

I

Introduction

And I Paul, the least of the apostles, give you bishops and presbyters these commands concerning the canons. Those who are first approaching the mystery of piety, let them be led by the deacons to the bishop or the presbyters.¹

This is a book about the reception of the Apostle Paul – doubly so, in fact. On the one hand, it primarily explores an important but unappreciated aspect of the early reception of Paul that shaped his developing profile in the early Church from the late second century through the fourth century: namely, the close link forged between the Apostle and the catechumenate. On the other hand, it is about the reception of Paul in the sense that it provides the occasion to offer some broader reflections on the meaning and contemporary value of reception-historical approaches to Paul. The question, then, is not only “what happened when the early Christians read about Paul?” but also “what, if anything, do these early readings mean for interpreters of Paul today?” The epigraph above is the starting point for this double investigation, which is perhaps best introduced simply by jumping in, beginning at the end of the development to be traced in subsequent chapters.

¹ CA 8.32 (ed. Marcel Metzger, *Les constitutions apostoliques*, 3 vols., SC 320, 329, 336 (Paris: Cerf, 1985–1987)) – Κἀγὼ Παῦλος ὁ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐλάχιστος, τάδε διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐπισκόποις καὶ πρεσβυτέροις περὶ κανόνων. Οἱ πρῶτως προσιόντες τῷ μυστηρίῳ τῆς εὐσεβείας διὰ τῶν διακόνων προσαγέσθωσαν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἢ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις. Note that all translations of primary and secondary literature are my own unless otherwise noted. For the most part, I will only list the edition for the first citation.

I.1 PAUL AT THE END OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

Sometime toward the end of the fourth century, an anonymous ecclesial leader, perhaps in Syria, compiled a work we know as the *Constitutiones apostolorum*. To produce this new church order document, the writer incorporated revised versions of at least three previous prominent church order documents that were already circulating in Syria: the *Didache*, the *Didascalia apostolorum*, and the *Traditio apostolica*. Although the compiler evidently had Arian theological tendencies, the treatises he appropriated were not themselves Arian, a fact that led him to recast and update his sources to fit with his theology and ecclesial praxis.²

In book 8 of this rather sprawling work, each of the apostles is brought forward – in roughly Matthean order (Matt. 10:2–4) – to declare their own canons for the Church. Paul, who is inserted after Matthias, begins his declamation with the epigraph that opens this chapter (CA 8.32):

And I Paul, the least of the apostles, command you, bishops and presbyters, these things concerning the canons. Those who are first approaching the mystery of piety, let them be led by the deacons to the bishop or the presbyters.

What follows is a discussion of the catechetical process, providing particular guidance on which vocations are suitable for baptism (with the repeated phrase “let one cease or let one be cast away”) and how best to assess the character of one requesting baptism.³

As we shall see in the next chapter, this concern for moral preparation is part and parcel of the catechumenate throughout its development into the fourth century. In fact, the material for this section of the *Constitutiones apostolorum* is drawn from the *Traditio apostolica*, which contains an important witness to the development of the catechumenate in the third century. The discussion of catechesis and baptism there supplies many details about Christian initiation lacking from other church order documents appropriated by the editor of the *Constitutiones*

² See the discussion of sources in Metzger, *Constitutions*, vol. 1, pp. 14–18 (who also notes the use of the *Canones apostolorum* in CA 8.47; see also F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et constitutiones apostolorum* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schönigh, 1905–1906), vol. 1, pp. xviii–xix; Edward J. Yarnold, “Baptismal catechesis,” in Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold (eds.), *The Study of Liturgy* (London: SPCK, 1978), pp. 59–60; Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, 2nd edn (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 84–86) and the theology of the text in Metzger, *Constitutions*, vol. II, pp. 10–39.

³ CA 8.32 *passim* – παυσάσθω ἢ ἀποβαλλέσθω.

apostolorum, including the concern for the vocation of initiates. Paul's presence, however, is particularly notable in CA 8.32 because it has been added to the underlying source material by the late fourth-century editor.⁴

In the majority of church rules, the voices of the apostles are combined near the beginning for the weight of their unified authority. For example, in the proem of the third-century *Didascalia*, the author writes with the collective authority of “the twelve apostles...with Paul the apostle to the Gentiles and James the bishop” of Jerusalem.⁵ The *Traditio apostolica* appears to have had a similar literary artifice at the beginning, though the fragmentary state of the manuscript tradition at that point makes certain determinations of how the apostles were referred to and which of them were included difficult.⁶ What is much less common, however, is the presence of individual apostolic voices. But for the compiler of the *Constitutiones apostolorum*, just as Peter, the chief apostle, has become responsible for the canons regarding the appointment of bishops (CA 8.4), Paul has become the apostle of initiation, directing the late fourth-century readers in the principal moral tasks of the catechumenate.

⁴ It is also worth noting that, while Paul's name does appear at the beginning of the *Didascalia apostolorum*, he is not a regular fixture in Church order documents. He (and his influence) is famously absent in the *Didache*. The Sahidic witness to the *Traditio apostolica* (TA), included in the *Apostolic Church Order*, omits Paul, as do the *Canones apostolorum*, transmitted in the same manuscript; Paul de LaGarde, *Aegyptica* (Göttingen: Arnold Hoyer, 1883), 209–238. It simply mentions “the apostles,” who transmit the canons to the church via “Clement.” Moreover, the *Canons of Hippolytus* address the catechumenate, but are not associated with Paul (Paul F. Bradshaw (ed.), *The Canons of Hippolytus*, trans. Carol Bebawi, Grove Liturgical Study 50 (Bramcote, Notts.: Grove Books, 1987)).

⁵ *Didasc. apost.* Proem, in Arthur Vööbus (ed.), *The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac*, 4 vols., CSCO 401, 402, 407, 408 (Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO, 1979), pp. 9–10; see also the second title to the *Didache* – Διδασχὴ κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

⁶ Further discussion of these textual issues are in Chapter 2.3.5 below. See also the comments on the introduction in Paul F. Bradshaw *et al.*, *The Apostolic Tradition: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), pp. 20–23. Moreover, the Sahidic witness to the TA is part of an ostensibly continuous text with the preceding *Apostolic Church Order*, which begins: “These are the canons of our fathers, the holy apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ (ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲕⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲓⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲧ ⲟⲩⲁⲗⲁⲛ ⲛⲁⲓⲓⲱⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁⲩⲟⲓⲥ ⲛⲓⲟⲩⲥ ⲛⲉⲕⲣⲓⲧⲟⲥ), which were appointed for the church. ‘Rejoice, oh our sons and daughters, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ!’ said John with Matthew, Peter, Andrew, Philip, Simon, James, Nathaniel, Thomas, Cephas, Bartholomew, and Judas the brother of James” (de LaGarde, *Aegyptica*, p. 239). The full manuscript is presented by de LaGarde, while the newer corrected edition and translation of Walter Till and Johannes Leipoldt, *Der koptische Text der Kirchenordnung Hippolyts*, TU 58 (Berlin: Akademie, 1954), reproduces only the text of the TA.

On its own, this text would merely be an interesting piece of trivia: which apostle gets which church canon? It is *not* on its own, however. Around the same time that the *Constitutiones apostolorum* was being compiled, a certain Euthalius appears to have been shaping his own edition of Paul's letters, which included a number of paratextual features: chapter titles (κεφάλαια-τίτλοι), book summaries (ὑποθέσεις), and prologues (πρόλογοι) for each block of texts – Paul's letters, Acts, and the Catholic Epistles.⁷ According to Eric Scherbenske, both the manuscript edition and the paratextual features were designed with “catechetical and paraenetic” goals in view.⁸ The author makes this clear at the end of the Prologue to Paul's letters. “Thus the book as a whole includes every aspect of proper way of life arranged according to progress.”⁹

This purpose, however, is not only that of Euthalius but is also presented as the purpose of the Pauline epistles themselves. As he says earlier in the Epitome to Paul's letters, “the letter to the Romans contains a catechism of Christ, in particular through an argument based on natural reasoning. This is why it is placed first, as a letter written to people whose devotion was new.”¹⁰ In fact, he claims that the first five letters

⁷ Unfortunately, almost nothing about either the author (Euthalius or Evagrius?), the date (somewhere between the fourth and sixth centuries?), or the scope (only Paul's letters or already including Acts and the Catholic Epistles?) of the original work is agreed on among scholars. The recent discussion of these matters in Vemund Blomkvist, *Euthalian Traditions: Text, Translation and Commentary*, TU 170 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), pp. 1–8, is judicious. He concludes later that “At the present stage of research only conjectures [*viz.* on these introductory matters] can be made” (p. 242). Even so, a plausible case has recently been made for placing the origin of the Euthalian Apparatus in the last decades of the fourth century; see Eric W. Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul: Ancient Editorial Practice and the Corpus Paulinum* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 118–122, who follows the analysis of Louis Charles Willard, *A Critical Study of the Euthalian Apparatus*, ANT 41 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009), pp. 111–127. Furthermore, Blomkvist has suggested that the final form of the Apparatus need not be the work of a single author, proposing that perhaps the first volume with the Pauline apparatus served as the original work, later expanded by another writer to include Acts and the Catholic Epistles (Blomkvist, *Euthalian Traditions*, pp. 4, 242–243).

⁸ Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul*, p. 135; see also pp. 142, 158–159, *et passim*.

⁹ *Prologus* 708A, edited in Blomkvist, *Euthalian Traditions* (trans. modified from Blomkvist) – οὕτως ἡ πᾶσα βιβλος περιέχει παντοῖον εἶδος πολιτειῶν κατὰ προσαύξησιν. This passage is noted in Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul*, p. 142.

¹⁰ *Prologus* 701A (trans. Blomkvist): περιέχει οὖν ἡ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολή κατήχησιν εἰς Χριστόν, καὶ μάλιστα διὰ τῆς ἐκ φυσικῶν λογισμῶν ἀποδείξεως, διὸ πρώτη τέτακται, οἷα δὴ πρὸς ἀρχὴν ἔχοντας εἰς θεοσέβειαν γραφεῖσα.

of the Pauline corpus – from Romans to Ephesians – are dedicated to “first principles for catechumens” and “introductions for believers.”¹¹ Moreover, one might argue that even Paul’s biography itself, presented in the *Prologus* (696A–701A), is based on an ideal model of repentance, conversion, and salvation.¹² Of course, as is the case for the authors discussed later, catechesis is not the only thing that Euthalius’ Paul is interested in. Nevertheless, it is an important aspect of his work and the ongoing function of his letters.

At first glance, the representation of Paul in the *Constitutiones apostolorum* and the Euthalian Apparatus may appear to contemporary scholars as simple anachronisms, unsupported by the textual resources of Paul’s letters. For instance, while “Paul” speaks about the function of the “bishop” (ἐπίσκοπος) in CA 8.32, scholars today normally differentiate between Paul’s varied and limited use of terms such as ἐπίσκοπος to denote community leaders and later developments of fixed church offices.¹³ Any portrayal of Paul that implicates him in such a strict ecclesial hierarchy is bound to strike many modern readers as strange, to say nothing of the fact that such an image of Paul and the other apostles is far more harmonious than many scholars today would accept.¹⁴ Second, it may appear out of place for Paul to offer apostolic canons on the

¹¹ Ibid.: καὶ εἰσὶν αὐταὶ...ἀρχαὶ κατηχομένων, πιστῶν εἰσαγωγαί. Similar comments on the catechetical quality of Ephesians (though with a different evaluation of Colossians) can be found in Euthalius *Hypoth.* 761C; cf. 765C on Colossians.

¹² This is the argument of Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul*, p. 124. See also his comments on p. 173: “Euthalius predicated his edition of the *Corpus Paulinum* on education, both preliminary and advanced. This pedagogical goal was articulated in and developed by means of the paratextual components of his edition. Foremost among the instructional aspects of these paratexts was Euthalius’s emphasis on exemplarity and mimesis, prominently displayed in the prologue’s epitomes of Paul’s letters and his *bios*.”

¹³ E.g., David G. Horrell, *An Introduction to the Study of Paul*, 2nd edn (London and New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006), pp. 134–135. See also the discussion in Benjamin L. White, “The traditional and ecclesiastical Paul of 1 Corinthians,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 79, no. 4 (2017), 651–669; and John S. Kloppenborg, “Pneumatic democracy and the conflict in 1 Clement,” in Mark Grundeken and Joseph Verheyden (eds.), *Early Christian Communities Between Ideal and Reality*, WUNT 1/342 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), pp. 61–81. The distinction between the Spirit-led communities and organized offices is normally more nuanced in current discussion than in the epochal debate between Sohm and Harnack; see the discussion in Jörg Frey, “Ämter,” in Friedrich Wilhelm Horn (ed.), *Paulus Handbuch* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), pp. 408–412, and Udo Schnelle, *Paulus. Leben und Denken*, 2nd edn, De Gruyter Studium (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), pp. 621–623.

¹⁴ This theme is picked up again in more detail below in Chapter 7.

preparation of candidates for baptism when he appears to claim in 1 Corinthians 1:17 that he was not sent to baptize at all: his task was proclamation. In fact, this tension – between Paul’s apparent disavowal of baptism and the clear importance of baptism and baptismal preparation in the (early) Church – generates an interpretive problem, even anxiety in some cases, for early and contemporary readers that is addressed in various ways. Furthermore, the catechetical and pedagogical structuring of Paul’s letters presented by Euthalius runs counter to the prevailing view among Pauline scholars that each letter ought to be treated primarily as an *ad hoc* act of communication, deeply marked by its historical exigency and only later compiled into a collection.¹⁵ Indeed, from this perspective it is hard to avoid the impression that, were he able to read it, the Apostle Paul would be rather surprised to find himself portrayed as he is in these works.

And yet, the presentation of Paul in these late fourth-century works is not mere anachronism. It is the culmination of a process of Pauline interpretation that begins near the end of the second century and is not without its undergirding textual resources within Paul’s letters. The themes of moral preparation for and progress within the Christian life, mimetic and paradigmatic appeals to Paul’s biography, and a link between Paul and the other apostles will appear repeatedly in the chapters that follow. The association between Paul and early Christian initiation, casting his ministry and letters as paradigmatic for catechetical praxis, is bound up with broader ecclesiological and pedagogical goals for writers from the second century to the fourth. Attempting to understand their goals and methods will take us a long way toward appreciating this association. For now, though, we must let the contrast stand between this late fourth-century Paul and the Apostle familiar to us from historical scholarship, as we move on to other introductory matters.

¹⁵ The debate over the reason for Romans is emblematic of this general shift, on which see esp. the essays in Karl Paul Donfried (ed.), *The Romans Debate* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991). This point stands even for those like Trobisch who argue that Paul’s own copies of his letters formed the basis for the later *Corpus Paulinum*; see David Trobisch, *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung. Studien zu den Anfängen christlicher Publizistik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989). A notable exception to this trend is Brevard S. Childs, *The Church’s Guide for Reading Paul: The Canonical Shaping of the Pauline Corpus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), whose arguments have not gained wide traction within the field.

I.2 ABOUT PAULINE RECEPTION

Although the first work devoted specifically to the reception and influence of Paul in the Church appeared in the 1880s, Otto Pfliegerer's *Lectures on the Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity*, it was not until the landmark works by Andreas Lindemann and Ernst Dassmann in 1979 that interest in Pauline reception truly began to gain momentum.¹⁶ Lindemann's and Dassmann's works represent a shift in the field, principally in their attempt to overturn the long dominant narrative stemming from F. C. Baur that the early Church had to rescue Paul from the Gnostics in their Catholicizing project – what Ben White refers to as the “Pauline captivity” narrative.¹⁷ Given that detailed accounts of scholarship on Pauline reception are available elsewhere, I will not reproduce one here.¹⁸ Rather, I want simply to highlight a few important considerations arising from work on (Pauline) reception which help to situate the present study and contributed to its shape.

I.2.1 Reception and (Mis)Interpretation

Perhaps the most decisive shift in studies of Pauline reception during the twentieth century has been away from the question of whether or

¹⁶ Otto Pfliegerer, *Lectures on the Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity, Delivered in London and Oxford in April and May, 1885*, 3rd edn, trans. J. Frederick Smith (London: Williams and Norgate, 1897); Andreas Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum. Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*, BHT 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979); Ernst Dassmann, *Der Stachel im Fleisch. Paulus in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Irenäus* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1979). Other important works from before 1979 are Eva Aleith, *Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche*, BZNW 18 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1937); Karl Hermann Schelkle, *Paulus, Lehrer der Väter. Die altkirchliche Auslegung von Römer 1–11*, 2nd edn (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1956); Maurice F. Wiles, *The Divine Apostle: The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles in the Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967); and Elaine H. Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).

¹⁷ Benjamin L. White, *Remembering Paul: Ancient and Modern Contests over the Image of the Apostle* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 20 and *passim*. Lindemann's work was particularly influential, and was supported largely independently by David K. Rensberger, “As the apostle teaches: the development of the use of Paul's letters in second century Christianity,” unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Yale University (1981). Work on specific early Christian writers also developed the Lindemann/Dassmann line of argumentation: e.g., Rolf Noormann, *Irenäus als Paulusinterpret. Zur Rezeption und Wirkung der paulinischen und deuteropaulinischen Briefe im Werk der Irenäus von Lyon*, WUNT 11/66 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994).

¹⁸ Useful accounts can be found in Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, pp. 6–10 (for a discussion of earlier scholarship, though he omits Wiles); Rensberger, “Apostle,” pp. 3–53; and particularly White, *Remembering Paul*, pp. 20–69.

not early readers got Paul “right” toward an effort to understand *why* they interpreted Paul in the way they did. In 1936, Heinrich Seesemann summed up the then dominant view of early Christian Pauline interpretation: “everyone knows that Paul was misunderstood very soon in the early Church.”¹⁹ At the end of the 1960s, Ernst Käsemann still considered it uncontroversial to claim that Paul’s “characteristic theology” had little success in the early Church, though sentiments were already shifting away from such evaluations.²⁰ Seesemann himself had noted that the more productive question was “how” the early Church had “misunderstood” Paul. Maurice Wiles was one of the first to highlight clearly the methodological problem inherent in passing judgment on early Pauline interpretations. He wrote:

the question that immediately arises in our minds is the question “How far then did the early commentators give a true interpretation of Paul’s meaning?” Yet the very form in which the question arises is not without danger. It implies the assumption that we have a true interpretation of Paul’s meaning – or at least a truer one than that of those whom we have studied – in the light of which theirs may be tested and judged. It may be so; but we as much as they are children of our own times and there may well be aspects of Pauline thought to which we are blinded by the particular presuppositions and patterns of theological thinking in our own day. If therefore we seek to pass judgement on other interpreters it can only be in the recognition that we also stand in need of judgement, even and perhaps especially when we are least conscious of that need.²¹

¹⁹ H. Seesemann, “Das Paulusverständnis des Clemens Alexandrinus,” *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 107 (1936), 312: “Daß Paulus in der Alten Kirche sehr bald mißverstanden wurde, ist allbekannt.” I will return to this again in Chapter 7 below. Similar judgments can be found in Walther Völker, “Paulus bei Origenes,” *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 102 (1930), 258–279; and Aleith, *Paulusverständnis* (summarizing her conclusion on pp. 119–122). Pfleiderer stated that “It was Luther in whom the spirit of Paulinism first re-appeared in all its power, successfully bursting the fetters of Catholicism”; Pfleiderer, *Influence*, p. 273.

²⁰ Ernst Käsemann, “The theological problem presented by the motif of the body of Christ,” in *Perspectives on Paul*, trans. Margaret Kohl (London: SCM, 1971), p. 115. Though Käsemann elsewhere explicitly indicates his debt to F. C. Baur, his comments here are reminiscent of Adolf von Harnack’s judgment that Paul’s letters were not the *basis* for early theological development (except for Marcion) but simply a “ferment” which generated a series of reactions; see Adolf Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. 1, trans. Neil Buchanan (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1895), p. 136 (see also pp. 89–90), and see the discussion of Harnack’s view in Rensberger, “Apostle,” pp. 22–24. This interpretation of Paul is well detailed in White, *Remembering Paul*, pp. 20–41.

²¹ Wiles, *The Divine Apostle*, p. 132.

Though he does not cite Wiles, Andreas Lindemann made similar observations about the dangers of treating contemporary Pauline understanding as the measuring rod for early readers.²²

Scholars have by and large taken this point to heart, exploring the ways in which early readers engaged in creative uses of Pauline materials within their own historical contexts and in the light of their own interpretive needs.²³ This has led to an emphasis among some scholars on the constructive element of Pauline interpretation, reflected clearly in the title of Richard Pervo's work, *The Making of Paul*.²⁴ Others, while acknowledging this aspect of Pauline reception, also emphasize the roles of memory and tradition in shaping early Pauline presentations.²⁵ In a programmatic article, Daniel Marguerat argued that there are "three poles" of early Pauline reception – documentary, biographical, and doctoral – among which early representations and appropriations of Paul can be construed.²⁶ This "should permit the modulation of the relationship with

²² Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, pp. 3, 72.

²³ See the comments in Rensberger, "Apostle," p. 57; Margaret M. Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), pp. 18–22; Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul, the Corinthians, and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 12; White, *Remembering Paul*, pp. 68–69; Jennifer R. Strawbridge, *The Pauline Effect: The Use of the Pauline Epistles by Early Christian Writers*, SBR 5 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), pp. 55–56. With respect to the Hebrew Bible, see the comments in Brennan W. Breed, "What can a text do? Reception history as an ethology of the biblical text," in Emma England and William John Lyons (eds.), *Reception History and Biblical Studies: Theory and Practice*, Library of Hebrew Bible 615/Scriptural Traces 6 (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), pp. 100–101. Nevertheless, some scholars repeat the trope of a misunderstood Paul, even if in a softened form. Peter Kohlgraf, *Die Ekklesiologie des Epheserbriefes in der Auslegung durch Johannes Chrysostomus. Eine Untersuchung zur Wirkungsgeschichte paulinischer Theologie*, Hereditas 19 (Bonn: Borengässer, 2001), pp. 355–366, and Matthias Westerhoff, *Das Paulusverständnis im Liber Graduum*, PTS 64 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008), pp. 212–213, presume a traditional, justification-centric Paul against which they measure later interpretations; while James D. G. Dunn, *Neither Jew nor Greek: A Contested Identity*, Christianity in the Making 3 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), measures early Pauline reception against his own construal of Pauline theology (see my review in *Australian Biblical Review* 64 (2016)).

²⁴ Richard I. Pervo, *The Making of Paul: Constructions of the Apostle in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010).

²⁵ So White, *Remembering Paul*, and, more optimistically with reference to the "historical" Paul, Alexander N. Kirk, *The Departure of an Apostle: Paul's Death Anticipated and Remembered*, WUNT 11/406 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015).

²⁶ Daniel Marguerat, "Paul after Paul: a (hi)story of reception," in *Paul in Acts and Paul in His Letters*, WUNT 310 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), p. 6, originally published as Daniel Marguerat, "Paul après Paul: une histoire de réception," *New Testament Studies* 54, no. 3 (2008), 317–337.

the writings of Paul, depending on whether one is situated in the realm of intertextuality ('doctoral' pole) or of the construction of a biographical memory."²⁷ In other words, particularly for the first and early second centuries, Marguerat shows that the Pauline letters constituted only one stream of Pauline tradition and so they cannot be taken as determinative for "Paulinism" as a whole.²⁸ Paul's self-presentation in his letters and, according to his own testimony (e.g., 1 Cor. 9:19–22), in person was itself multifaceted, and it appears that "the different roles accorded to the apostle correspond" to his manifold "self-comprehension."²⁹ These observations indicate how deep is the difficulty of comparing the "historical" Paul with early Christian images of Paul. If, in Margaret Mitchell's excellent phrase, "the marvelous malleability" of Paul extends back through his reception into his own works, deciding which Paul to use as the benchmark for the "real" Paul becomes very difficult.³⁰ Rather than providing grounds simply to abandon historical-critical readings of Pauline texts, however, this fact points toward the value of a hermeneutically nuanced approach, one in which the reception, interpretation, and appropriation of Paul's persona and letters also feature as meaningful contributions to understanding the Apostle and his writings, rather than as an optional add-on for those with extra time on their hands.

These points will receive further reflection and expansion in Chapters 7 and 8. At present it is enough simply to note that this shift in studies of Pauline reception has in fact taken place and shapes the present study in a particular way. If the dominant recent trend has been to focus on the plurality and constructive quality of Pauline reception, there have also been some who have reacted by emphasizing the tight continuity between the historical figure of Paul and his early reception.³¹ The present study, though, adopts a middle path: acknowledging the developments and shifts in the reception of Paul, and noting the constructive elements in early interpretation, while attending to the way in which this reception

²⁷ Marguerat, "Paul after Paul," p. 21.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 14. See the similar comments about the plurality of *Paulusbilder* in Samuel Vollenweider, "Paulus zwischen Exegese und Wirkungsgeschichte," in Moisés Mayordomo-Marín (ed.), *Die prägende Kraft der Texte. Hermeneutik und Wirkungsgeschichte des Neuen Testaments*, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 199 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2005), pp. 153–154.

³⁰ Mitchell, *Heavenly Trumpet*, p. 20.

³¹ So esp. Kirk, *Departure*, who uses the language of "family resemblance" to link various portrayals of Paul's death in the late first and second centuries; see also Brian J. Arnold, *Justification in The Second Century*, SBR 9 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017).