

## 8 ~ THE CRADLE OF THE CHURCH

### Continuity~Discontinuity~Resurrection

Jesus never *conceived* the church or *intended* to *establish* the church. The church is not a product of Jesus' will, intention, or action. The earliest Jesus movement in Jerusalem emanated from a faith based on the resurrection belief. However, it is an open question whether this "church" reflects a continuity or discontinuity with the cause of Jesus. The peculiar quality of Jesus' cause is its inclusiveness and antihierarchical tendency. The Jerusalem faction is known for its embeddedness in Israel's mores. It is not known for openness towards the Gentiles or for egalitarianism. Yet it does not mean that there is an absolute discontinuity between Jesus and the earliest Jesus movement in Jerusalem. The historical Jesus brought his message within the scope of Israel. The Jerusalem faction searched Scriptures and found evidence that Jesus was adopted by God to be Israel's messiah.

From this messianic outlook and with an apocalyptic mind-set, the Jerusalem faction apparently started a process of institutionalizing Jesus' last meal with close followers as a table fellowship symbolizing their participation in God's "spiritual kingdom." These followers of Jesus distinguished themselves from the circle of the disciples of John the Baptist. Like Jesus himself, some of them could initially have belonged to this circle. Their separation was symbolized by their distinctive understanding of the baptismal rite. The baptism by John the Baptist was a water ritual that initiated a lifestyle to be lived when and where God reigns. The fellows of the Jesus

movement in Jerusalem institutionalized a “spiritual baptism” in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit of God as sign of initiation into a discipleship of the “heavenly kingdom.” According to their scrutinizing exegesis of the Hebrew Scriptures, this “imperial rule” was inaugurated by Jesus as Israel’s spirit-filled messiah who triumphed by his victory over death as it was expected within an apocalyptic mind-set that the Child of Humanity would do. Apocalypticism can therefore be seen as the mother of the Jerusalem faction’s theology<sup>1</sup> and unthinkable without the belief in the resurrection from the death.

The first sentence of the first paragraph above is my paraphrase of the well-known words of Wolfgang Trilling:<sup>2</sup> *Jesus never conceived the church or intended to establish the church.* These words have since been repeated with approval by many historians, of whom Geza Vermes<sup>3</sup> is a recent example. The establishment of the “church” is, therefore, not to be traced back to a foundational event (*Anfangserfahrung*) in the life of the historical Jesus. After Jesus’ brutally maltreated body had not been laid in a family tomb, Jesus arose in the kerygma. In other words, Jesus lived forth through the retelling of his cause. This process resulted in a development of Jesus movements<sup>4</sup> that reached back to his followers’ experience of resurrection appearances of Jesus, in particular, by Mary Magdalene, Peter, James, and Paul.<sup>5</sup>

For some in early Christianity, it was as if they experienced the appearance of the resurrected Jesus in the form of the Child of Humanity in an altered state of consciousness (for evidence in Matthew, see *inter alia* Mt 24:30; 27:52-53; 28:16-20). The Child of Humanity is that triumphant apocalyptic figure who had been expected to come at that point in history when the experiences in this world would be almost

unendurable so that God's people began to fantasize about the inauguration of the Kingdom of God transcending the worrisome times that they experienced (see *inter alia* Dn 7:13-14).

Others could only hold on to the kerygma of those who said that they had been sent by the exalted Jesus to convey his cause (cf. Jn 20:29). Paul said explicitly that he was sent by God to become an “apostle for the Gentiles” (see Gl 2:8). It is reported that this commission was given to Paul when he was transformed by an epiphany by means of a divine light in which the risen Jesus appeared. This is, however, not described as a visual experience. It is reported that he heard Jesus’ voice (see Acts 9:3-4; 22:6-7; 26:13-14; cf. Gl 1:25-27).

Mary of Magdala claimed to have been the first to have experienced an appearance of the risen Jesus. This is probably authentic (see Mk 16:1, 9; Mt 28:1; Lk 24:10; Jn 20:1; Gospel of Peter 12:50; Epistula Apostolorum 9 [in both the Ethiopic and Coptic versions]). Only the Epistula Apostolorum does not place the previously demon-possessed Mary Magdalene first on the list of the women who said they had a vision of the resurrected Jesus. This story of the women *confused* (in Greek: εἰσθημι) the men (Lk 24:22-24)—the Greek word *existemi* (εἰσθημι) refers to amazement, astonishment—what man could believe the witness of a woman! Fortunately, for the sake of the men, another “stone” pillar of faith confirmed that the master appeared to him (cf. Lk 24:34). It seems that Paul believed Peter in that he was actually the first to have seen Jesus (Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza<sup>6</sup> calls 1 Cor 15:3-8 a “...list intended to legitimate male authority”), although Peter himself and the other “pillars of faith” fled during the turmoil surrounding Jesus’ crucifixion (Mk 14:50). The rumor follows that when Peter’s

shame prompted him to return his heart failed him again (see Mk 14:34, 66-72). Nevertheless, it is believed that God made him an “apostle for the Israelites” (see Gl 2:8).

According to Paul, Jesus also appeared to the core group of Jesus’ followers, believed to be twelve, as if they could claim to represent all the sons of Israel (cf. 1 Cor 15:5; Lk 24:36-49; Jn 20:19-23; 26-29). Another early tradition was also transmitted that the cause of Jesus began to find its way through the Roman Empire after the “end-time” Spirit of God came upon a larger group of people, from many different ethnic backgrounds, who came to Jerusalem as the prophets said the nations would do. This spiritual experience of an altered state of consciousness happened when Peter started “evangelizing,” telling the people about the crucified Jesus whom God made to be Lord (*Kyrios*) and Messiah (*Christ*) of *all* of Israel (Israelites and Gentiles included) (cf. Acts 2:1-42). Through his death, a transformation of the temple cult took place. Instead of sacrificial rites for receiving forgiveness of sin, everyone could now be baptized in the name of Jesus Messiah as a sign of their spiritual renewal (cf. Acts 2:38ff).

This message is referred to as *good tidings* (eu0agge/lion). The word *gospel* was used over the alleged “good news” of the divine birth of the emperor Augustus who claimed to be the saving patron of the whole world. This altered state of consciousness happened when the Spirit of God came upon not only an individual but upon many sons and daughters of Israel (see Acts 2:17-21). According to an earlier transmission of probably the same story, it might have been that their numbers were more than five hundred (see 1 Cor 15:6). Paul, the source of this early testimony (cf. 1 Cor 15:6), said he was informed that Jesus’ brother James claimed to have seen him after his crucifixion (also witnessed to in the Gospel of the Hebrews, fragment 7, preserved by Hieronymus,

De Viris Illustribus 2). This reportedly happened before the appearance to “The Twelve” as a group. The authority of James’ upcoming leadership of the Jesus movement in Jerusalem probably depended on his being a primary witness (see 1 Cor 15:6). The historian Josephus (Ant 20.197-203) mentioned that James became an important official in the priestly circles of Jerusalem after the Romans had killed his brother. The experience of seeing his crucified brother resurrected apparently ignited in James the desire to become a follower of Jesus. However, while Jesus was among them, James, his mother, and other kin from Nazareth did not believe in Jesus’ cause. Nevertheless, he became one of the “pillars of faith” in Jerusalem. Having never been a follower of Jesus during his lifetime, it comes as no surprise that James did not believe that the gospel should go further, from Jerusalem through Samaria into the rest of the Roman Empire, even to the world of the barbarians who could not speak Greek. The legitimacy of his *apostleship* can therefore be questioned.

Another man, Paul, who apparently did not even know Jesus personally, was truly an *apostle* because he advocated this cause. This he did in the midst of afflictions that made him feel like a woman being crucified (according to a “reading between the lines” of 2 Cor 4:12). Likewise he considered his right to be an apostle to be based on the authority of a revelation of the resurrected Jesus (see Gl 1:12). Here it seems that both parties used the resurrection belief in a way that indicates that they did not internalize Jesus’ disdain for selfish superiority (cf. Mk 10:42-44). Yet Paul dissociated himself from the Jerusalem faction with his ideology critique of the idea that the obedience to cultural conventions makes right the relationship with God (see Phlp 3:7-11). He also

disagreed with the notion of an apostle bringing the light of the gospel to the nations outside of Jerusalem.

Paul was eventually killed in Rome, so it seems to (despite 1 Clem 5:7), because the Roman emperor Nero used Christians for his own end. The emperor wanted to expand the mansions of his family members. For that he needed the land where catacombs were used as shelter by outcasts. He started a fire, lied, and said that Christians were responsible. The outcome of this was that many Christians were killed (cf. Tacitus Ann xv.44). Two years earlier, Jesus' brother was also killed in Jerusalem. The historian Josephus (Ant 20:197-203) reported that the high priest eliminated this "pillar of faith" in 62 C.E. because he and other Pharisees were charged with lawlessness (ἀνομία), probably because their opposition to the high priest could topple him from his lofty position.

## **A Movement of and for Others**

Apart from those pre-Easter followers of Jesus, centered in Jerusalem after his crucifixion, the cause of Jesus soon also became a movement for others—Israelites in the Diaspora and devout Hellenists who associated themselves with the religion of the "children of Abraham." Pioneers like Paul played a major role in this Jesus movement. We have seen that the origins of the Jesus movement in Jerusalem seemingly lie in the claims of Peter and James (and probably also the sons of Zebedee, John, and James) that they saw the resurrected Jesus. We have seen that Mary Magdalene also had such a

vision and that it was not brought up in the tradition of the Jerusalem faction. Paul and Mark (and Christian writers dependent on them) knew of this tradition about “The Twelve” and conveyed it further—albeit not very enthusiastically. However, Paul seems unaware of the bias that caused the astonishment among the Jerusalemites about Mary’s experience of the resurrected Jesus.

Paul developed a theological construct of participation in the risen Christ Jesus. This “unity” with the cause of Jesus was a faith experience that can be described as an altered state of consciousness because of its spiritual nature. Spirituality was expressed by Paul with the formulae “to be in Christ,” “to be in the *Kyrios*,” “to be in the Spirit,” and “to call upon God as *Abba*.” The “live in Spirit” formed an alternative to a life according to everyday cultural arrangements. In this regard, Paul differed from the Jerusalem group in his opinion that the continuing experience of the meaning of Jesus’ life through the resurrection belief meant that the “old” Israel died as well. The Jesus movement in Jerusalem believed that Jesus “restored” Israel as an ethnic entity. For Paul, “the Israel of God” was totally transformed into a spiritual entity. He grounded his conviction in his understanding of Jesus’ death and resurrection. The church as an “altered” Israel meant that it was seen as a movement of people who believed in *Christ* and in the *Kyrios*, the Jesus of faith for both Israelites and non-Israelites.<sup>7</sup>

The historical Jesus did not foresee that an entity like “the church” would be built upon such an interpretation of his death. However, Paul’s “altered” vision of egalitarianism and cultural subversiveness was in continuity with Jesus’ “altered” relationship with God as the Father of “nobodies.” According to the core of the Pauline and gospel tradition in the New Testament, Jesus’ interpretation of the Kingdom of God,

his wisdom, his redefinition of the concept “children of Abraham” (i.e., “children of God”) constituted the essence of human self-understanding. For Paul, the essence of religion is doing what fits in with God (Rm 12:1-2). If rejection and death were seen as failure, folly or offense, then Jesus’ vision would have failed. But this paradoxical and repugnant perception was what the life of Jesus pertained to be. The Pauline tradition conveyed this vision. It is a contra-cultural perspective without escaping reality. It comprises the vision that strength is possible in weakness, wisdom in folly, honor in shame, and life in death. Cultural institutionalization always causes people to become accepting of hierarchical hegemony, exclusive hybrid and alienating agony provoked by the powers that be. Because God turns shame into honor, the resurrection faith is, according to Paul, the sign of a new birth, a new start, a new creation (2 Cor 5:17; Gl 6:15), the birth of the “true Israel,” the “Israel of God” (Gl 6:16). According to Jesus’ gospel, an “altered” vision, not arrogant egotism, constitutes the self-understanding of human beings.

To deny the foundation of the church in the Jesus cause (that is folly to the world, but wisdom in the eyes of faith) is to deny the historic cradle of the church and to allow the essence of the church to evaporate into an ecclesiological ideology. This also amounts to Paul’s thinking. The core of the Pauline gospel with regard to the crucified Jesus (1 Cor 1:17-31) should be understood as “condensed history” of the historical Jesus. C.H. Dodd<sup>8</sup> puts it as follows:

Thus Paul’s preaching represents a special stream of Christian tradition that was derived from the mainstream at a point very near to its source. No doubt his own idiosyncrasy counted for much in his presentation of



the Gospel, but anyone who should maintain that the primitive Christian Gospel was fundamentally different from that which we have found in Paul must bear the burden of the proof.

The source behind Paul's kerygma is found in the Jerusalem faction's emphasis of Jesus' death. The kind of life Jesus lived led to his death. It is in this sense that his crucifixion should be seen as "condensed history."

### **The Circle of "The Twelve"**

There is some evidence in the New Testament that seemingly traces the establishment of the church directly to Jesus himself. However, this evidence is limited, uncertain, and historically unreliable. Three references in this regard deserve to be mentioned. The first consists of the reported words of Jesus to Peter in Matthew 16:17-19: "You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church." The next is presupposed in the report on the institution of the Eucharist: "The Lord (*Kyrios*) Jesus...said: 'This is my body...'" (1 Cor 11:23-26; Mk 14:22-25). Both references must, however, without doubt be dated later, and are, in addition, historically unreliable.<sup>9</sup>

The most outstanding New Testament source that has something to say about the establishment of the church is the Pauline credo in 1 Corinthians 15:3-5b.<sup>10</sup> According to the credo, Peter (see also Lk 24:34) was the first observer of an appearance by the Resurrected One and therefore, viewed historically, was the "founder" of the church—a creed that assumes that this founding can be traced back to a deed of the resurrected

Jesus. A second aspect of this credo is that the Risen One appeared to “The Twelve” (1 Cor 15:5b) and also to “all the apostles” (1 Cor 15:7b). It could, with reference to this, be argued that Jesus himself *legitimated* “The Twelve” and in this way indirectly gave rise to the idea of the church (expressed in “The Twelve” as representatives of God’s chosen people).<sup>11</sup> However, there is no historical evidence that Jesus called “The Twelve” or sent out the “the apostles.” These designations seem to be interchangeable for Mark and for those documents that are modeled after Mark. Paul did not see it this way. He regarded the concept “apostles” as an expansion of “The Twelve” in Jerusalem. The group of Jesus followers in Jerusalem created the idea of “The Twelve.” The number twelve represented the apocalyptic “true Israel.” The circle of “The Twelve” came into being as a result of the traditions concerning the appearances of the resurrected Jesus.

The phrases “disciple of Jesus” and “follower of Jesus” have different connotations. Discipleship presupposes that the historical Jesus called someone who then physically followed him. Therefore, according to the gospel tradition, people such as Mary, Martha, Bartimaeus, and Zacchaeus were “followers” of Jesus but not “disciples.” The question is whether the designation of “The Twelve” in Mark (e.g., Mk 6:7) and John (e.g., Jn 6:67) should be seen as an “inner circle”<sup>12</sup> among Jesus’ disciples and whether the term “apostle” equates “disciple” and pertains particularly to the circle known as “The Twelve.”

Matthew also employed the phrase “the twelve disciples” (Mt 10:1; 11:1; possibly 20:17). This phrase seems to be an equivalent for “disciples.” If this is the case, “The Twelve” and the “disciples” were, according to Matthew, the same group of people. However, it is important to notice that the term “twelve apostles” also occurs in Matthew

(10:2). Luke, based on Mark, took over the Markan designation of “The Twelve” but does not employ the Matthean phrase “the twelve disciples” or “twelve apostles.” According to Meier<sup>13</sup> the “use of ‘the Twelve’ as completely equivalent to ‘the disciples’ does not reflect the earliest strata of Gospel traditions or the historical situation of Jesus’ ministry.” I fully agree with Meier in this regard, but I will argue that Jesus also did not call an “inner circle” to whom he referred as “The Twelve.” There is no historical evidence that Jesus was responsible for the concept “The Twelve” or the phenomenon “the apostles.”

Both the Markan character with the name “Levi” (see Mk 2:13-15) and the Johannine character with the designation the “beloved disciple” (also referred to as “the other disciple”— see Jn 13:23-25; 18:15, 16; 19:26-27; 20:2, 3, 8; 21:20-23) do not occur in the list of “The Twelve” (Mk 3:16-19). However, according to Mark and John, both were called “disciple.” It is remarkable that, at the time when Levi was reportedly called to be Jesus’ disciple (cf. Mk 2:15), Mark did not count him among “The Twelve.” At this stage in the Markan narrative, the individuals among “The Twelve” mentioned were Peter, Andrew, James, and John. The actual selection and naming of “The Twelve” was recorded for the first time in Mark 3:13-19.

Mark 3:7 makes a clear distinction between Jesus’ disciples and the crowds. Mark 3:13 could therefore be interpreted<sup>14</sup> that Jesus summoned “The Twelve” out of a larger group of disciples. This is how Luke understood Mark 3:13: “And [Jesus] called his disciples, and chose from them twelve....” With regard to Jesus’ calling of the “rich man” to be a disciple (Mk 10:17-22) one can also argue that a larger group of disciples apart from “The Twelve” existed. The fact that the “rich man” reportedly responded

negatively seems to be irrelevant for Mark when he referred to the “rich man” as a potential *disciple*.

However, in a number of cases Matthew redactionally changed Mark’s tendency to equate “The Twelve” with *all* of the disciples. In the case of Levi, Matthew transformed “the toll collector’s” name into “Matthew” – a name that is found in the list of “The Twelve.” Actually, in the Matthean narrative, no individual “disciple” appeared who was not named in the list. Whereas Luke (6:12-16) took over the Markan report of the selection and the naming of “The Twelve” (Mk 3:13-19), Matthew did not narrate a story in which Jesus called “The Twelve” out of a larger group of disciples. When Matthew referred to the calling of the “rich man” and his negative response, he characterized him as someone who associated himself with Jesus’ opponents.<sup>15</sup> Meier concludes: “Perhaps one can say that Matthew presents the circle of the Twelve as de facto coterminous with the circle of the disciples.”<sup>16</sup>

The word “apostles” refers to envoys sent by Jesus and it occurs only once in Mark (6:30). The parenthetical phrase (i.e., printed in italics) in Mark 3:14 (“and [Jesus] appointed twelve, *whom he also designated apostles*, in order to accompany him and to send them out to proclaim....”) should not be seen as the best reading.<sup>17</sup> It represents a secondary reading and should be regarded as a harmonization with Luke 6:13. The “Greek manuscript tradition evinces various attempts to harmonize Mark’s story of the selection of the Twelve with Matt 10:1-4 and Luke 6:12-16.”<sup>18</sup>

In Mark 6:30, the word “apostles” is used within the context of messengers who accomplished their missionary itinerary and it could refer to a concept known in Aramaic as *schaliach*.<sup>19</sup> This figure was a legitimized agent who was sent out with the full

authority of the sender. Matthew (10:2) took the reference to the “apostles” over from Mark. The context of Mark 6 represents the typical Markan “sandwich-style.”<sup>20</sup> Between the sending of *The Twelve*, two by two (Mk 6:7-13), and the return of *The Apostles* (Mk 6:30-32), the narrator intercalated the report of John the Baptist’s decapitation (Mk 6:1-29). A function of this particular narrating technique in Mark<sup>21</sup> could be to create for the implied reader a distance between the role of “The Twelve” and the *mission* of the “apostles.” However, this is no mere repetition, for the second part adds precision and clarifies the first part.<sup>22</sup> Both parts comprise a two-step progressive description. The first part is important, yet the emphasis often lies on the second step, which usually contains the more significant element.”<sup>23</sup>

After his reference to the completion of the mission by the messengers (“apostles”), Mark does not use the word “apostles” any longer. At least one can conclude that when Mark linked “The Twelve” to the concept “apostles,” he did it only within the context of mission. But Markan research has also pointed out that the “disciples” in Mark’s story were not very enthusiastic to serve people from outside the boundaries of their own homeland. The story of the apostles’ return is followed by the “double story” about Jesus giving bread to people. In the first narration of this story (Mk 6:35-44), the recipients of bread were people from the land of Israel and the disciples took the initiative (cf. Mk 6:35). In the second version (Mk 8:1-10) the recipients were from across the boundaries of the homeland and the disciples were not only hesitant to react on Jesus’ initiative but were also unwilling to act as mediators of Jesus’ gift of bread to the people. This “double story” is again intercalated by, among others, the report of the Syro-Phoenician woman (Mk 7:24-30) who received leftover bread intended

to be consumed by dogs. A possible interpretation of Mark's narrative point of view in the mission discourse could be to understand the intention of his creation of a distance between "The Twelve" (i.e., the "disciples") and the "apostles" as an illustration that the nature of their "apostolate" was particularistic. This is exactly how Matthew (10:5) interpreted Mark. Yet, in line with his overall narrative point of view, Matthew did not report this particularistic attitude pejoratively.

However, a comparison with Luke clearly points out that Luke did not consider the "apostles" as equivalent to "The Twelve." For Luke, "apostles" were rather the "itinerants" who traveled two-by-two (seemingly male and female).<sup>24</sup> It is therefore noticeable that Luke did not characterize Paul as an "apostle." In the Lukan mission discourse, the "itinerants" were numbered seventy (or seventy-two, according to other early manuscripts). It is also important to see that Luke expanded the "mission of the disciples" into a journey with Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem (commencing at Lk 9:51) and that they traveled through Samaria. Luke also made it clear that the "disciples James and John" (sons of Zebedee) wanted the Samaritans to be struck by an apocalyptic catastrophe similar to Sodom and Gomorrah (Lk 9:51-56). The sons of Zebedee clearly disapproved of Jesus travelling through Samaria and their hatred towards the Samaritans was easily evoked by the bastards' reported antagonism against Jesus. Luke (9:57-62) however compared James and John to "would-be followers" of Jesus. The "itinerants," on the other hand, were implicitly described as "apostles."<sup>25</sup> They traveled to "every city and place" where Jesus himself was prepared to go (Lk 10:1). According to the context in Luke, this reference would include Samaria.

In light of our knowledge of Luke's overall conservative transmission of Q traditions, one can assume that Matthew's version represented more of a radical

redactional change of the Q tradition than Luke. In the Sayings Gospel Q and in Luke, the itinerant emissaries were distinguished from “The Twelve” in Jerusalem. This can be seen in the designation in the mission discourse of those who were sent out as “others.”<sup>26</sup> Luke described this group as seventy or seventy-two (Lk 10:1). This is a clear distinction between the “mission of the disciples” and the “mission of the seventy/seventy-two.” These “itinerants” were depicted against the disciples such as the sons of Zebedee to whom Luke explicitly referred as “disciples” (Lk 10:5), but in Mark (3:16f) as “The Twelve.” Thus, both Luke and Mark created a distance between the “itinerants” and the “disciples”/“The Twelve.” The opposing ideologies behind this distinction can be read between the lines as that of a particularistic mission and a universal mission.

We have seen that Matthew changed this and equated the “itinerants” with the “twelve disciples” (Mt 10:1). He also referred to them as the “twelve apostles” (Mt 10:2) and said that they did not travel on the “road to the nations” or visit a “city in Samaria” (Mt 10:5), but *rather* proclaimed the “approaching kingdom of heavens” only to the “lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Mt 10:6). The “rich man” was, for Matthew, a potential follower of Jesus who chose to share the ideological perspective of Jesus’ opponents (in Matthew represented by the “coalition” of Pharisees, Sadducees, chief priests, and the “elders” in Jerusalem).<sup>27</sup> In Matthew, the “rich man” was not seen as a disciple. He displayed an ambivalence similar to that of the character of the person without a wedding garment (Mt 22:11-13) in the parable of the wedding banquet.<sup>28</sup> In Matthew, disciples of “little faith” were also tempted to collaborate with the enemy. Like the “rich man,” Judas (a “disciple” among “The Twelve”) and other renegades revealed their preference by using names for Jesus that were constantly used by the antagonists in Matthew’s story.<sup>29</sup>

My hypothesis with regard to Matthew is that Matthew conformed to the Jesus faction in Jerusalem. The existence of such a group is historically sure. Independent multiple witnesses of the role of, among others, James (the brother of Jesus) in this group are found in the Pauline tradition (Gl 1:19; Acts 1:14 [implied]; 15:13 [explicit]) and Josephus (*Antiquitates* 20.200). Similar witnesses with regard to the killing of James (the brother of John), due to his role in the Jesus faction in Jerusalem, occur in Mark 10:38ff. (implied) and in Acts 12:1ff. (explicit). According to information gained from the gospel tradition, this faction was probably formed around a core group (the “inner-circle”) that Paul (Gl 2:9) referred to as “the pillars” (of which Cephas, i.e. Peter, and James, i.e., the brother of Jesus, and the brothers James and John were the leaders). This group idealized their movement by thinking about it as the “end-time Israel” and referring to the “first” disciples as “The Twelve.” This designation is clearly analogous to “the twelve patriarchs” referred to in the Hebrew Scriptures.

It seems as though Luke (and Mark as the source of Luke) knew that the indication of the “inner circle” as “the twelve disciples” was not authentic. Therefore, they interpreted “The Twelve” as a selection from a larger group of disciples. We have seen that Matthew differed from Mark and Luke by equating the “disciples” with “The Twelve.” Matthew would not use the term “disciple” when referring to potential disciples. He therefore changed the name “Levi” into “Matthew” in order to have all “disciples” explicitly referred to by a name that appears in the list of “The Twelve.” This list was taken over from Mark, but probably originated earlier within the Jerusalem faction. Paul was acquainted with a group in Jerusalem called “The Twelve” but he did not mention their names. He only mentioned the leaders Peter and James. Paul’s



reference to “*all* the apostles” in juxtaposition to “The Twelve” in 1 Corinthians 15:3-7 indicates that “apostles” were people who should be seen as an *extension* of “The Twelve.” It means that “The Twelve” were also seen as “apostles,” but the “apostles” were not restricted to “The Twelve.”

In Luke-Acts, “The Twelve” were distinguished from a “crowd of disciples” and also from the “servants of the word” (see Lk 1:2). Probably due to Pauline influence, the election of Matthias in Acts (1:26) was described as an addition to the “eleven apostles” (cf. also Acts 2:14). In Acts 6:2, the eleven plus Matthias are called “The Twelve.” After Acts 6:2 both the terms “The Twelve” and “apostles” do not appear in Acts again. It seems that the “servants of the word” took over the role of the “apostles” as if they were athletes in a relay race. In Luke 1:2, these two “character roles” were anticipated by means of the expressions “eyewitnesses” and “ministers of the word.” It is, however, noticeable that Luke did not describe Matthias as an “apostle.”

It seems that for both Paul and Luke, someone could only claim to be an “apostle” if he<sup>30</sup> was a “witness of Jesus’ resurrection” (Acts 1:22; 1 Cor 15:7f). This is the reason why Paul saw himself as an “apostle,” though the “last among the apostles” (1 Cor 15:9). Apart from witnessing Jesus’ resurrection, Acts (1:22) also expected an apostle to be someone who accompanied Jesus from his baptism to his ascension (see the term “eyewitnesses” in Lk 1:2). In this regard Luke could not have been influenced by the Pauline tradition, since Paul never knew the historical Jesus. This material is peculiar to Luke (in German: *Sondergut*). It also explains why Luke, apart from Acts 14:4 and 14, preferred not to call Paul an “apostle.”<sup>31</sup>

However, the New Testament does not attest unanimously that the “apostles” were the same as “The Twelve.” We have seen that this is Matthew’s presentation. In this regard, it could be that Matthew conformed to the Jerusalem faction’s opinion. The world of Matthew seems to depict a Syrian situation (Antioch?) that reflected Pauline influence, albeit more than forty years after Paul’s contact with Antioch.<sup>32</sup> According to Meier<sup>33</sup> “(t)he viewpoint of the late-first-century church may be reflected ever so fleetingly here.” For Mark, “apostles” were emissaries who should be distinguished from the Jerusalem faction.

This distinction indicates Mark’s use of the second redactional layer (according to Burton Mack,<sup>34</sup> Q<sup>3</sup> additions) of the Sayings Gospel Q.<sup>35</sup> The tradition about Jesus addressing his followers as “lambs among wolves” originated prior to the first “formative” stratum of Q. This saying, however, does not appear in Mark. Scholars increasingly “assume the literary independence of the Sayings Gospel Q and Mark, as well as their use of some shared tradition.”<sup>36</sup> Parts of the “mission discourse” (Mk 6:6b-13, 30; Lk 10:1-22; Mt 10:1-42/43) are examples of these shared traditions.

The “formative” stratum of Q underwent at least two major redactional changes. Apart from the “formative” stratum (Q<sup>1</sup>), a second (Q<sup>2</sup>) and a third stratum (Q<sup>3</sup>) can be distinguished. The reference in the “mission discourse” (Q 10:3) to the *sending out* (u9pa/gete: i0dou a0poste/llw u9ma=j ) of “The Twelve” (Mk 6:7) / “others” (Lk 10:1) / “the twelve disciples” (Mt 10:1) as “wandering missionaries” seems to be part of the first “formative” stratum. The designation of the followers of Jesus as either “The Twelve” (Mark), “the twelve disciples” (Matthew) or simply “others” (Luke), seems not to appear in Q<sup>1</sup> but is rather the product of the three synoptics’ respective

responses to a tradition. In other words, designating the “inner circle” of the followers of Jesus as “The Twelve” represents a pre-Markan tradition.

One can infer that some uneasiness with regard to this tradition caused the synoptics to reflect on its meaning. We have seen that Mark considered it necessary to distinguish between the sending of “The Twelve” (Mk 6:7) and the successful return of “apostles” (Mk 6:3). The designation “apostles” is a Markan addition. It does not occur in the “mission discourse” found in the Q collections.<sup>37</sup> Matthew combined the concept “disciple” with “The Twelve” (Mt 10:1; 11:1), but did not report the successful completion of the mission, as did Mark and Luke.<sup>38</sup> Instead, Matthew considered it necessary to give the “twelve disciples” their own identity over the “disciples” of John the Baptist (Mt 11:2ff.). This episode appears in Luke before the commencement of the mission.

Luke emphasized that the “itinerants” were *other* persons than “The Twelve.” In Matthew’s “mission discourse,” the list of the names of “The Twelve” appears at the beginning of the mission (Mt 10:2-4), described as a mission to the “lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Mt 10:6). Jesus’ appointment of “The Twelve” and the presentation of a list of their names coincide in Mark’s gospel (Mk 3:16-19) and are reported to have happened prior to the mission (Mk 6:7ff). In Luke (6:14-16) the list of twelve names appears *before* Jesus reportedly presented a Sermon on the Plain (Lk 6:20-49) and *before* he sent *others* on a mission beyond the boundaries of the homeland of the Israelites (Lk 10:1ff). As I have said, Matthew mentioned the list at the beginning of the mission discourse (Mt 10:2) and the mission is reported to have happened *after* the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5-7). It is probably Mark’s reference that “The Twelve” were sent out “two-

by-two” (Mk 6:7) means that Matthew arranged the twelve names in six pairs. Luke saw the mission of the “seventy”/“seventy-two” as an itinerary of pairs.

The idea of the *sending out* is a Q<sup>1</sup> addition to the tradition that Jesus compared his followers with “lambs among wolves.” This addition, as is generally the case with the other Q<sup>1</sup> additions,<sup>39</sup> seemingly intended to make the Jesus sayings relevant to a larger Israelite community. It is unclear whether Q<sup>1</sup> already contained a list of the twelve names or that it should rather be seen as a Q<sup>2</sup> addition. Be that as it may, it appears that in the collections of the Sayings Gospel Q a list of “The Twelve”<sup>40</sup> was included at the second stratum phase of the tradition history of Q. But I will also argue that a pre-Markan list existed that differs from the one that was included in Q<sup>3</sup>.

This second stratum was prompted by the opposition from the ranks of Israel against the Jesus movement before the Romans destroyed the temple in 70 C.E. It led to Q<sup>2</sup> additions in which the mission to Israel was extended to the nations. After the war, the Q community sought its self-identity in light of increasing Pharisaic bigotry. Q<sup>2</sup> also introduced apocalyptic eschatology into Jesus sayings. It can be seen in the “appended prophetic threat” in Q 10:13-15.<sup>41</sup> This addition pertained to an announcement in Q 10:11 that the kingdom was near. In Q 10:13ff., it also pertained to woes against antagonized Galilean cities and to an announcement that those who rejected the “laborers” would be judged. These elements are absent from Mark. It is possible that both the proclamation of judgment and the woes against Capernaum, Gorazin, and Bethsaida as the “Galilean counterpart of Jerusalem”<sup>42</sup> should be seen as Q<sup>3</sup> additions.<sup>43</sup>

In the third stratum (i.e., the “second recension” of the “formative” stratum), the mission discourse was reinterpreted from an “universal” perspective. Both Matthew and Luke

used the third version of the Sayings Gospel Q,<sup>44</sup> but Mark was only acquainted with the second version of Q. Luke was closer to the intention of Q<sup>3</sup>, while Matthew redactionally changed some aspects of the “universal” tendency in Q<sup>3</sup>. Luke knew that the “intinerants” were not “The Twelve,” but Matthew equated them with “The Twelve.” Whereas, for Mark, “The Twelve” (Mk 6:7-13) were linked with the “apostles” (Mk 6:30-32), for Luke the concepts “disciples” and “apostles” were interchangeable.

Luke is the only witness of the tradition (either the creator thereof or he took it over from the Jerusalem faction)<sup>45</sup> that the number “twelve” was restored by the selection of Matthias after Judas’ death. In the “salvation history” scheme of Luke-Acts, this “historical” core group is separated from the “servants of the word” (such as Stephen and Paul). In the Lukan narrative the “disciples”/“apostles” fulfilled their role within the central part of the narrative (in German: the *Mitte der Mitte*). In Luke’s salvation history, the Jesus story forms the middle narrative line and should be seen as apart from the story of the prophets (the first narrative line) and the story of the church (the third narrative line). In the plot of Acts, the “servants of the word” appear later. According to Acts, they took the Jesus tradition over from Peter as the leader among the “apostles”/“disciples.” The “servants” are characters in the story of the church that began in Jerusalem with the missionary work of Peter and the other “pillars” and ended in Rome with Paul’s mission.

Paul explicitly referred only to Peter as an *apostle* (see Gl 1:17-19; 2:8). Allusions in this regard to John (the son of Zebedee) and James (the brother of Jesus) seem to be ambiguous. Within the context of Galatians 2:1-10, the reference to James and John (vs 9) in juxtaposition to Cephas (explicitly called an apostle in vs 8) could

indicate that they were included among the apostles. Also Galatians 1:19 may be read as “I did not see any other of the apostles *except* (in Greek: εἰὼ μὴ) James” or as “I did not see any other of the apostles, *but* (in Greek: εἰὼ μὴ) [I did see] James.”<sup>46</sup> In 1 Corinthians 15:9, Paul saw himself as “the last of the apostles.” Because of this reference and also his articulation “*all* the apostles” as an expansion of the “The Twelve,” it seems that Paul did not fully equate the “apostles” with “The Twelve.” He did, however, regard “The Twelve” as among the “apostles.” The context of Galatians 1 and 2 also does not clearly indicate whether Paul regarded only Peter, James (the brother of Jesus), and John (the son of Zebedee) or the entire group of “The Twelve” as the “pillars” (Gl 2:9).

In the New Testament as a whole, references to the “The Twelve” are relatively scarce:

(T)he Twelve are mentioned in the Four Gospels, in the pre-Pauline formula in 1 Cor 15:5, and in the early chapters of the Acts of the Apostles (the group called the Twelve is never mentioned after Acts 6:2, while even references to “the apostles” diminish notably after chap.8, disappearing entirely after 16:4). This exhausts all purportedly historical reports of the Twelve in the NT. They are mentioned again only fleetingly in Rev. 21:14, an apocalyptic vision of the heavenly Jerusalem at the end of time (“the twelve apostles of the Lamb”).<sup>47</sup>

According to Meier,<sup>48</sup> the “reasons for the swift disappearance or total absence of the Twelve from most of the NT are unclear.” He suggests that after the death of some members (such as the martyred James, the son of Zebedee) during the first decade after Jesus’ crucifixion, “it made little sense to continue to speak of the Twelve in regard to the present situation of the church...” Or it could be that “the power of the Twelve as a group was eclipsed by the ascendancy of individual leaders like Peter or James [the brother of

Jesus?], or some other members of the Twelve imitated Peter in undertaking a mission to Diaspora Jews in the East or the West—thus leaving no visible group of twelve leaders ‘on the scene’ in Palestine.” Meier summarizes Schmithals’ viewpoint as follows: <sup>49</sup>

(1) a life of Jesus without the Twelve, (2) the sudden creation of the Twelve after Easter as a result of a resurrection appearance, (3) the conferral of such an important and lofty status on the Twelve in the early church that the group was retrojected into various streams of NT tradition (Mark, Q, L, and John), (4) the disintegration of the Twelve quite early as the apostasy of Judas and not later that the martyrdom of James the son of Zebedee, and consequently (5) the almost total absence of the Twelve from the rest of the traditions and writings of the first-century church.

Meier regards it as specifically “complicated” when Schmithals<sup>50</sup> notes that Mark was the first to retroject “The Twelve” into the public ministry. Schmithals, like many other historical critical exegetes (e.g., the Jesus Seminar),<sup>51</sup> sees Mark’s transfiguration story (Mk 9:2-8) as a reworked edition of a story of an appearance of the risen Jesus.

The appearance tradition links up with Mark’s understanding of Jesus as Son-of-God within a Greco-Roman environment and the apostolate of the church outside the boundaries of Judean particularity. What actually happens here is that Meier expresses his disapproval of Schmithals who says that Mark was the first to “free” the Jerusalem faction from its particularistic attitude by transforming its self-designation (as though the members are “The Twelve”) into “apostles.”<sup>52</sup> By doing so, Mark in fact criticized the leaders of the Jesus faction in Jerusalem.

Although Meier sees this view as a “convoluted hypothesis,” I concur fully with Schmithals in this regard. According to Meier, Schmithals sketches the origin and

disappearance of the idea of “The Twelve” as a “meteoric rise” followed by a “meteoric fall.” It “strains credulity and in the end is totally unnecessary.”<sup>53</sup> Meier utilizes both the “criteria” of “multiple independent attestation” and “embarrassment” to argue that the “circle of the Twelve did (probably) exist during Jesus’ public ministry.” However, I will argue in light of Meier’s discussion of “multiple independent attestation” against the probability that Jesus created the idea of “The Twelve.”<sup>54</sup> Both concepts “The Twelve” and “apostles” are lacking in the earliest Jesus traditions.<sup>55</sup> The idea of “The Twelve” should rather be seen as going back to the earliest Jesus faction in Jerusalem.<sup>56</sup>

The primary evidence for this statement, from a tradition critical perspective, is that both Paul and Mark related their knowledge of the idea of “The Twelve” to their receipt of the kerygmatic tradition (i.e., the gospel about the salvation through the death and resurrection of Jesus). This tradition is said to have been taken over from the leaders in the Jerusalem faction who regarded themselves as “The Twelve.” From the ten (or eleven) times that Mark mentioned “The Twelve,” two “at least...seem firmly embedded in the pre-Markan tradition”:<sup>57</sup> the list of names in Mark 3:16-19 and the reference to Judas as “one of the Twelve” in Mark 14:43.

The following synopsis<sup>58</sup> clearly indicates that Matthew and Luke represent an independent tradition about “The Twelve” with regard to Mark :



<b>Mark</b>	<b>Matthew</b>	<b>Luke</b>	<b>Acts</b>
<b>3:16-19</b>	<b>10:2-4</b>	<b>6:14-16</b>	<b>1:13</b>

*First Group of Four*

Simon Peter	Simon Peter	Simon Peter	Simon Peter
James [son of] Zebedee	Andrew his brother	Andrew his brother	John Zebedee
John brother of James	James [son of] Zebedee	James	James
Andrew	John his brother	John	Andrew

*Second Group of Four*

Philip	Philip	Philip	Philip
Bartholomew	Bartholomew	Bartholomew	Thomas
Matthew	Thomas	Matthew	Bartholomew
Thomas	Matthew the toll collector	Thomas	Matthew

*Third Group of Four*

James [son of]	James [son of]	James [son of]	James[son of]
Alphaeus	Alphaeus	Alphaeus	Alphaeus
Thaddeus	Thaddeus	Simon the Zealot	Simon the Zealot
Simon the Cananean	Simon the Cananean	Jude [of] James	Jude [of] James
Judas Iscariot	Judas Iscariot	Judas Iscariot	

An explanation of the differences in the texts above is that a list of “The Twelve” was orally transmitted before it was taken up in the narrative gospels and that the differences occurred during the oral transmission.<sup>59</sup> According to Sanders,<sup>60</sup> Jesus referred only symbolically to his disciples as “twelve.” Consequently, it could be that there was not necessarily always a group of twelve followers around him.

Meier<sup>61</sup> does not think the lists vary much. The only name that varies in all four lists is *Thaddeus* versus *Jude of James*. According to Meier,<sup>62</sup> the “replacement of Thaddeus by Jude of James finds no explanation in the theological program or stylistic preferences of Luke.” I am in agreement with this judgment. I also agree that Luke 6:14-16 most likely represents a “tradition of the names of the Twelve that is independent of that in Mark 3:16-19.” But I disagree that this evidence “witnesses both to the existence of the Twelve during the life of Jesus and the names of the individuals who made up the Twelve.” Multiple independent attestations illustrate four other points:

- A single list that could go back to Jesus himself did not exist.
- A pre-Markan list that differed from the one that was added to Q<sup>2</sup> (in other words, a Q<sup>3</sup> addition) existed.
- The list in Q<sup>3</sup> was used by Luke and Matthew (and also known to John).
- Matthew’s list represents both an acquaintance with Q<sup>3</sup> and redactional changes of the list found in Mark.

We have seen that the list of the names of “The Twelve” appears in Matthew at the beginning of the mission discourse. The fourth point is therefore specifically important because it demonstrates that the *Sitz im Leben* of the sending of “twelve apostles” on a mission does not go back to the historical Jesus. In this regard, Kloppenborg’s remark about Matthew’s conflation of Q with Mark is relevant:<sup>63</sup>

That Matthew both conflates Q with Mark and displaces Marcan stories is a matter of empirical fact. When we encounter a Q pericope that is conflated

with a Marcan story [e.g., the *sending* (Q) of *the Twelve, designated as apostles* (Mark) and, therefore, referred to as *twelve apostles* (Matthew)] we may assume that the setting is secondary. Similarly, when a cluster of Q sayings [e.g., those relating to the “mission discourse”] is placed in such a way as to fulfil a specific function in respect to the *Marcan framework or Marcan materials* (i.e., a function it could not originally have had in Q [e.g., Mark’s presentation of the mission discourse in terms of his “sandwich-style”]), then its position is certainly secondary (emphasis by Kloppenborg, but my additions).

Yet the *difference* in the lists with regard to *Thaddeus* and *Jude of James* is not the real issue. It is the *similarity* with regard to the place of *Judas Iscariot*, despite of the respective redactional changes made by all three synoptists, that points to a common pre-Markan *Sitz im Leben*. This setting however does not go back to the historical Jesus. Both the research of John Shelby Spong (Judas was Mark’s invention) and John Dominic Crossan (Judas was a real person but Mark’s story about Judas’ betrayal is fiction with the aim to place the guilt on the Judean elite) point to a unauthentic situation.<sup>64</sup>

The most important issue is the fact that the reference to Judas Iscariot is independently linked to the “Last Supper” as an eschatological meal (cf. Mk 14:17-25; Jn 13:18-30). It is possible that Jesus could have had such a “last meal” with close followers but the interpretation of this meal as an eschatological event, in all probability, goes back to the earliest Jesus movement in Jerusalem. This evidence is also supported by John 14:22. Where Judas Iscariot referred back to John 13:18-30 and was called “Judas son of Simon Iscariot.” The context here pertains to the tradition of the “Last Supper” as an eschatological meal. Thus, in light of the diversity of the “list” tradition, we cannot affirm the existence of *a* list that could be traced to the historical Jesus.

However, we can trace the tradition of “The Twelve” back to the origins of the kerygmatic tradition because of Mark’s passion tradition with regard to Judas’ betrayal.

The “minor agreement” between Matthew 19:28 and Luke 22:30 supports my belief that the Jerusalem faction was responsible for putting itself on the pedestal of the “new” Israel. The common source of this saying is Q<sup>3</sup>.<sup>65</sup> From a post-war situation Q<sup>3</sup> reflected on the position of the Jesus movement that originated in Jerusalem. It attested to a position of trying to clarify its self-identity in light of the Pharisaic reformation at Jamnia. The difference between Matthew 19:28 and Luke 22:30 with regard to Q<sup>3</sup> is important. It demonstrates their respective attitudes towards the Jerusalem faction. These perspectives cohere with their overall ideological points of view. Matthew, who conformed to the Jerusalem tradition, wrote: “you shall sit on *twelve thrones* obtaining justice (in Greek: *kri/nontej*) for the *twelve tribes of Israel*.” Luke, who was ambivalent towards the Jerusalem tradition and, on the one hand, legitimized the “authority” of the *apostles in Jerusalem* but, on the other hand, did not regard them as “The Twelve”, wrote: “You shall sit on *thrones* obtaining justice for the *twelve tribes of Israel*.”

Meier asks:<sup>66</sup> “Did ‘the Twelve’ count as ‘apostles’ in the earliest days of the church?” Scholars such as Günter Klein and Walter Schmithals do not think so. Jürgen Roloff believes that they were.<sup>67</sup> Meier says: “It was in the early church that ‘apostle’ was first used as a set designation for a specific group—though different authors used the designation in different ways.”<sup>68</sup> Which of these opinions is correct can only be ascertained if expressions such as the “earliest days of the church” and “early church” are clarified. We must keep in mind that, since its earliest days, the “church” was a diverse

phenomenon.

Considering only the form-critical development of the disciple/apostle tradition, it has become clear that the post-Easter resurrection belief in particular influenced this tradition. This influence pertains specifically to the convictions held in Jerusalem by influential male followers of Jesus. They regarded themselves as “apostles” (i.e., legitimized “agents” of the cause of Jesus) and as the most important “prophets” (i.e., “The Twelve” analogous to the twelve patriarchs) of the “new Israel.”

The tradition history of the “disciples’ mission” be can diagrammatically be described as follows:

### **The historical Jesus**

(addressing followers as “lambs among wolves”)

### **The Jerusalem faction**

(“inner circle” was “The Twelve,” “apostles” of Jesus, the Messiah)

**Q<sup>1</sup>**

(reference to discipleship and God’s kingdom; unclear whether a list of twelve names was included)

### **Paul**

(“The Twelve” expanded to *other* “apostles” of Jesus Christ, including Paul himself)

**Q<sup>2</sup>**

(mission to larger Israelite community; a list of twelve names included and apocalyptic woes added, but without a return reported)

### **Mark**

(a list of twelve disciples *and* the mission of “The Twelve” to “Israel” [including those living in the Decapolis]; woes included and the return of the *apostles* separately reported)

**Q<sup>3</sup>**

(a list of twelve names; mission discourse included woes, but without a return reported)

### **Matthew**

(conflation of Q<sup>3</sup> with Mark: Markan list of the twelve disciples coincided with the mission of “twelve apostles” [i.e., non-Markan tradition in conformation with the Jerusalem faction] to “lost sheep of Israel” [i.e., non-Markan tradition]; woes included but no return reported [i.e., non-Markan tradition but rather Q<sup>3</sup> ])

### **Luke**

(influenced by Pauline tradition and both Q<sup>3</sup> and Mark: adapted list of twelve names and mission of seventy/seventy-two *other* apostles to Israelites, Samaritans, and Gentiles; woes included; in connection with Mark, a successful return is reported in terms of Lukan *Sondergut*)

### **Revelation**

(the “twelve apostles of the Lamb” [a tradition shared by Matthew in conformation with the Jerusalem faction; in Revelation, the expression “twelve apostles” symbolizes the “heavenly Jerusalem”]).

## From Jesus to the Church

We have seen that the Jesus of history did not see his death as a kerygma, as a gospel, as “good tidings.” Seen as “condensed history,” however, the earliest Jesus movement in Jerusalem understood the crucifixion as something intended by Jesus himself. They found proof for this in the Hebrew Scriptures. Yet there were also other early factions among the followers of Jesus. An example is the audiences to whom the Sayings Gospel Q and the Gospel of Thomas were directed. They followed Jesus simply as an “ethical model.” Seemingly, they did not need the apocalyptic kerygma (i.e., an Israelite-Hellenistic notion) of Jesus dying and rising. This kerygma originated in the Jerusalem movement and was transmitted to Paul and Mark, and from them on to other New Testament writings.

The inclusive and egalitarian perspectives presented in the sayings and deeds of the historical Jesus are the ones, which were mainly expressed fully within the faction that became known as the *church* (in Greek:  $\epsilon\omicron\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota/a$ ). This expression should be “technically” understood as reference to the faction distinguished from the *synagogue* (in Greek:  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\eta$ ). For this reason, the forming of the church cannot be viewed as being totally discontinuous to Jesus. The discontinuity pertains to the Paschal kerygma. The continuity pertains to the church’s inclusiveness and egalitarianism. Viewed historically, the establishment of the church (in German: die *entstehende Kirche*) is therefore, because of the discontinuity, not totally identical to the pre-Easter Jesus movement.<sup>69</sup>

The transition from the Jesus movement to the church represents phases of a sociological process. Historically, diversity can be indicated early. Some groups (for instance, the non-kerygmatic followers of Jesus in Northern and Trans-Jordan who, in certain later sources, were referred to as the sect of the Nazarenes and are closely related to the Ebionites) linked themselves closely to the historical Jesus, but, in fact, theirs was an exclusive and very particularly focused nationalist ideology discontinuous with the Jesus of history. It does not really matter whether these followers of Jesus are to be mentioned in the same breath as, or alongside, the Jerusalem group.

However, they must be distinguished from that Jesus movement in Antioch designated by outsiders (Romans? Or Judeans in Jerusalem?) as “Christians” (in Greek: *Xristianoï*/—see Acts 11:26; 26:28; 1 Pet 4:16). Luke’s acquaintance with the Antioch tradition probably came by way of the Pauline tradition. In this regard, one can say that between Paul and the Jesus movement in Jerusalem stood the Hellenistic churches in Antioch, Damascus, and Tarsus.<sup>70</sup> Paul was converted to this community of believers in Damascus and Antioch—a Jesus movement with a universal and egalitarian aim. It was a conversion that was described by Paul himself as the experience that the Crucified One still lived, that God had made known his “Son” (Jesus) to him (Paul) (Gl 2:12, 16), and that he (Paul) was crucified with the Crucified One, so that he was now living with the Crucified One (Gl 2:20; Phlp 3:10-11). The origins of the movement that is called “Christianity” are grounded in the kerygma of this “new life.”

The pre-Easter Jesus movement and the establishment of the post-Easter church cannot therefore be absolutely separated from each other.<sup>71</sup> This continuity is, as far as the process of group forming is concerned, like links in a chain. The first link represents



the phase during which an isolated group within the boundaries of a parent body<sup>72</sup> comes into being. The “parent body,” in this case, was “Israel” (consisting of diverse groups like the Sadducees, Pharisees, Essenes, and Samaritans), defining themselves genealogically by means of the metaphor “family”<sup>73</sup> and, indeed, in the physical sense as the “children of Abraham.” The start of the first phase may be situated historically in the time when Jesus was still identifying closely with John the Baptist and started attracting disciples (followers).

### **From Faction to Sect to Church**

“Christianity” came into being as a set of factions within Israel. Differences and tensions about particular matters (especially as far as the resurrection faith, the nonphysical understanding of the concept “children of Abraham,” and the belief in the miraculous conception of Jesus were concerned) lead to the development of “Christianity,” which consisted of different factions, into a sect that eventually became the church (in Greek: *e0kk1hsi/a*), independent from and opposed to the synagogue (in Greek: *sunagwh/*).

The nonphysical understanding of the concept “children of Abraham” is particularly well expressed in Romans 9:8.<sup>74</sup> Here the “children of God” form a fictive family. As we have already seen, this concept can be traced back to Jesus. Jesus, whose relationship to his own family was tense, cherished the notion of an imaginary familial structure. In this fictive family, God fulfilled the role of Father. The mutual relations

between the members of the family as brothers and sisters were not necessarily determined by biological, and therefore, ethnic kinship.

This understanding of God formed the basis of the social constitution of Christianity. It is the basis of the fundamental difference between Israel and the church. Israel also used the metaphor “family” to indicate the bonds that invisibly linked Israelites to one another. Herein lay the justification for the excommunication of groups like the Samaritans and the Christians. According to the Pauline and Johannine traditions, Christians formed the “spiritual” Israel, while those belonging to the Judean temple formed the cult, “Israel in the flesh.” Genealogy indicated the bonding of the latter.<sup>75</sup>

In this regard, the genealogical register of Jesus and the nativity and childhood narratives in the gospel of Matthew reflect in a remarkable way the break between the church and the synagogue. Jesus’ “sonship of Abraham” does not exist on the basis of physical kinship. The infancy narrative in the gospel of Matthew emphasizes God’s legitimization of Jesus as child of God. The metaphor “the church as the household of God” has its origins in these Jesus events. It also explains the fundamental distinction between the synagogue and the church. This break between the synagogue and the church,<sup>76</sup> that is, the coming into being and rise of the church, can be studied as a movement from a faction to a sect.

When a person became conscious of the necessity of change and started sharing this consciousness with others he or she cherished the expectation that change within a particular cultural context could be brought about successfully. Small groups then formed.<sup>77</sup> The investigations of sociologists into the factors that gave rise to factions in

society help us to understand the establishment of the church. Four prerequisites for the forming of small groups can be distinguished:<sup>78</sup>

- conditions for change are favorable;
- a vision of a new situation comes into being;
- this vision is accompanied by the expectation that change will be brought about successfully;
- the social system (society) within which the change is brought about inherently contains the possibility of accommodating or facilitating problem-solving groups.

Favorable conditions for change were the manipulation of the Roman Empire (and the Herodians as its client kings) and the exploitative and exclusive temple ideology of the Judeans centered in Jerusalem. During the time of the historical Jesus, the Jerusalem cult was an outrage and led to the formation of the different factions among the Jesus movement. The historical Jesus offered an alternative order for life and redefined the concept of power as compassion. He did this by his ironical use of “kingdom” as the apogee of power in the sense of imperial rule. Through his (often metaphoric) words and deeds, he himself became the living symbol of a vision that focused on both his conception of God and on society in terms of a father-child relationship. In spite of being considered alienated from God, fervor that the above-mentioned vision might offer special opportunities to authentic life for outcasts loomed.

Historically, this conversion to a new life was a phenomenon in both pre-Paschal and post-Paschal Jesus movements. In the Jerusalem and Pauline movements, one finds

such an “alternative consciousness” expressed in the resurrection faith. During the period before 70 C.E., the relative accommodating spirit prevalent within a variety of Judaism (Sadducees, Pharisees, and Essenes—the severe antagonism against the “impure” Joseph tribe [the Samaritans] was an exception to the rule) made possible the forming of Jesus factions. The increasing intolerance after 70 C.E. resulting from the Pharisaic reformation<sup>79</sup> at the “Jamnia Academy” and at centers of scribal activity in Galilee and Syria caused the Jesus factions to develop into sects and ultimately into “churches” independent of and opposed to Judaism. The following phases<sup>80</sup> may, sociologically speaking, be distinguished in the forming of groups: forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning.

In the period of *forming*, Jesus shared his alternative vision with similarly disillusioned people who suffered as a result of oppressive circumstances and alienation from God. This is the phase of the pre-Easter Jesus movement. The period of *storming* pertains to the actions of the Herodian dynasty, village leaders in Galilee and Judean “royalties” against the cause of Jesus. Against the background of the brutality of Roman imperial might, Jesus’ life culminated in the traumatic events of the crucifixion. The confusion of his bewildered disciples led to a highly diverse post-Easter Jesus movement. The recovery of a section, first led by Peter and then by James, the brother of Jesus, within the Jerusalem movement was accomplished through their resurrection faith.<sup>81</sup> The diversity was probably a result of the following set of factors:

- The search for an identity in view of the development away from, first, the Judean ideology in Jerusalem and, later, the Pharisaic movement at Jamnia and in Galilee/Syria.
- The issue of whether the vision of Jesus has to be seen as the “narrow gate,” in contradistinction to the temple cult and the Pharisaic movement as the “wide gate.”<sup>82</sup>
- The issue of how to interpret the nature of Jesus’ death. Foremost, one finds among the “pillars of faith” in Jerusalem the apocalyptic inference that Jesus’ martyr-like vicarious death should be seen as a “ransom for many.” This tradition was also taken over by Paul and Mark and authors depending on them. It is an assessment that could be influenced by questions as to how the offense caused by the scandal of the crucifixion could be overcome (Jesus’ brother, James); how one could make peace with intense sorrow because of denial (Peter) or because of persecution of those who proclaimed Jesus’ cause (Paul); and how one could deal with intense personal reminiscences (Mary Magdalene)?
- The issue of the crossing of the boundaries between Israel and the Gentiles (including the Samaritans). Was this a logical consequence of Jesus’ compassionate vision towards degraded people and of his pushing against the conventions of the Judean purity regulations through which the particularistic temple ideology, the calendar, and the idea of the ethnically circumcised children of Abraham were maintained?
- The issue of whether faith in/like Jesus required obedience to the Torah (e.g., the Jerusalem faction and Matthew who shared this view) or not (e.g., Paul).

During the *norming* phase, a degree of cohesion developed as a result of certain compromises. This was the period of the institutionalizing of the church and could also be referred to as “the institutionalization of authority.” During this time, the antihierarchical and symbolic nature of Jesus’ message resulted in imaginary household structures (Luke-Acts, 1 Timothy, writings of the Apostolic Fathers). However, the inclusive vision of Jesus and people like Paul was organized into structures that were not characterized by ethnic limitation, even though the biological and hierarchical family remained the metaphor for this “spiritual” and egalitarian “family.”

The period of *performing* pertains to the transition from the initial “missionary work” across boundaries (the epistles of Paul and the Pauline traditions in Luke-Acts) to “missionary work” towards the marginalized, like widows (also among the Hellenists) and Samaritans, by the Stephen-Philip group, orphans, street children, and those possessed by demons (see, e.g., evidence in Luke-Acts and the Gospel of Matthew, the writings of Clement of Alexandria, the author of the letter to Diognetus and 1 Timothy).

The *adjourning* phase has to do with the potential destruction of the church. This was a strong possibility already in the initial phase of the pre-Paschal Jesus movement. Yet although this social-scientific theory of group formation mainly concerns the forming and dissolution of “small groups,” the aspect relating to the adjourning of groups may also be applied to the post-Paschal church as an institute. Dissolution (“adjourning”) was, during the post-Paschal period (and still is today), a possibility that should not be ignored. Facets of it may be:

- Early on, the pre-Easter Jesus movement was confronted with the “scandal” of both Jesus’ “birth from a (humble) woman” (Paul, in Gl 4:4) and his scandalous crucifixion, as if he were a criminal. In the post-Easter phase, the Jesus movement made a thoroughfare of what seemed to be a cul-de-sac. The words and acts of Jesus live on in the honorific names his followers granted him. The offense of the cross was overcome by means of the resurrection faith.
- The ascetic (later, Gnostic) Christians were first confronted with the separation between the synagogue and the church (the *aposunagogos* movement) and later the ecclesiastical councils. The first refers to the abandonment by Christians of the synagogue and the latter to the formation of the New Testament canon and the ontologic-metaphysical dogma of “two natures” of Jesus as human and divine. Gnostics did not like the First Testament. They did not like the Creator-God of Israel at all. On the other hand, the synagogue did not distinguish between the Jesus factions. Some “Christian” communities, to a greater or lesser extent, conformed to many aspects of synagogical ideas and caused an increasing hostility against the Gnostics in their midst. Because of the anti-Arian movement<sup>83</sup> and the ecclesiastical councils in the fourth century, Gnostic Christianity, in the end, did not survive. The reopening in 1947 of the “Nag Hammadi Library” may cause their writings to breathe new life into similar contemporary thinking.
- The “non-kerygmatic” Jesus followers did not proclaim Jesus in apocalyptic sense in terms of the formula buried, resurrected, and ascended. They regarded him as an ethical exemplar. This group expanded not only into an ascetic movement but also formed the group in Trans-Jordan, known as the “Ebionite Nazarenes.” These people

- At the beginning, the Constantinian-Catholic church was confronted by the supporters of Arius. Later, Roman-Catholicism was challenged by the influence of the Renaissance, humanism, Socinianism,<sup>84</sup> and sixteenth-century Reformation. The church of the Reformation, too, has always had to struggle against the hierarchical system hidden in its bosom.
- Modern Christendom is being confronted with institutionalization and secularization. But this “offense,” too, can be overcome if we can share the consciousness that the cause of Jesus has the dynamics to provide meaning to disillusioned people living in depressing circumstances in a plural and multicultural, post-modern world. But there are certain conditions: the inhibitory effect of institutionalization, that dooms the church, must be opposed, and secularization must be seen as an opportunity for the church to be “church for the world.” Seen in this way, we can still say today, in the words of Willi Marxsen: *Die Sache Jesu geht weiter!*<sup>85</sup> The cause of Jesus is still on its way!



## END NOTES

1. These words intentionally resemble that of Ernst Käsemann 1960, “Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie,” p. 180: “Die Apokalyptik ist–da man die Predigt Jesu nicht eigentlich als Theologie bezeichnen kann–die Mutter aller christlichen Theologie gewesen.” However, Käsemann’s expression “all Christian theology” should be reduced to only the theology of the Jesus faction in Jerusalem. Other “Christian” factions, contemporaneous to that in Jerusalem (e.g., the communities respectively responsible for the formative stratum of the Sayings Gospel Q and the first layer of the Gospel of Thomas), did not interpret the Jesus event from an apocalyptic perspective but from a sapiential one.
2. Trilling, W. 1978, “‘Implizite Ekklesiologie’: Ein Vorschlag zum Thema Jesus und die Kirche,” p. 68.
3. Vermes, G. 1993, *The Religion of Jesus*, pp. 214-215.
4. See Schillebeeckx, E. 1974, *Jezus: Het Verhaal van Een Levende*, p. 38; Schille, G. 1994, “Die Jesusbewegung und die Entstehung der Kirche,” p. 104.
5. Cf. Lüdemann, G. [1994] 1994, *The Resurrection of Jesus: History, Experience, Theology*, pp. 68, 100, 170, 176-177, with regard to Peter and Paul, and the Jesus Seminar with regard to Mary Magdalene, *contra* Lüdemann, p. 160.
6. Schlüssler Fiorenza, E. 1994, *Jesus–Miriam’s Child, Sophia’s Prophet: Critical Issues in Feminist Christology*, p. 122.
7. Cf. Bousset, W. [1913] 1926, *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus*, pp. 76-77.
8. Dodd, C.H. [1936] 1956, “The Primitive Preaching,” p. 16.
9. Cf. Conzelmann, H. 1988, “History of Early Christianity,” p. 341.
10. Cf. Conzelmann, H. 1973, *Jesus*, p. 94.
11. Cf. Conzelmann, H. 1988, “History of Early Christianity,” pp. 341-342.
12. Meier, J. P. 1997, “The Circle of the Twelve: Did it Exist during Jesus’ Public Ministry?,” p. 637.
13. Meier, J. P. 1997, “The Circle of the Twelve,” p. 638.
14. Meier, J. P. 1997, “The Circle of the Twelve,” p. 638 note 8.
15. See Van Aarde, A.G. 1994, *God-with-us: The Dominant Perspective in Matthew’s Story, and Other Essays*, pp. 56-57.

16. Meier, J. P. 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve," p. 638 note 8.
17. Metzger, B.M. 1971, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, p. 69.
18. Meier, J. P. 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve," p. 639 note 11; cf. also Meye, R.P.1968, *Jesus and the Twelve*, p. 190.
19. See Schmithals, W. 1986, *Das Evangelium nach Markus: Kapitel 9,2-16,20*, pp. 737-738; Meier, J. P. 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve," p. 639.
20. See Best, E. [1983] 1985, *Mark: The Gospel as Story*, p. 11.
21. See Rhoads, D. & Michie, D. 1982, *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*, pp. 47-49,
22. See Neiryneck, F. 1972, *Duality in Mark: Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction*, on the "two-step progression" as a Markan rhetorical device.
23. Rhoads, D. & Michie, D. 1982, *Mark as Story*, p. 47.
24. Cf. Seim, T.K. 1994, *Patterns in Gender in Luke-Acts*, p. 21.
25. See Luke's (10:1) use of the verb ἀποστε/llw.
26. In Greek: εἰτε/rouj.
27. See Van Tilborg, S. 1972, *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew*, p. 1.
28. See Van Aarde, A.G. 1994, *God-with-us: The Dominant Perspective in Matthew's Story*, p. 242.
29. See Van Aarde, A.G. 1994, *God-with-us*, pp. 54-59.
30. It seems that Luke (see Lk 24:10f, 22f) and Paul (see the omission in 1 Cor 15:3-8) found it difficult to take the witness of women, such as Mary Magdelene, seriously.
31. Schmithals, W. 1982, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*, p. 131, refers to Paul's "apostleship" in Acts as follows: "In V.4 überrascht wie in V.14 die Bezeichnung 'Apostel' für Paulus und Barnabas. Da Lukas den Aposteltitel im übrigen für die Zwölf Apostel reserviert, um sie wegen ihrer unwiederholbaren Rolle am Beginn der apostolischen Tradition auszuzeichnen (vgl. 1,21f.), dürfte im vorliegenden Fall die Bezeichnung 'Apostel' für Paulus und Barnabas auf die Quelle des Lukas zurückgehen. Natürlich hat Lukas diese Bezeichnung nicht ohne Bedacht übernommen (oder ggf. eingeführt). Daß Paulus selbst sich mit Betonung 'Apostel' nannte, war Lukas ohne Frage bekannt. Er konzidiert diese Benennung auch, freilich in der hier vorliegenden funktionalen Weise: Paulus ist Apostel nur wie Barnabas in dem allgemeinen Sinn, in dem man die christliche Missionäre, die von Antiochien abgesandt wurden (13, 1-3), 'Apostel' (= Abgesandte) nennen konnte. Mit dem genuin lukanischen Apostelbegriff, wie er in 1,21f. dargelegt wird, hat der Apostolat des Paulus nichts zu tun. Eben dies

32. According to David Sim 1998, “Are the least included in the kingdom of heaven? The meaning of Matthew 5:19,” pp. 573-587, Matthew was highly critical of Paul and his alleged “law-free” gospel.
33. Meier, J. P. 1997, “The Circle of the Twelve,” p. 639 note 12.
34. Mack, B.L.1993, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q & Christian Origins*, pp. 177-179.
35. According to Burton Mack, *The Lost Gospel*, pp. 128-130, the mission itself was also part of the first stratum of Q and the saying regarding the lambs and wolves was earlier (a saying of the historical Jesus?). Mack therefore supports me in this regard. The following judgmental pronouncements against towns that rejected the Jesus movement are Q<sup>2</sup> additions. For Mack, the Q<sup>3</sup> additions were added shortly after the war and it is this stratum that “was subsumed by the authors of the narrative gospels later in the century” (Mack 1993:172). The Q<sup>3</sup> additions represent “(1) the mythology of Jesus as the son of God, (2) the relationship of Jesus as the son of God to the temple in Jerusalem, and (3) the authority of the scriptures” (Mack 1993, p. 173). Kloppenborg, J.S. 1987, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*, p. 101, refers to Q<sup>1</sup> as the “formative” stratum, to Q<sup>2</sup> as the “first recension” (see Kloppenborg 1987, pp. 167-170) and to Q<sup>3</sup> as the “second recension” (Kloppenborg 1987, pp. 238-243). Jacobson, A.D. 1992, *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q*, p. 49, explains it as follows: “What we have, therefore, are two basic recensions of Q, followed by a third stage during which only the temptation account (Q 4:1-13) was added.” Q<sup>1</sup> represents a “sapiential” layer and contains sayings with regard to discipleship, poverty and the Kingdom of God. This layer entails the redaction of earlier sayings by a “missionary-sending community” (cf. Jacobson 1992:50). According to Kloppenborg Q<sup>3</sup> was induced because of the “failure of the mission to Israel. Q<sup>3</sup> added material concerning the announcement of judgment in an apocalyptic fashion. My disagreement with Mack’s stratification pertains to both the date of the writing of Mark and that the above-mentioned Q<sup>3</sup> additions should be regarded as part of the second stratum. I do not think that Mark was written almost half a decade after the war, but rather in the immediate aftermath of the war. The third stratum represents those sayings that pertain to the self-identity of the Q community over against the Jamnia Academy. Matthew and Luke made use of the Sayings Gospel Q in its final redactional stage, but the Q known to Mark represents the second redactional layer.

36. Jacobson, A.D. 1992, *The First Gospel* p. 62 note 2; cf. *inter alia* Lührmann, D. 1989, “The Gospel of Mark and the Sayings Collection Q,” pp. 51-71. The following advice of Arland Jacobson 1992, p. 62 note 2, is worth taking into consideration: “For the study of the theology of Q, it is advisable to include only those possibly shared traditions where there is significant evidence of Q, and where there is sufficient recoverable Q material to support the argument that this material presents a point of view different from Mark’s. I include among these esp. Mark 1:1-8; 4:30-32; 6:6b-13; 8:11-13 and their Q parallels.”
37. See Jacobson, A.D. 1992, *The First Gospel*, pp. 138-139.
38. See Van Aarde, A.G. 1994, *God-with-us*, p. 103.
39. Cf. Kloppenborg, J.S. 1987, *The Formation of Q*, p. 200.
40. See Schürmann, H. 1969, *Das Lukasevangelium, I: Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-9,50*, pp. 318-319, and Schneider, G. 1980, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Erster Band, p. 206, with regard to Luke’s relationship to Q.
41. See Jacobson, A.D. 1992, *The First Gospel*, p. 68.
42. Van Aarde, A.G. 1994, *God-with-us*, p. 124.
43. Jacobson, A.D. 1992, *The First Gospel*, p. 68, does not distinguish between three layers as such, but rather describes the “theology” of Q as a literary unit, consisting of sayings that are added linearly. He explains Q in light of the above-mentioned absence from Mark as follows: “In contrast to Mark, who omits any reference to the kingdom, Q makes it clear that in the person of the ‘laborers’ the kingdom draws near to Israel, and that this means judgment, so that those in Israel who reject the ‘laborers’ reject God and bring wrath upon themselves. What we have in Q, therefore, is not really a mission at all but rather an errand of judgment. The results seem predetermined, for the discourse opens with a saying describing the laborers as lambs in the midst of wolves. Here the image of God’s lamb, Israel, in the midst of hostile Gentile wolves has been sarcastically inverted. The appended prophetic threat (Q 10:13-15), which says that Gentiles would have responded better than Israel, assumes the failure of the call for Israel to return to Yahweh.”
44. The Q version used by Matthew and Luke represents the “final” addition. This version, according to Kloppenborg, J.S. 1987, *The Formation of Q*, pp. 246-262, includes the last addition, namely the “temptation” report (cf. Jacobson, A.D. 1992, *The First Gospel*, pp. 94-95).
45. This possibility would be in accordance with the probability that Luke received the outline for his representation of the “apostolic preaching” (e.g., that of Peter and Paul) in

46. Meier, J. P. 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve," p. 640 note 15.
47. Meier, J. P. 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve," p. 670.
48. Meier, J. P. 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve," p. 671.
49. Meier, J. P. 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve," pp. 671-672 note 83; Schmithals, W. [1961]1969, *The Office of Apostle in the Early Church*, pp. 96-70.
50. Schmithals, W. 1972, "Der Markusschluß: Die Verklärungsgeschichte und die Aussendung der Zwölf," pp. 398-401.
51. Cf. Funk, R.W.(& The Jesus Seminar) 1998, *The Acts of Jesus: What Did Jesus Really Do?*, p. 106.
52. Schmithals, W. 1986, *Das Evangelium nach Markus: Kapitel 9,2-16,20*, pp. 736-737: "Die missionarischen Aktivität der Urgemeinde setzt vermutlich das 'Messiasbekenntnis des Petrus' voraus; denn eigentlich christliche Verkündigung gibt es erst mit dem Glauben an Jesus als den 'Sohn Gottes': 'Dies ist mein geliebter Sohn; hört auf ihn [Mk 9:7]!' Dadurch werden die Zwölf, anfangs die Repräsentanten der endzeitlichen Gemeinde, welche die apokalyptisch vorgestellte Äonenwende erwarten, zu den 'Zwölf Aposteln.'"
  53. Meier, J. P. 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve," p. 672 note 83.
  54. See Denaux, A. 1966, "Did Jesus Found the Church?," pp. 25-45, for a list of scholars who argue pro and contra the historicity of the belief that the historical Jesus constituted "The Twelve." For arguments used on both sides, see Klein, G. 1961, *Die Zwölf Apostel: Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee*, pp. 34-37. Among the scholars from a previous generation who "affirm the existence of the Twelve during Jesus' ministry" are W.G. Kummel, H. von Campenhausen, G. Bornkamm, and J. Gnilka. Among those who questioned the possibility are J. Wellhausen, J. Weiss, E. Hirsch, R. Bultmann, P. Vielhauer, W. Schmithals, H. Braun, G. Schille, S. Schulz, and H. Conzelmann (cf. Meier, J.P. 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve: Did It Exist during Jesus' Public Ministry?," p. 643 note 22.). Recently E.P. Sanders 1985, *Jesus and Judaism*, pp. 11, 98-106 (see also Sanders, E.P. 1993, *The Historical Figure of Jesus*, pp. 169-195) and J.P. Meier 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve: Did It Exist during Jesus' Public Ministry"?, pp. 643-672, have been among the "positivists" and J.D. Crossan 1995, *Who Killed Jesus?*, p. 75, and

55. E.g., miracles, chreias, apothegms, and controversy reports.
56. Cf. Conzelmann, H. 1988, "History of Early Christianity," pp. 341-342. Schmithals, W. 1986, *Das Evangelium nach Markus: Kapitel 9,2-16,20*, p. 733, puts it as follows: "Die Konstituierung des Kreises der Zwölf fällt in die früheste Zeit der Jerusalemer Urgemeinde, wie aus 1 Kor 15,5 hervorgeht. Ob die Zwölf durch eine Erscheinung des Auferstandenen berufen wurden oder ob sie sich auf die Erscheinung vor Petrus hin zusammenfanden und dann dem Auferstandenen begegneten, sei dahingestellt. Sie verstehen sich offenbar als Repräsentanten jener eschatologischen Heilsgemeinde des neuen Israel (vgl. Lk 22,29f.), die wie anfänglich auch Petrus [Mk 9,5f.] in Jesu Auferstehung den Anbruch der allgemeinen Totenaufstehung sah (1 Kor 15,20). Vielleicht repräsentierte jeder der Zwölf einen der Stämme Israels; jedenfalls bildeten sie den 'Ältestenrat' der Heilsgemeinde (vgl. Bar 8,3)."
57. Meier, J.P. 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve," p. 644; cf. Schmahl, G. 1972, "Die Berufung der Zwölf im Markusevangelium," pp. 203-213; Trilling, W. 1977, "Zur Entstehung der Zwölferkreises: Eine geschichtskritische Überlegung," pp. 204-206; Kertelge, K. 1969, "Die Funktion der 'Zwölf' im Markusevangelium," pp. 193-206.
58. Taken from Meier, J.P. 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve," p. 646.
59. Meye, R.P. 1968, *Jesus and the Twelve*, pp. 200-201.
60. Sanders, E.P. 1985, *Jesus and Judaism*, p. 102.
61. Meier, J.P. 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve," pp. 647-648.
62. Meier, J.P. 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve," p. 652.
63. Kloppenborg, J.S. 1987, *The Formation of Q*, p. 72.
64. See Funk, R.W. (& The Jesus Seminar) 1998, *The Acts of Jesus: What Did Jesus Really Do?*, pp. 136-137.
65. See Mack, B.L. 1993, *The Lost Gospel*, p. 205.
66. Meier, J.P. 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve," p. 636.
67. Günter Klein, G. 1961, *Die zwölf Apostel: Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee*; Schmithals, W. 1969, *The Office of Apostle in the Early Church*; Roloff, J. 1965, *Apostolat – Verkündigung – Kirche*, pp. 57-60.
68. Meier, J.P. 1997, "The Circle of the Twelve," p. 64.
69. See Schille, G. 1994, "Die Jesusbewegung und die Entstehung der Kirche," p. 106.

70. See Wilhelm Bousset 1926, *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusbis Irenaeus*, p. 75. Cf. also Schmithals, W. 1994, *Theologiegeschichte des Urchristentums*, pp. 88, 90.
71. Cf. Schille, G. 1994, “Die Jesusbewegung und die Entstehung der Kirche,” p. 104.
72. Cf. White, L.M. 1988, “Shifting Sectarian Boundaries in Early Christianity,” pp. 7-9; Stanton, G.N. 1992, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*, pp. 89-91.
73. See Neusner, J. 1987, “Israel: Judaism and its Social Metaphors,” pp. 331-361.
74. See Schmithals, W. 1994, *Theologiegeschichte des Urchristentums*, p. 156.
75. See Neusner, J. 1987, “Israel: Judaism and its Social Metaphors.”
76. Cf. Schmithals, W. 1994, *Theologiegeschichte des Urchristentums*, pp. 86, 111, 118, 169-176.
77. See Malina, B.J. 1994, “Early Christian Groups: Using Small Group Formation Theory to Explain Christian Organizations,” p. 6.
78. See Malina, B.J. 1994, “Early Christian Groups.”
79. See Neusner, J. 1973, *From Politics to Piety*.
80. See Tuckman, B.W. 1965, “Developmental Sequence in Small Groups,” pp. 384-399; cf. Malina, B.J. 1994, “Early Christian Groups.”
81. Cf. Lüdemann, G. 1994, *The Resurrection of Jesus: History, Experience, Theology*, p. 176.
82. With regard to the Sayings Gospel Q as evidence, see, *inter alia*, Horsley, R.A. 1989, *Sociology and the Jesus Movement*; Kloppenborg, J.S. 1993, “The Sayings Gospel Q: Recent Opinion on the People behind the Document,” pp. 20-21.
83. Arian christology denied that Christ was of the same “substance” as God, and thereby denied that Jesus was simultaneously “true” divine and “true” human.
84. Socinianism was a school of theological thought in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century that denied Anselmus’ view of Christ’s death as satisfaction. “While accepting the finality of God’s revelation in Christ, it nevertheless argued as follows: If God forgives sin, satisfaction is unnecessary; if there was satisfaction, then forgiveness is an illusion. In this context Christ was seen as a supreme example to all Christians and as an ordinary man chosen by God to be head of the church” (Deist, F. 1984, *A Concise Dictionary of Theological Terms*, p. 159).
85. Marxsen, W. 1976, “Jesus–Bringer oder Inhalt des Evangeliums?,” in *Die Sache Jesu geht weiter*, pp. 45-62.