hardly be contested that people were arguing for the resurrection by saying that they saw Jesus. In fact, 1 Cor. 15.3-8 reads:

> For I handed on to you as of first importance what I in turn had received: that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures, and that he appeared to [Peter], then to the twelve. Then he appeared to more than five hundred brothers

> and sisters at one time, most of whom are still alive, though some have died. Then he appeared to James, then to all the apostles. Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me.[20]

The accounts of physical appearances that involve touching and spending time with Jesus come later, possibly as early as 80 CE.[21] For Paul, though, resurrection is not about physicality; as evidenced by Paul's comparison of physicality and spirituality later in 1 Corinthians 15, Paul argues for a notion of resurrection that is spiritual rather than bodily.[22]

Before looking specifically at the physical versus spiritual conception of resurrection in Paul, I find it important to highlight some of the similarities between Daniel, the apocryphal / pseudepigraphical texts, and Paul's view of the resurrection. The texts described earlier (Daniel and the non-canonical texts) mention numerous times a God who rules all and brings down those other authorities in opposition to him. For example, *Psalms of Solomon* states that God "bringeth down the proud into eternal destruction" (2.35), which sounds remarkably similar to Paul's statement that by the time Christ hands over the key of the kingdom to God, God will have "destroyed every ruler and every authority and power." Further, although Paul adds Jesus's return, his statement that "all will be made alive in Christ" and that after Christ, "those who belong to Christ" (1 Cor. 15.24, 23) will be resurrected, sounds like the author of Daniel's statement, "Your people shall be delivered, everyone who is found written in the book. Many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life" (Dan. 12.1-2).[23] Paul seems not only to be familiar with and influenced by the traditions of resurrection in these texts, but he even seems to be writing his conceptions of resurrection in line with them.

Paul adapts these conceptions of resurrection that have influenced Judaism, the early followers of Jesus, and himself, for his own use. Whereas Daniel and the non-canonical Old Testament texts appear to be concerned with a bodily resurrection, Paul is concerned with a spiritual resurrection. That is not to say that the spirit is simply an unembodied mass and that is what goes to the afterlife; rather, for Paul, the body someone has at the resurrection is not physical, but it is spiritual, where spirit is a new substance that embodies the soul.[24] Paul states that "it is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a physical body, there is also a spiritual body." For Paul, the physical body is not sufficient. The physical body that someone has during this life cannot go to the after-

life because "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable" (1 Cor. 15.44, 50). Those who are resurrected must receive a new body at the time of passage into the afterlife because "this perishable body must put on imperishability and this mortal body must put on immortality" so that the final enemy who will be destroyed, death, will be "swallowed up in victory" (1 Cor. 15.44-54).

This distinction between a physical or a spiritual resurrection is of utmost importance for a number of reasons. One, it is a key part of Paul's overall conception of resurrection. Keep in mind that, for Paul, the primary concern for the early followers of Jesus is the resurrection.[25] He even goes so far as to say that "if the dead are not raised, then Christ has not been raised [and if] Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins" (1 Cor. 15.16-17). Moreover, Paul uses rich imagery to explore the relationship between old and the new bodies, using seed and grain, earthly and heavenly bodies, and physical and spiritual bodies. He does this because there is a competing conception of resurrection in Corinth—the Petrine conception that involves a bodily resurrection. As with other times in 1 Corinthians when the Corinthians ask Paul about various doctrinal issues,[26] they again wonder about which conception of resurrection is correct. Paul says, "But someone will ask, 'How are the dead raised? With what kind of body do they come? Fool!" or the even more forceful "What stupid questions!" in the *Revised English Bible* (1 Cor. 15.35-36). As Goulder contends, these questions arise when the Petrines come into the group to cause divisions (*Competing Mission* 19) and teach different ideas to the Corinthians. Here, these competing conceptions of resurrection become an important aspect of the Pauline-Petrine Controversy.

The Petrine group is influencing the group in Corinth, and Paul is obviously not happy about it. He presents his conception of a spiritually-embodied resurrection, alongside eschatological views that align with those of Daniel and the apocryphal / pseudepigraphical literature, to argue against the views of a physically-embodied resurrection held by the Petrines. From both sides of the controversy, different accounts of the resurrection narratives appear in the three Synoptic Gospels, and part, but not nearly all, of the evidence to see whether they align with a Pauline or Petrine viewpoint hinges on the conception of a spiritual versus physical resurrection.

## The Resurrection Narrative in Mark

I begin with Mark because of the nearly unanimous agreement amongst scholars that this was the first of the Synoptic Gospels written. In addition to this, Matthew and Luke most likely used Mark as a primary source for their own accounts, so it is important to gain an understanding of Mark's account first. Of the different resurrection accounts, Mark's is by far the shortest. Excluding the later interpolation of Mark 16.9-20,[27] there are only eight verses that make up Mark's resurrection account. That said, this brief narrative paints a significant picture of the controversies of the time, and we can see that Mark hopes to discredit the Petrine perspective through his narrative.

To start, three women head to the tomb: Mary of Magdala, Mary the mother of James, and Salome. They go "very early…when the sun had risen" (Mark 16.2). Mark does not care to detail how the stone was moved, so he simply notes that they already found that it had been moved when they arrive. When they enter the tomb, they see not the body of Jesus but a "young man, dressed in a white robe, sitting on the right side" (Mark 16.2). This is an important point. Paul has no concern for a bodily resurrection; rather, as discussed previously, he cares only for a spiritual rebirth. In 1 Corinthians, Paul states, "But someone will ask, "How are the dead raised? With what kind of body do they come? Fool!...Not all flesh is alike…There are both heavenly bodies and earthly bodies…sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body" (1 Cor. 15.35-44). Mark, a Pauline author, has a similar discontentment with the concern for a literal, physical resurrection of Jesus. This is something different. This is not physical; this is spiritual.

The young man tells the women not to be alarmed. He does have an interesting note that many tend to gloss over, though—the young man states, "He has been raised" (Mark 16.6). This seems to be a small power shift. Typically, Christians consider Jesus to be the conqueror of death, the omnipotent being who can overcome and be born again. However, this verb "raised" (ἠγέρθη, the aorist passive form of ἐγείρω) is in the passive voice. Jesus did not do the raising; someone, or something, raised him. The young man continues with one of the most problematic verses that has plagued scholars for centuries: "But go, tell his disciples *and Peter* [emphasis added] that he is going ahead of you to Galilee; there you will see him, just as he told you" (Mark 16.7). As I have been arguing, Mark

is not a fan of Peter. Here he goes so far as to make a distinction between Jesus's disciples and Peter. This has led to a range of interpretations, but I will only mention one here—this could suggest that Peter, even if he were a disciple, was not actually with the disciples. This may be feasible after his denials in chapter 14, as he may have not wanted to be seen with the associates of Jesus, particularly after his denial of him.

Turning to the last verse, the three women run away from the tomb in fear and terror. Mark ends with, "They said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid" (Mark 16.8). This verse states quite clearly that the women kept the knowledge of this event to themselves. They did not tell any disciples what happened. If anyone were to claim he knew of the events in Mark's account, he would have to appeal to the women telling him secretly or he would have to have seen the young man himself, neither of which seems very believable. The author of Mark wants so desperately to undermine Petrine doctrine that he has the characters in his account not only never see a body, but also never take the news of the resurrection to anyone, including the disciples.

In these eight short verses, Mark utilizes two main rhetorical techniques to undercut the Petrine doctrine. The first is the allegedly angelic figure who does not seem like the most important or credible figure,[28] compared to an archangel like Gabriel, whom, for example, Luke has appear to Mary in his birth narrative. The second technique, and perhaps more important for this Pauline-Petrine Controversy, is the fact that there is no body. Mark is only dealing in the spiritual realm here, as Paul does in his authentic letters. For the Petrines to claim a bodily resurrection, they have their work cut out for them; fortunately, Matthew and Luke are up to the task.

## The Resurrection Narrative in Matthew

As stated previously, the author of Matthew knew and used Mark's account to craft his own. This compositional practice has been viewed as rhetorical *mimesis*, a common Greco-Roman practice that is present in all genres and is defined by Michael Fronda as "an author's conscious use of features and characteristics of earlier works" ("Imitation"). *Mimesis* can involve any and all aspects of a predecessor's writing from which an author pulls information, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus argues that "in virtually all kinds of discourse two things require study: the ideas and the

words. We may regard the first of these as concerned chiefly with subject-matter, and the latter with expression; and all those who aim to become good [rhetors] pay close attention to both these aspects of discourse equally" (*Critical Essays* 17). Indeed, *mimesis* involves an author not only imitating the work that comes before him, but also paying careful attention to both the words and ideas, and even studying the words and ideas to radically alter them for the author's unique purposes. As Dr. Brad McAdon has argued, "It is (almost) astonishing that recent studies that concern themselves with compositional conventions within the synoptic gospels have…either neglected or outright dismissed its role in the composition of these texts" (*Mimesis and Conflict*, 39).

In fact, this imitation of Mark's resurrection narrative is clear in Matthew's own resurrection narrative, not only from what details the author of Matthew chooses to maintain from Mark, but particularly those he chooses to alter to better fit his own Petrine viewpoint. Unlike Mark, who, as a Pauline, can support a resurrection that is spiritual in nature instead of bodily,[29] Matthew is Petrine who needs a bodily appearance to support his viewpoint. Matthew keeps the same time at which the women go to the tomb, but then the author notes that "Mary Magdalene and the other Mary" (Matt. 28.1) were those at the grave. There is no mention of Salome here, which seems troubling for the credibility of his account from the outset.[30] Matthew also adds detail regarding how the stone was moved: "And suddenly there was a great earthquake; for an angel of the Lord, descending from Heaven, came and rolled back the stone and sat on it." Further, this angel is magnificent in appearance, and his actions and appearance are so great that the guards of the tomb "shook and became like dead men" (Matt. 28.2-4). Instead of dealing with vagueness or glossed-over detail as in Mark, the author of Matthew provides divine intervention to describe how the stone was moved. This aids in the credibility of his account. To start, he has added credibility by adding a divine figure, credibility that he would have lost by simply keeping the two women as the sole witnesses. Instead of seeing a young boy as in Mark, who may or may not be open to interpretation as a divine figure, the women see a powerful angel who comes from heaven. Moreover, the guards also see what occurs and they later go and report their findings to the chief priests, showing that not only was there a divine figure who came down to interact with the people and environment, but that there were men at the tomb who saw the event, adding to the number of witnesses to validate the account.

The angel says statements remarkably similar to those made by the young boy in Mark. He states that "[Jesus] has been raised from the dead, and indeed he is going ahead of you to Galilee." One key difference to note here is that the angel tells the women to "go quickly and tell [Jesus's] disciples" (Matt. 28.7). This seems like an obvious revision of Mark's odd phrase "say to his disciples and Peter" (Mark 16.7). Matthew, as a Petrine, does not want to exclude Peter from the group of disciples. In fact, the author has Jesus say in Matt. 16.18 that Peter is the rock on which the church will have its foundation, pointing to the significance that this author attributes to Peter and the Petrine sect. From this viewpoint, the author of Matthew must include Peter in the disciples lest we have serious interpretive issues on our hands.

Next, notice that Matthew 28.8 blatantly contradicts Mark 16.8. Whereas in Mark the women are filled with fear, in Matthew the women are filled with awe and great joy, and in sharp contrast to the women in Mark who say nothing to anyone, the women Matthew's account "ran to tell [Jesus's] disciples" (Matt. 28.8). This is of utmost importance to the gospel, for if there is no account of a physical resurrection, then Christianity probably would not be what it is today. Matthew needs an appearance of the physically resurrected Jesus here for his narrative purpose of portraying a Petrine viewpoint.

It is worth noting a few key points on the difference between Mark 16.8 and Matthew 28.8.[31] as seen in Table 1 below:

| | |
|---|---|
| καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι **ἔφυγον**[a] ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, εἶχεν[b] γὰρ αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις, καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν, ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.[c] | καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ταχὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου μετὰ φόβου καὶ χαρᾶς μεγάλης ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ |
| And they went out and fled from the tomb, for trembling from fear [τρόμος] and astonishment from terror [ἔκστασις] had seized them, and they said nothing to anyone, for they were terrified. Mark 16.8 | And they immediately went out from the tomb with awe (or reverence) and great joy to tell his disciples. Matthew 28.8 |

Table 1: Greek-English Translations of Mark 16.8 and Matthew 28.8

The original *Koine* Greek is on the top, and the English translation is on the bottom. Notice the ἔφυγον in Mark 16.8a. The verb is "fled," which denotes "to flee," "take flight," or "escape." Matthew deletes this word and slightly alters Mark's word "they went out" (ἐξελθοῦσαι) with "they departed from" (ἀπελθοῦσαι). Matthew removes any notion that the women "flee" or "escape" from the tomb in fear. Second, look at the two instances of the word γὰρ in Mark 16.8c. This is called a gar clause, and according to Smyth's *Greek Grammar*, this "is especially common in sentences which offer a reason for, or an explanation of, a preceding statement" (638). This means that in the context of Mark 16, the women fled from the tomb *because of* their fear. Matthew deletes this clause and replaces it with a prepositional phrase, "with (μετὰ) awe," completely removing any notion that the women ran away *because of* fear or another emotion. Third, Mark 16.8b uses the word εἶχεν, which denotes "possession," meaning that this passage can be translated "because they were in a mental state of trembling from fear and astonishment from terror." Matthew deletes this word, not only removing the possibility of fear in the women that Mark describes, but also transforming Mark's narrative scene of fear and terror to one of awe, even reverential awe. We can clearly see the author's mimetic skill here by his altering Mark's Pauline account to defend his own Petrine account.

Not only is there an appearance to the disciples later in this chapter, but there is also an appearance to the women on the way to go see the disciples. Jesus appears in the path and then repeats a shorter version of what the angel said earlier to the women, telling them again to "go and tell [his] brothers to go to Galilee; there they will see [him]" (Matt. 28.10). There are two interesting points to note here. One, Jesus now refers to the group as his *brothers* instead of simply his *disciples*, showing an even closer relationship. Involved in this group of brothers is Peter. Whereas Mark appears to separate Peter from the disciples, here Matthew makes Peter not just a disciple, but a brother of Jesus. Two, Matthew potentially adds more credibility for the readers in his account, for, while he is still using only two women instead of three as the main witnesses, they have now not only seen an angel but they have seen the risen Jesus himself, and there have been two guards who witnessed the events at the tomb.

The author then inserts a section detailing what the guards relay to the chief priests. After the disciples meet, they decide on a "large sum of

money" to give to the guards and tell them to say, "His disciples came by night and stole him away while we were asleep" (Matt. 28.12-13). This story allegedly becomes spread widely in the Jewish community. Ideologically speaking, while Matthew was a Petrine author, in support of a Jewish Christianity of sorts, he was not particularly in favor of the chief priests and elders, having Jesus call them hypocrites frequently earlier in Matthew (Matt. 6.5, 23.14). In the same vein, the chief priests and elders here spread what the author considers to be a lie, and thus they are portrayed in a negative light.

In the conclusion of this chapter, the disciples meet Jesus at a mountain in Galilee.[32] Jesus claims that he has "all authority in heaven and on earth" (Matt. 28.18). Moreover, this authority has been given to him, supposedly from God. He then commands them to go to all places, make the people in those places disciples, and then baptize them. Verse twenty seems to follow a Petrine line of thought when connected to the rest of the gospel. Jesus tells them to teach the people to "obey everything that [he has] commanded [them]" (Matt. 28.20). Compare this command to Matthew 5 (the Sermon on the Mount), in which Jesus is preaching to the crowds and says, "Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the prophets; I have come not to abolish but to fulfill. For truly I tell you, until heaven and earth pass away, not one letter, not one stroke of a letter, will pass from the Law until all is accomplished" (Matt. 5.17-18). This is a significant part of the teaching that the disciples must do; they must teach others to follow the Mosaic Law and Jesus. Further, Jesus is "with [the disciples] always, to the end of the age" (Matt. 28.20). Matthew here wants to solidify the importance and eternality of the Mosaic Law for the Christian—the Law that Paul consistently claims is now null and void, as, for example, in Romans 10.4 wherein he claims that "*Christós* is the end of the law." In this manner, he directly opposes the author of Mark and overall supports a Petrine perspective.

## The Resurrection Narrative in Luke

The resurrection narrative in Luke is not so distinctly Pauline or Petrine, as Mark and Matthew are, respectively. Next we will analyze how the author of Luke alters his sources (Mark and Matthew) to defend the Petrine theology in some ways, but even more so to attempt to mediate between the two sects, essentially whitewashing the controversy, possibly to depict a unity between Paul and Peter that historically never existed.

Looking at Luke, it seems clear that not only did the author use Mark's account, but that he also used Matthew's account.[33] In Luke, the time of day is the same, and the women are not mentioned specifically until verse 10 when they are identified as Mary of Magdala, Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, along with some others. While there is the addition of Joanna and other unnamed women, the two Marys are consistent with Mark and Matthew's accounts. Luke rejects Matthew's account of the stone in favor of Mark's narrative version. The first difference between Luke, Mark, and Matthew is that the women actually go inside the tomb themselves before an angel's presence is announced. They see that there is no body and then two "men in dazzling clothes"[34] appear to explain the situation to the women. They have a message strikingly similar to that of the young man in Mark and the angel in Matthew, and, as in Matthew, the women go out to tell the disciples what they witnessed. Unlike Matthew's account, however, the disciples do not believe the women, noting that "these words seemed to them an idle tale" (Luke 24.11). Luke revises his sources, adding the narrative in which Jesus sees two men, instead of two women, who report to the disciples, thus adding more witnesses to the resurrection.

In this "Road to Emmaus" narrative, two men, one named Cleopas and one unnamed, are walking to Emmaus, a village outside of Jerusalem. The risen Jesus comes alongside them and the two men do not recognize him. Jesus is portrayed as ignorant regarding the news of the resurrection, and the men begin to explain to him what has allegedly occurred. They describe Jesus as "a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people" and they reveal that they hoped he was "the one to redeem Israel" (Luke 24.19-21). Then they recount that the women told them about the empty tomb and the angels (not men)[35] who told the women that Jesus was alive. Consistent with what was accounted earlier, the men do not believe the women, and some, namely Peter, go to the tomb to see for themselves if it is indeed empty. Further, whereas the disciples in Matthew seem to believe the women's account, evidenced by their going to a mountain outside Galilee to meet Jesus, Luke simply has Jesus communicate the news directly to men.

After listening to the men, Jesus, still unrecognized, goes through "all the scriptures" (Luke 24.27) to explain what was allegedly prophesied about him. The "scriptures" were an important consideration for Petrines,

the followers who maintained the Mosaic Law, but not for Paulines, who reject the Law. It seems the author of Luke is continuing to attempt to reconcile Pauline and Petrine ideas; while he presents a Jesus who has been physically resurrected, and the resurrected Jesus uses the scriptures as a defense for the resurrection, both Petrine ideas, he also presents Jesus as the promised *Masiah*, an idea that Paul asserts frequently (1 Cor. 15.23-24, 1 Thess. 4.16).[36]

As the three close in on Emmaus, Jesus planned to depart from these two, but they convince him to stay, and they enter a house. While in the house, Jesus breaks bread and blesses it, similar to the events of the Last Supper, and the men recognize him after Jesus offers them the bread. Jesus immediately vanishes as soon as the men recognize him, and they set out to go tell the eleven disciples and others in Jerusalem what they had seen, but soon learn that the disciples already know of the risen Jesus because he "appeared to Simon."[37] As they are all together, Jesus suddenly appears to all of them and they believe they are seeing a spirit,[38] but Jesus assures them that he is not a ghostly figure because he has "flesh and bones" (Luke 24.39). The men, despite seeing the risen Jesus in front of them, still seem doubtful, and thus Jesus, as he did for the two men on the Emmaus road, "opened their minds to understand the scriptures" (Luke 24.45) that allegedly referred to him. This is truly an appropriation for Luke's view of Jesus, but there is good reason for Luke's doing this. In order to successfully mediate the Pauline-Petrine controversy, Luke must appeal to elements of both sects. Jesus is a teacher and spiritual being in this account, as he is in Mark (as teacher) and Paul (as a spiritual entity after the resurrection). On the other hand, Luke has Jesus appeal to the scriptures twice in this account, and not simply parts, but "the Law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms"—the whole of it (Luke 24.44). Luke points out that both Pauline and Petrine conceptions of Jesus and the *Christós* (Greek for *Masiah*) are important, and he wants to whitewash the controversy between the two groups.

Luke's Jesus then continues to explain the importance of Jerusalem, a Petrine idea, as the spot at which forgiveness of sins will begin. He then takes the men out to Bethany, blesses them, ascends, and the men return to Jerusalem to worship God in the temple. There are three important firsts here in Luke when compared to Mark and Matthew. One, the narrative in Luke focuses on Jerusalem instead of Galilee. Jerusalem is a

more important city for the Petrines than the Paulines, evidenced by Paul's continual mention of his opposition that comes from Jerusalem and his hardly going to Jerusalem, helping make this more of a whitewash account than a Pauline or Petrine one specifically. Two, this is the first time in which Jesus ascends after his time on Earth after his resurrection, setting the scene for the beginning of the narrative in Acts. Tradition may assume that an ascension happened after the so-called Great Commission in Matthew 28.18-20, but looking at the text of Matthew reveals that this is not at all mentioned, thus the first explicit account of an ascension is in Luke. Three, Luke is the first account to describe what the men do after their interaction with the risen Jesus. In Matthew, the men are commanded what to do, but the text does not say if they follow the command. Luke, however, shows that the men praise God in the temple in Jerusalem. The men are not told to follow the commandments, especially the Mosaic Law, as they are told in Matthew, a Petrine work, but they do head back toward Jerusalem, the Petrine center, to worship in the temple. This account of the resurrection appears to show that the author of Luke not only knew Mark, a Pauline work, and Matthew, a Petrine work that advocates obeying every "letter" and "stroke of a letter" (Matt. 5.18) of the Mosaic Law, but also he used their accounts in the formation of his own resurrection narrative in an attempt to blur the Pauline-Petrine lines.

## Conclusion

The Pauline-Petrine Controversy is of utmost importance for the scholar and the lay person alike. Not only is it important to understand that Paul had opposition from someone or some group in general, but it is important to recognize that this opposition is from Peter and James, the leaders of the followers of Jesus centered in Jerusalem. This controversy is based on nearly every aspect of doctrine, but especially the resurrection of Jesus. The Paulines argue that the resurrection is spiritual, and the Petrines argue that it is physical. The different conceptions of resurrection from Paul and Peter influence not only the followers alive during the decades following Jesus's death, including the authors of the Synoptic Gospels, but also people in and associated with a church today. While many today talk about the spiritual nature of resurrection, they nevertheless often suggest that a Christian's resurrection, as well as Jesus's, is a physical event, demonstrating that these competing views of resurrection have not definitively been decided, even to this day.

The different narratives that arise from the Synoptic Gospels' resurrection accounts are crucial to understanding an important part of this Pauline-Petrine Controversy and to gaining a more thorough understanding of the history of the early followers of Jesus. As opposed to holding on to a more traditional view that the early followers were united, this work demonstrates that not only were the earliest followers divided—and two of the most well-known early leaders of the movement, Paul and Peter, were diametrically opposed to one another—but also this opposition influenced various understandings of covenants and doctrines, especially conceptions of resurrection, as well as various texts that responded to the controversy and came after Paul's writing. This type of research, analyzing both the Pauline-Petrine Controversy and various conceptions of resurrection, must be continued if we are to gain a more accurate view of the history of the early followers and of the texts. Through this, we can all become more religiously literate, being better able to understand the history and tradition behind one of the world's most influential religious traditions, Christianity.

## Works Cited


Anderson, Jr., R. Dean. *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms Connected to Methods of Argumentation, Figures and Tropes from Anaximenes to Quintilian*. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2000. Print.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Mark: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007. Print.

Davies, W.D. and Finkelstein, Louis. *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984. Print.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. "On Literary Composition." *Critical Essays*. Ed. and Trans. Stephen Usher. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974. Print.

Fronda, Michael P. "Imitation (*mimesis*, *imitatio*)." *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*. Ed. Roger S. Batnall, et al. Hoboken: Blackwell Publishing, 2012. Web. 10 November 2015.

Goodacre, Mark. *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze*. London: T & T Clark International, 2001. Digital File.

Goulder, Michael D. *Paul and the Competing Mission in Corinth*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 2001. Print.

---. *St. Paul versus St. Peter: A Tale of Two Missions*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994. Print.

Harvey, A.E. "The Opposition to Paul." *The Galatians Debate*. Ed. Mark D. Nanos. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 2002. 321-33. Print.

*Kerygmata Petrou*. *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. II. Eds. Wilhelm Schneemelcher and R. McL. Wilson. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992. 531-541. Print.

Luedemann, Gerd. *Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1989. Print.

McAdon, Brad. "Concepts of Resurrection." University of Memphis. Patterson Hall, Memphis, TN. n.d. Lecture.

---. “Galatians 2.7-9 as Interpolation.” University of Memphis. Patterson Hall, Memphis, TN. n.d. Lecture.

---. *Mimesis and Conflict in the New Testament: The Greco-Roman Rhetorical Practice of Mimesis and the Composition of New Testament Texts*. Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2015.

---. “Mk 16.8 and Matthew 28.8 table Greek English.” Digital File.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1994. Digital File.

Price, Robert M. “Apocryphal Apparitions: 1 Corinthians 15.3-11 as a Post-Pauline Interpolation.” *Drew.edu*. Institute for Higher Critical Studies, Drew University. 1995. Web. 22 October 2015.

Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. New York: American Book Company, 1920. Digital File.

*The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*. Ed. R. H. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913. Digital file.

*The New Oxford Annotated Bible: New Revised Standard Version with the Apocrypha*. Ed. Michael D. Coogan. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2010. Print.

*The Oxford Study Bible: Revised English Bible with the Apocrypha*. Eds. M. Jack Suggs, Katharine Doob Sakenfeld, and James R. Mueller. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1992. Print.

Throckmorton, Jr., Burton H. *Gospel Parallels: A Comparison of the Synoptic Gospels*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1992. Print.

## Endnotes

1. I want to thank the reviewer and the editor for their comments and suggestions for revision, which improved the coherence and focus of this essay.

2. Different scholars refer to these groups by different names, including Hellenistic (Pauline) followers of Jesus / Christians and Jewish (Petrine) followers of Jesus / Christians. For the purposes of my research, I prefer to refer to the two groups as either Pauline or Petrine.

3. The Synoptic Gospels (Mark, Matthew, and Luke) are so called because of the ability to line up narratives within the three texts and notice similarities and differences between them. This leads to what is called the Synoptic Problem, which Mark Goodacre defines as "the study of the similarities and differences of the Synoptic Gospels in an attempt to explain their literary relationship" (16).

4. The Q document is alleged to be a source that the authors of Matthew and Luke used in addition to Mark's material. The main idea is that Q contained sayings of Jesus and is an independent source from which Matthew and Luke pulled their information on what Jesus reportedly said. Matthew and Luke then weave those sayings, plus parts from Mark, into the particular accounts of the Jesus they want to portray. I do not accept Q's legitimacy, but lean more towards the view that Matthew knew and used Mark and that Luke knew and used both Mark and Matthew, a view most recently advanced in Mark Goodacre's *The Synoptic Problem*.

5. See A.E. Harvey's "The Opposition to Paul" in which Harvey proposes that "those who are troubling the church [in Galatia] are not Jews by birth, but Gentiles who have only recently become Jewish proselytes, or who are still contemplating doing so" and further, "there is no longer any reason to suppose that the Judaizing opposition in Galatia represented a theological position. The issue, once again, was a matter, not of doctrine, but of observances" (*The Galatians Debate* 326, 328). I concede that Jewish observances were a part of what Paul's opponents wanted the Gentiles to perform, but I argue in this paper that the controversy is not only between Paul and Peter instead of Paul and new Jews, but also that the controversy is highly concerned with opposing theological viewpoints or doctrines, not merely observances of Jewish customs.

6. Many scholars include seven letters in the list of authentic Pauline works: Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, Philemon, Philippians, and 1 Thessalonians. I will only be focusing on Galatians and 1 and 2 Corinthians for this work because, while a controversy seems to appear in six of the seven letters (Philemon being the exception), the Pauline-Petrine Controversy is most evident in the three I have chosen to focus on.

7. I will be using the *New Revised Standard Version* for this project.

8. I chose this order to follow what I understand to be the chronological order of the texts.

9. The only exception I have found in the list of allegedly genuine letters that does not

mention a controversy is Philemon.

10. The Greek rhetorical term, as mentioned previously, is σὐγκρισις.

11. Cf. *Ibid*. 1.7-9 in which Paul says that these individuals are perverting the gospel and that anyone who does so should be "accursed."

12. *Ibid*. 2.6. I find it noteworthy to mention briefly that one may find fault with my argument so far by mentioning Galatians 2.7-9, verses that suggest unity between the Jerusalem leaders (Peter and James) and Paul. Dr. Brad McAdon, in his article "Galatians 2.7-9 as Interpolation," has argued that these three verses are a later interpolation for two main reasons. One, these verses serve as an awkward break where verse six followed by verse ten flows smoothly, and they do not align with what is happening in the verses immediately preceding and following. For the first point, the ending of verse six and the beginning of verse ten are as follows: "those leaders contributed nothing to me. They asked only one thing, that we remember the poor." This flows much better than the awkward addition of verses seven through nine. For the second point, Paul and the "pillars" making peace while Paul condemns the Jewish practices in favor of his gospel seems to be implausible as well as inconsistent with other texts that come in the following decades that either recast the controversy (Acts) or demonstrate that the controversy is still alive (*Kerygmata Petrou*). Some might further argue that these verses as an interpolation run counter to the common New Testament interpolation arguments, and it does. Noticing that this section could be an interpolation, though, supports the idea of the controversy more generally as those three verses describe a unity between Paul and Peter that the rest of Galatians and the other Pauline letters do not demonstrate. See Brad McAdon, "Galatians 2.7-9 as Interpolation."

13. Cephas is the Aramaic name for the Greek Πέτρος. Discussion on why Paul uses the Aramaic name and the canonical gospels use the Greek name could be extensive, but for simplicity's sake, I use the name Peter to refer to both Cephas and Πέτρος.

14. Although John is often included in the list of leaders of the Jewish Christians, I choose not to add him because, as Dr. Brad McAdon argues, the only time in early Christian literature in which all three are named is in Galatians 2.9, (which I hold to as a later interpolation) and John does not appear in any of Paul's letters or at the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15 (Brad McAdon, "Galatians 2.7-9 as Interpolation").

15. Cf. Matthew 16.18 in which the author has Jesus say, "And I tell you, you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church." As will be discussed later, Matthew aligns with a Petrine viewpoint, and certainly, as I have argued thus far, the idea of authority and alleged apostleship are at the center of this controversy, and this even comes to the idea of who the foundational leaders of the followers of Jesus are.

16. Cf. Philippians 3.4-6 in which Paul offers an autobiographical sketch of his religious life before his conversion.

17. For much of the information in this section, particularly the information regarding the extra-biblical texts, I am indebted to Dr. Brad McAdon's lecture and handout on conceptions of resurrection from Judaism to Paul.

18. This is merely one line of reasoning to explain the development of resurrection within Judaism. It certainly seems clear that Judaism was impacted by that culture, but the extent of this impact is still debated. That said, "the idea of a general resurrection of the whole of mankind…seems to have been moulded by contact with Iran. An earlier idea (Isa. 26.19; Dan. 12.2-3) seems to have envisaged a selective resurrection – and that idea may or may not have been originally Jewish" (Davis and Finkelstein 323).

19. The many references include *4 Maccabees* 7.3; 9.22; 13.17; 14.5-6; 15.3; 16.13, 25; 17.12; 18.19

20. It is important to note here that some have argued that this passage may be a later interpolation, including Robert M. Price in "Apocryphal Apparitions: 1 Corinthians 15.3-11 as a Post-Pauline Interpolation." Indeed, its differences are striking when compared to the gospels and even to Paul's conception of resurrection that he later describes in chapter 15. It seems strange that Paul would first mention that Jesus actually appeared to him if he then later seems to argue for a spiritual, rather than a bodily, resurrection. Further, as Price argues, "That Paul should have delivered the following tradition poses little problem; but that he had first been the recipient of it from earlier tradents creates, I judge, a problem insurmountable for Pauline authorship…If the historical Paul is speaking in either passage [Galatians 1 and 1 Corinthians 15], he is not speaking in both" ("Apocryphal Apparitions"). Moreover, Paul's receiving the news from someone, some group, or some tradition is in sharp contrast to his claims in Gal. 1.11—in which he says he "did not receive it from a human source, nor was [he] taught it, but [he] received it through a revelation of Jesus Christ." Paul either believes in a spiritual or a bodily resurrection and he either had this news given to him by God or by man, but it cannot be both; the evidence seems in favor that 1 Cor. 15.3-11 is a later interpolation.

21. While the dating of the Synoptic Gospels is still under dispute, most scholars put Matthew as composed between 80 and 90 CE, although some argue anywhere in a range from 70-110 CE. At any rate, Matthew holds the first resurrection account in the New Testament with a physical post-resurrection appearance, so I choose 80 CE here as the earliest possibility on that basis.

22. Contra Goulder. Cf. *St. Paul* 177 in which Goulder argues that the Pauline followers hold to a physically risen Jesus and the Petrine followers hold to a spiritually risen Jesus, a view which is the opposite of my own.

23. See also 1 Thess. in which Paul says that "the Lord himself, with a cry of command, with the archangel's call and with the sound of God's trumpet, will descend from heaven, and the dead in Christ will rise first" (4.16).

24. For the Stoics, a dominant philosophical school during Paul's time, the πνεῦμα or πνευματικόν is an airy, but still material, substance. It appears that Paul follows this same line of materialism when he appropriates this word for his resurrection conception as he makes the soul still embodied, albeit in a different type of body, in the afterlife. See Davies and Finkelstein who argue in *The Cambridge History of Judaism* that "the Iranian term *mainyu*…is commonly translated 'spirit'. It basically denotes a non-material entity…A similar analysis could be made of the corresponding notion in the Jewish writings of the period under consideration, whether it is expressed by the Hebrew term *ruah* or by the Greek *pneuma*" (317). *Pneuma* may have been immaterial at the time of Persian influence on Judaism, but by Paul's time under the domination of Stoic philosophy, *pneuma* quite possibly was understood, even by Paul, to be a material substance.

25. Cf. 1 Cor. 1.22-23 and 15.12-19 among other passages in which Paul argues that the resurrection is the most important aspect of faith, and that without the resurrection of Jesus, there is nothing.

26. For example, Paul discusses ideas and gives advice about food sacrificed to idols in chapter 8 and spiritual gifts in chapter 12 of 1 Corinthians, among other doctrinal concerns of the Corinthians present in this letter.

27. There is nearly unanimous agreement among scholars that Mark 16.9-20 is a later addition. Bruce Metzger argues that "it is unlikely that the long ending was composed *ad hoc* to fill up an obvious gap; it is more likely that the section was excerpted from another document, dating perhaps from the first half of the second century." For more detail on this discussion, see *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* by Bruce M. Metzger, esp. pp. 122-28.

28. See end note 34 in the discussion of Luke's resurrection narrative in which Luke appears to have altered Mark's figure who speaks at the empty tomb from a youth to a man, offering, at least arguably, more credibility to his own account.

29. Contra Adela Yarbro Collins, who contends that Mark's "understanding of resurrection, unlike Paul's, involved the revival and transformation of Jesus' earthly body, as well as the exaltation of his inner self" (Mark 781). While this view seems plausible as the body is not present and the young man contends that the body was raised, I am not convinced that this makes for a transformed earthly body. At the most basic level, there is no body to be seen, so transformation seems like a questionable word choice. Further, surely if the concern were on the revival of the physical body itself, the author would have included an appearance narrative as the author of Matthew does. Lastly, as will be discussed further in the analysis of Matthew and Luke's account, Mark must not consider the idea of a bodily resurrection important if he makes the characters who know about it a youth and several women, people who were not deemed credible during this time period, which the authors of Matthew and Luke recognize and attempt to account for by altering the people present at the empty tomb.

30. Whereas Mark includes three women, Matthew only includes two. Matthew has one less person now to validate the authenticity of his account.

31. For the included table and the discussion of the nuances in the *Koine*, I am indebted to Dr. Brad McAdon.

32. Galilee was the place Jesus allegedly told the disciples he would meet them after his resurrection, saying, "But after I am raised up, I will go ahead of you to Galilee" (Matthew 26.32). It is interesting to note that this verse aligns nearly word for word with Mark 14.28, which reads, "But after I am raised up, I will go before you to Galilee." This nearly identical wording again demonstrates that Matthew knew and used Mark as a source.

33. I say this as a result of the striking similarities between Luke's and Matthew's accounts regarding narratives that do not appear in Mark. This, like the brief discussion in "The Resurrection Narrative in Matthew," is another clear use of mimesis where the author of Luke is now using his sources to craft a narrative not in defense of a Pauline or Petrine viewpoint, per se, but rather as a narrative to attempt to whitewash the controversy altogether. See Brad McAdon's chapter "The Prevalence and Practice of Greco-Roman Mimesis" of his upcoming book *Mimesis and Conflict in the New Testament* and Burton H. Throckmorton, Jr.'s work *Gospel Parallels: A Comparison of the Synoptic Gospels* in which Throckmorton aligns the Synoptic Gospels in parallel columns to demonstrate similar passages, including some instances of sentences that are nearly identical, word for word.

34. The Greek for "men" here is ἀνήρ. There is a human figure in Mark's resurrection narrative, the νεανίσκος, of Mark 16.5. This is an interesting alteration by the author of Luke from Mark because Mark's νεανίσκος denotes a youth, someone who is "mostly of youthful qualities" and "headtstrong." This youth who gives the news of a resurrected Jesus to women makes the event in Mark's account seem unlikely, if not comical in some ways. Luke alters νεανίσκος to ἀνήρ, denoting a "man as opposed to youth," possibly offering more credibility to his own account.

35. The Greek here actually changes to ἄγγελος instead of ἀνήρ.

36. Goulder argues that "the Jewish Christian belief [is that] Christ and Jesus [are] separate entities, which challenges the notion of Paul's unity of Jesus and Christ as one" (*Competing Mission* 20). If this is the case, Luke's presentation of Jesus and *Christós* as one, a Pauline idea, evidenced by "all the scriptures," a Petrine defense, demonstrates a further whitewashing of the controversy.

37. It doesn't seem clear who this Simon is, whether it is Peter or another man named Simon.

38. The Greek is πνεῦμα, sometimes translated as breath, but more accurately here refers to a noncorporeal entity or spirit. Cf. fn 21 regarding the Stoics and Paul's possible conception of πνεῦμα.