

I have received a number of emails asking me about the Cephas and Peter article I started giving a couple of posts ago, and most of the questions, as it turns out, are answered in the \*second\* half of the article, which I had originally planned not to provide here on the blog. So now I've decided, well—why not?

And so here is the rest of the article for anyone who is interested. For those not interested in all the convoluted ins and outs of the argument, you may want to see the end, the summary and conclusions, as the pay-off of the argument is rather significant. As with the rest of the article, I have not included any of the footnotes, where I give some of the logic and evidence for my sundry points.

As it turns out, I'm not sure I buy the argument anymore. I'll explain why in simple terms in a later post.

\*\*\*\*\*

The evidence of Paul has not been exhausted by this consideration of Gal 2:7-9. There remain the other references to Cephas in Paul's letters, references that provide other points of interest. Indeed what is striking is that in virtually every instance, Paul's references to Cephas contain something that is difficult to explain if in fact he meant "Peter," Jesus' disciple, the one who had received the "apostolate to the circumcised" (Gal 2:8) just as Paul received that to the uncircumcised.

In some respects the reference in 1 Cor 15.5 is the most interesting. In reciting the tradition he had received concerning the death and resurrection of Jesus ...

**The Rest of this Post is for MEMBERS ONLY. If you don't belong yet, You DON'T KNOW what you're missing. It would change your life!! So shell out, join up, and live happily ever after!**

You need to be logged in to see this part of the content. Please [Login](#) to access.



[My Work for the New Revised Standard Version Committee  
Cephas and Peter in the Writings of Paul \(Who Knew Them\)](#)